

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Bartlett, Thompson)

Chair Jordan announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

Commissioner Jordan called for a recess at 3:56 P.M and reconvened the hearing at 3:58 P.M

Commissioners Thompson and Bartlett returned to the dais at 3:58 P.M.

V. **DISCUSSION ITEM**

ACTUAL TIME: 3:58 P.M.

AVERAGE UNIT SIZE DENSITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Staff will present to the Planning Commission three process review options for rental projects developed under the Average Unit Size Density Incentive Program. The Planning Commission will forward a recommendation to the City Council.

Case Planner: Bettie Weiss, City Planner

Email: BWeiss@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 5509.

Bettie Weiss, City Planner, gave the Staff presentation. John Ledbetter, Principal Planner and Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Supervisor, were available to answer questions.

Chair Jordan opened the public hearing at 4:18 P.M.

The following people commented on the project:

1. Greg Reitz, developer, requested that any decisions made not be retroactive, that any referral to the Planning Commission be limited to projects that do not fit the AUD and that the process not be lengthened.
2. Lisa Plowman, SB4ALL, submitted a letter suggesting an alternative option.
3. Paul Zink, Architectural Board of Review (ABR) Chair, stated that staff reports are helpful to ABR and that approving four story buildings is going to be difficult for ABR.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 4:37 P.M.

Commissioner's Comments:

Commissioner Lodge:

- Would like to see an automatic referral to the Planning Commission for formal action.

- Preferred a concept design review prior to proceeding to the Planning Commission.
- Suggested that there be an automatic referral for all projects with 8 or more units.

Commissioner Lodge left the dais at 5:28 P.M.

Commissioner Pujo:

- Supported using a trigger of half an acre for High Density/Priority Housing Overlay projects
- Supported concept review at PC for comments not action.
- Would like one design review meeting before Planning Commission.
- Keep the process timeline down and the cost of projects down. Remove any overlap of listed fees from projects and notice once.

Commissioner Schwartz:

- Proposed an ordinance amendment in the long term to establish formal early review by the Planning Commission.
- The Planning Commission should provide direction, not just comments.
- In the short term, would like a number of parties able to call up a project to the Planning Commission: staff, applicant, review board, or Planning Commission (like the Staff Hearing Officer process).
- Suggested a trigger of 10 units or more for formal Planning Commission review.

Bettie Weiss, City Planner, reminded the Commission that an applicant already has the ability to request a concept review without an ordinance amendment. Any other party calling up a project to the Planning Commission would require an ordinance change.

Commissioner Campanella:

- Recommended looking at the four vacant half acres sites in the commercial zones before deciding on the number of units.
- Did not support going to the Medium-High density tier, or going below 5 units in the High Density/Priority Housing categories.
- Allow the test to work with the established parameters.

Commissioner Thompson:

- Believed the design review boards have the capability of reviewing AUD projects if given the same support that is given to the Planning Commission.
- Felt SB4ALL's alternative makes most sense if the Planning Commission is involved.
- The Applicant always has the option to come to the Planning Commission prior to design review.

Discussion followed on what type of action would the Planning Commission take if the Applicant came to the Planning Commission first. No agreement was made pending further discussion at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Jordan:

- Agreed with other Commissioners that design review boards are capable of handling AUD reviews.
- Would like to find a way to keep Planning Commission involvement on a comment level.
- Liked SB4ALL's option, but with some tweaks on triggers and thresholds.
- Did not want an ordinance amendment that would permanently involve the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Bartlett

- Believed that design review boards are capable of reviewing AUD projects and should get the same support the Planning Commission receives.
- Only projects found inconsistent with city policies should be reviewed by the Planning Commission.
- Whatever policy direction is taken should not be retroactive.
- Applicant should have ability to call for an initial PC concept review and combined ABR or HLC.
- Training should be provided to design review boards.

MOTION: Thompson/Bartlett

Continue discussion to December 19, 2013

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Lodge)

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

ACTUAL TIME: 6:27 P.M.

D. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report
None.
2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports
None.

ACTUAL TIME: 3:04 P.M.

AVERAGE UNIT-SIZE DENSITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Staff will continue discussing with the Planning Commission the three process review options presented December 12, 2013, for rental projects developed under the Average Unit Size Density Incentive Program (AUD). The Planning Commission will forward a recommendation to the City Council.

Case Planner: Bettie Weiss, City Planner

Email: BWeiss@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 5509.

Chair Jordan re-opened the public hearing at 3:04 P.M.

Lisa Plowman, SB4ALL, submitted and read written comments into the record.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 3:06 P.M.

Irma Unzueta, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Commissioner's comments on the scope of review of AUD projects: Commissioners Pujo, Campanella, and Jordan felt Planning Commission review of AUD projects should be limited to high density and priority housing overlay density tiers.

- Commissioners Bartlett and Thompson preferred no automatic triggers, but if AUD projects come to the Planning Commission, they should be limited to high density and priority housing overlay projects, and only for projects requesting modifications.
- Commissioner Lodge would like to see all AUD density tiers come to the Planning Commission.
- Most Commissioners agreed that not all high density and priority housing overlay projects should come for Planning Commission review.

