



# CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

## COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

**AGENDA DATE:** December 13, 2016

**TO:** Mayor and Councilmembers

**FROM:** Planning Division, Community Development Department

**SUBJECT:** Work Program For The Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program

**RECOMMENDATION:** That Council:

- A. Confirm a work program for items related to implementation of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program;
- B. Initiate amendments to Title 28 of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code related to the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program; and
- C. Provide direction to staff regarding the membership, objectives, and expected duration of a Housing Task Force.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Preliminary conclusions regarding the effectiveness of the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program to meet its intended objectives were included in the City's 2016 Adaptive Management Program report and discussed at the semi-annual City Council/Planning Commission work session held on October 27, 2016. In addition, staff recommended four potential work efforts related to implementation of the AUD Incentive Program, and two additional recommendations were generated by the Planning Commission (PC) and Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC). This report summarizes those potential work efforts with the intent of seeking direction from City Council on a work program related to near-term implementation of the AUD Incentive Program.

**DISCUSSION:**

Background

An important component of the 2011 General Plan is the Adaptive Management Program (AMP), which provides an opportunity for timely policy adjustments during the 20-year life of the plan. The 2016 AMP Report focused on whether the AUD Incentive Program is meeting its three key objectives to: encourage smaller rental units; locate

units closer to transit, services, and recreational opportunities; and encourage workforce housing. The AMP Report concluded that the AUD Incentive Program is encouraging smaller rental units and locating units close to transit, services, and recreational opportunities, but not enough data is available to determine unit affordability.

The 2016 AMP Report was the primary topic of discussion at the semi-annual City Council/Planning Commission work session held on October 27, 2016. At that meeting, staff presented preliminary conclusions regarding the effectiveness of the AUD Incentive Program to meet its intended objectives. In addition, four staff recommendations were presented and discussed by the Council and PC:

1. Consider initiating an ordinance amendment by the end of 2017 to address the initial trial period for the AUD Incentive Program.
2. Continue requiring annual survey data from developers of AUD Incentive Program projects for as long as it is deemed useful.
3. Consider a focused ordinance amendment to require additional parking for AUD Incentive Program projects located outside the Central Business District.
4. Provide design boards with additional tools and support for their review of AUD Incentive Program projects.

Discussions with the PC and HLC in August and September 2016 also generated two recommendations for Council to consider: 1) establishing a Housing Task Force, and 2) amending the AUD Program map to better protect historic resources.

The purpose of this report and Council meeting is to receive direction from City Council on a proposed work program to address the items mentioned above.

### Ongoing Work Efforts

#### *Annual Surveys*

As discussed in the 2016 AMP Report, most AUD Incentive Program project approvals have been conditioned to require the owner to submit annual survey data to staff. As currently written, the surveys request certain information about the residents (e.g., household size, zip code of prior and current employment location, zip code of prior residence, and number of vehicles and bikes owned) and are due in December each year after a project has been completed and occupied for at least six months. As very few units have been constructed and occupied at this point, no surveys have been received to date. Staff will continue to require this annual survey as a standard condition of approval for as long as it is deemed potentially useful to evaluate the effectiveness of the AUD Incentive Program. The survey questions can be revised or cease to be required at any point, if deemed necessary. Staff would consult with the Planning Commission and/or the recommended Housing Task Force prior to adjusting significant aspects of the annual survey requirement.

### *Improvements to the Design Review Process*

Some projects proposed under the AUD Incentive Program have generated concerns from the public and the design review boards regarding size, bulk, scale, and compatibility with existing development and historic resources. Although the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) and HLC must consider six compatibility criteria in order to approve a project, the board members have expressed that they often feel ill-equipped to adequately review AUD Incentive Program projects. As a result, staff and subcommittees of the ABR and HLC are in the process of revising and augmenting several aspects of the design review process and are developing interim infill design guidelines to assist the design boards in their review of AUD Incentive Program projects. Draft design guidelines are tentatively scheduled for review by the Planning Commission in early 2017 and will ultimately require approval by the City Council. In the meantime, efforts to augment the design review application submittal requirements can be implemented immediately.