Commissioner's comments on automatic triggers for Planning Commission review:

Number of Units:

- Commissioner Lodge could support eight units as the trigger.
- Commissioners Pujo, Bartlett, and Jordan could not support number of units as a trigger.

Size of Property:

- Commissioner Thompson and Bartlett did not support size of property as a trigger since there are not many vacant half acre and larger properties.
- Commissioner Lodge could support reviewing project sites of 10,000 square feet.
- Commissioner Pujo was in support of size of property because it is a fixed variable. Would like to see the trigger able to catch at least 20 % of the available inventory.
- Commissioner Jordan was in support of size of property as a trigger, but would like to have the trigger reach at least 25-30 % of the available inventory.
- Commissioner Campanella does not support an automatic trigger, but felt that the Planning Commission should not review anything smaller than 10,000 square feet.

Staff provided clarification on the square footage of a third acre as being able to accommodate approximately eight units. In response to the four vacant properties identified by Commissioner Campanella, Staff clarified that there are vacant and underdeveloped properties in the inventory that allow for more projects to qualify for review.

Four Stories

- Commissioner Lodge was in support of reviewing four story AUD projects.
- Commissioner Bartlett felt that this trigger was not needed since the Planning Commission already reviews any project over 45'.
- Commissioner Pujo did not support four stories as a trigger.

Environmental/Historic Constraints:

- Commissioner Pujo did not support this as a trigger and felt that the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) would be more appropriate for historic review.
- Commissioner Campanella felt that if a project required a full Environmental Impact Report (EIR) then the Planning Commission should review the full project.
- Commissioner Bartlett could support this trigger if a review board wanted to refer the project to the Planning Commission for review in balancing housing resources with historic resources.

Applicant Request:

- The majority of the Commissioners supported the Applicant's request for a Planning Commission review as a trigger.

Suspension (like Staff Hearing Officer):

- Commissioner Thompson did not support 'suspension' or 'pulling up prior to action' as triggers.
- Commissioner Bartlett did not support this trigger.

- Commissioner Jordan did not support this trigger; preferred a Planning Commissioner Liaison to the AUD process that could bring projects to the Planning Commission, similar to what exists for the Staff Hearing Officer.

“Pulling-up” prior to action

- Commissioner Bartlett did not support this trigger.
- Commissioner Pujo did not support this trigger and felt that only the applicant and the review board should be able to ‘bump up’ a project to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Jordan concurred.

Staff clarified that the existing ordinance gives the design review boards the ability to refer projects to the Planning Commission. The applicant also has the ability to take a project to the Planning Commission for concept review.

Commissioner’s comments on the action to be taken by the Planning Commission in a review:

- A majority of the Commissioners felt that the Planning Commission should offer comments only and not approval.
- Commissioner Lodge supported Planning Commission approval with specific findings.
- Commissioner Thompson did not support either action option and suggested that if the Council would like Planning Commission review, then AUD decisions made by the design review boards should be appealable to the Planning Commission action. Commissioner Jordan concurred.

Commissioner’s comments on when a Planning Commission review should occur:

- A majority of the Commission supported concept review prior to Planning Commission review.
- Commissioner Bartlett advocated for a joint review between the design review board and the Planning Commission.

Based on preliminary assessment of the Commission’s comments, Staff felt that the Commission was more closely aligned with Option One, on page 3, in the Planning Commission Staff Report dated December 5, 2013.

Commissioner’s comments on having an automatic trigger:

- Commissioners Lodge, Pujo, and Jordan were in support of having an automatic trigger.
- Commissioners Campanella, Thompson, and Bartlett were not in support of having an automatic trigger.

Commissioner's comments on appeals:

- Commissioners Campanella and Thompson felt that a third party appeal should come to the Planning Commission.
- Commissioner Thompson felt that any Planning Commission appeals could be appealed to City Council.
- The Commission was evenly split on whether or not the Planning Commission should hear appeals only on an intermediary basis.

Additional Commissioner's comments:

- Commissioner Pujo did not support having many triggers and preferred a clean, up-front expectation of Planning Commission review on some projects.
- Commissioner Thompson agreed that additional staff support, such as staff reports and site visits, should continue to be given to ABR and HLC.
- Commissioner Bartlett recommended that applicants be able to voluntarily request a joint Planning Commission and design review board concept review meeting.
- Commissioners Bartlett and Campanella requested that any changes to the review process not be made retroactive to projects currently being processed.
- Commissioner Pujo requested keeping timelines and additional AUD cost as low as possible.
- Commissioner Thompson asked that we keep operating under the current process until City Council directs otherwise.

Commissioner Jordan offered to represent the Planning Commission's position when this item goes before City Council.

V. **ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

ACTUAL TIME: 5:27 P.M.

E. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

None was given.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

- a. Commissioner Lodge reported on the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of December 18, 2013.
- b. Commissioner Thomson reported on the Single Family Design Review Board meeting of December 16, 2013.