Staff is also committed to providing additional support to the design review boards in their review of AUD Incentive Program projects in the form of brief written staff reports; additional project statistics, such as FAR and amount of on-grade open space; and an analysis of the project's potential compatibility with applicable design guidelines. If possible, staff will also make every attempt to provide project plans to the design board members prior to the day of their meeting, for their advance review.

### Potential Amendments to the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program

Two recommendations of the 2016 AMP Report require amendments to the Municipal Code in order to address the program's initial trial period and revise the minimum parking standards. A third potential ordinance amendment, to revise the AUD Program Map, was recommended by the HLC. All three are discussed below.

#### *Initial Trial Period*

The AUD Incentive Program is in effect for an initial trial period of either eight years or until 250 units have been constructed (as evidenced by the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy), whichever comes first, in the areas designated for High Density Residential or within the Priority Housing Overlay. Any application deemed complete prior to the expiration of the AUD Incentive Program may continue to be processed under the AUD Incentive Program. Concerns have been expressed that too many AUD Incentive Program units are pending and continuing to proceed through the review process while the initial 250 units are awaiting occupancy to "test" this Program, which could result in the construction of more than 250 units. As of November 1, 151 units in the High Density Residential or Priority Housing Overlay areas are under construction, and another 164 units have received planning approval. Therefore, staff estimates that the initial trial period for the Program will be reached in approximately 22 to 28 months.

It is highly speculative to predict the possible number of units that could be developed under the AUD Incentive Program. At the July 21, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, some Commissioners requested that City Council consider a method to pace the number of AUD Incentive Program applications or building permits, or moderate it otherwise by adjusting incentives and/or the extent of the Program area. If the AUD Incentive Program is not amended prior to expiration of the trial period, the allowed residential density will default to the Variable Density standards allowed under SBMC §28.21.080.F., as it existed in early 2013. Staff has heard little support for returning to the previous Variable Density standards. An ordinance amendment typically takes at least one year to complete. In order to complete such an amendment before the trial period lapses, staff recommends that an ordinance amendment to address the sunset of the AUD Incentive Program be initiated by City Council at this time.

#### *Residential Parking Standards*

The limited amount of parking provided for some projects proposed under the AUD Incentive Program has generated concerns from the public. The current minimum parking requirement for AUD Incentive Program projects is one space per unit and no guest parking, regardless of unit size. This is the same residential parking standard for units restricted to very low- and low-income households, senior housing projects, and any mixed-use projects in the Central Business District (CBD), and is similar to the mixed-use parking standard outside of the CBD when residential uses occupy no more than 50% of the development. But the AUD Incentive Program parking requirement is less than the standard multi-family residential requirement, which can be twice as much, depending on the number of bedrooms per unit in a development. Since the AUD Incentive Program does not rely on bedrooms to determine allowed density, project proposals have included multiple bedrooms with only one parking space per unit. Staff expects this will ultimately impact the on-street parking supply, which will be more pronounced outside of the CBD.

When the AUD Incentive Program ordinance was originally considered, the Planning Commission recommended a maximum of 1.5 spaces per unit for downtown housing with unbundled parking (i.e., rented/sold separate from the unit). At the time of ordinance adoption, setting the minimum parking requirement at one space per unit became a key incentive of the program. Providing parking on-site adds to project expense and can limit the size of units and/or density of a project. Staff believes that the lower off-street parking requirements coupled with the higher density allowed have been significant catalysts for high development activity related to the AUD Incentive Program.

Council could explore an ordinance amendment to reduce anticipated on-street parking impacts in the areas of greatest concern, outside of the CBD. Alternately, because adjusting the parking requirements upward would likely influence the number and size of units proposed in a project, this concern could be evaluated by the Housing Task Force. In that context, the desirability of the AUD Incentive Program could be analyzed as a whole, considering physical development standards together with any potential mandatory in-lieu fee or provision of income-restricted units.

### *The AUD Incentive Program Map*

On August 24, 2016, the HLC provided feedback and direction to its subcommittee developing interim infill design guidelines and also recommended that City Council consider amending the AUD Incentive Program map to ensure protection of historic resources. Specifically, the HLC believed that certain portions of the Priority Housing Overlay within El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District should be removed to reduce potential conflicts or incompatibility of high density residential developments in the historic downtown core. Although a couple specific areas for further study were mentioned at the HLC meeting, staff indicated that we would not further engage with the HLC on specific recommendations prior to receiving Council direction on this work effort. Staff is seeking Council direction as to whether or not this effort should be included in proposed amendments to the AUD Incentive Program ordinance.

### Housing Task Force

On September 6, 2016, staff held the second of two meetings with the PC to discuss the AUD Incentive Program. At that meeting, the PC voted on several staff recommendations and also adopted a resolution (Attachment 2 - PC Resolution No. 024-16) to recommend that “City Council form a Task Force to facilitate employer-sponsored housing and limited equity housing cooperatives under the AUD program, as well as affordable housing.”

At the October 27, 2016 joint City Council/PC work session, a majority of Council also expressed support for such a task force. If formed, this task force would be supported by staff from the Administration, Housing and Human Services Division. Staff is seeking direction from Council related to this task force in the following areas:

- Membership (e.g., number of task force members, representative groups/interests). As a point of reference, the Housing Action Task Force that convened in Fall 2001 for the purpose of recommending strategies to increase housing construction in the City had seven members, comprised of three Councilmembers, three Planning Commissioners, and one Housing Authority Commissioner.
- Objectives. The following items have been raised in past discussions of the AUD Incentive Program, and it may be appropriate for the Housing Task Force to:
  - Explore options to assess impact fees or otherwise mandate the construction of rental housing affordable to households earning 80 to 120% of the Area Median Income (AMI). An objective of the AUD Incentive Program is to provide workforce housing, defined by the City’s General Plan as households earning 120 – 200% of AMI. Concerns have been raised that the provision of market-rate housing increases the need for additional housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households (50–120% AMI) in the community.

- Consider potential sources of information to better analyze the AUD Incentive Program's effectiveness in providing workforce housing and housing for households already working or living in Santa Barbara.
- Investigate adjustments to parking requirements based on location and desired outcomes such as: smaller units, units with fewer bedrooms, parking in-lieu fees, or other benefits in exchange for parking requirement reductions.
- Explore ways to encourage employer-sponsored and limited-equity cooperative housing development.
- Duration. Staff recommends that a final work product be presented to Council in approximately six months.
- Other expectations for defined objectives and duration of the task force, and final work product(s).

#### **BUDGET/FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

The work efforts outlined in this report would be completed by existing staff from the Planning Division and Administration, Housing and Human Services Division of the Community Development Department, and Transportation Planning staff of the Public Works Department.

Housing Division staff could allocate up to 20 to 25 hours per month to support the Housing Task Force. Any additional time would impact staff's ability to carry out essential duties of the Housing Development and Preservation Program. Planning Division staff has existing work efforts (e.g., New Zoning Ordinance, Local Coastal Program update, Historic Districts Ordinance) and other planned ordinance amendments resulting from recent state ballot initiatives or legislation (e.g., Adult Use of Marijuana Act, Accessory Dwelling Units) that may be delayed or prolonged as a result of these anticipated AUD Incentive Program ordinance amendments. A more in-depth discussion and prioritization of the Planning Division's workload is anticipated at the next City Council/Planning Commission work session in the spring of 2017.

- ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. Historic Landmarks Commission Minutes, dated August 24, 2016
  2. Planning Commission Resolution No. 024-16

**PREPARED BY:** Renee Brooke, AICP, City Planner

**SUBMITTED BY:** George Buell, Community Development Director

**APPROVED BY:** City Administrator's Office



# City of Santa Barbara

## Planning Division

### HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION MINUTES

**Wednesday, August 24, 2016**      **David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street**      **1:30 P.M.**

**COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

PHILIP SUDING, *Chair*  
 CRAIG SHALLANBERGER, *Vice-Chair*  
 MICHAEL DRURY  
 ANTHONY GRUMBINE  
 WILLIAM LA VOIE  
 BILL MAHAN  
 FERMINA MURRAY  
 JUDY ORÍAS  
 JULIO JUAN VEYNA

**ADVISORY MEMBER:** DR. MICHAEL GLASSOW  
**CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:** JASON DOMINGUEZ  
**PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:** SHEILA LODGE

**STAFF:** JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor / Historic Preservation Supervisor  
 NICOLE HERNANDEZ, Urban Historian  
 DAVID ENG, Planning Technician  
 JENNIFER SANCHEZ, Commission Secretary

**Website:** [www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov](http://www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

An archived video copy of this regular meeting of the Historic Landmarks Commission is available at [www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov/HLC](http://www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov/HLC) by clicking on Videos under Explore.

### CALL TO ORDER.

The Full Commission meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Chair Suding.

### ATTENDANCE:

Members present: Drury, Grumbine (at 1:32 p.m.), La Voie, Mahan, Murray (until 3:43 p.m.), Orías, Shallanberger, Suding, and Veyna  
 Members absent: None  
 Staff present: Limón (until 2:50 p.m.), Eng, and Sanchez

### GENERAL BUSINESS:

#### A. Public Comment:

Kellam de Forest commented on the new draft zoning ordinance, stating that historic resources are not addressed sufficiently.

B. Approval of previous meeting minutes.

**Motion:** Approval of the minutes of the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of August 10, 2016, as amended.

Action: Mahan/Drury, 6/0/3. (La Voie [Item 5], Murray [Item 5], and Shallenberger abstained.) Motion carried.

C. Consent Calendar.

**Motion:** Ratify the Consent Calendar as reviewed by Bill Mahan.

Action: Murray/Drury, 9/0/0. Motion carried.

D. Announcements, requests by applicants for continuances and withdrawals, future agenda items, and appeals.

1. Mr. Eng announced the following:

- a. Item 1, an archaeology report for 6100 Wallace Becknell Road, has been postponed indefinitely at the applicant's request.
- b. Commissioner Murray will leave early.

2. Commissioner Mahan announced that the new criminal courthouse project is not proceeding at this time because of budgetary problems.

E. Subcommittee Reports.

Commissioner Drury reported that the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) ad hoc subcommittee met on August 17 and 19; Commissioners Grumbine, Mahan, and Orías also attended.

**ARCHAEOLOGY REPORT****1. 6100 WALLACE BECKNELL ROAD****A-I-1/SP-6 Zone**

**(1:45)** Assessor's Parcel Number: 073-080-065  
 Application Number: MST2014-00619  
 Owner: City of Santa Barbara - Airport Admin.  
 Agent: Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services, Inc.  
 Applicant: Direct Relief  
 Architect: DMHA

(Proposal to construct a new facility for Direct Relief, a nonprofit organization, including a new 127,706 square foot warehouse with an attached two-story 27,294 square foot administrative office building, a secure truck yard loading area, and 162 parking spaces on a 7.99 acre parcel to be purchased from the City of Santa Barbara Airport. The existing eight buildings totaling 12,937 square feet would be demolished. A new public road is proposed to be constructed immediately south of the project site, which is located in Sub-area 3 of the Airport Specific Plan [SP-6]. The project received a designation as a Community Benefit project and an allocation of 80,000 square feet [and reservation of 30,000 square feet] of non-residential floor area from the Community Benefit category by the City Council. Development Plan approval by the Planning Commission is required.)

**(Review of Phase 3 Archeological Resources Research Design Addendum, prepared by David Stone, Dudek.)**

**Item postponed indefinitely at the applicant's request.**

**Motion: To postpone the item indefinitely.**  
**Action: Drury/Veyna, 9/0/0. Motion carried.**

**DISCUSSION ITEM****2. AVERAGE UNIT-SIZE DENSITY (AUD) INCENTIVE PROGRAM**

**(1:50)** Staff: Renee Brooke, City Planner, and Jaime Limón, Design Review Supervisor  
 (Discussion of the objectives of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program and the role of the Historic Landmarks Commission.)

Actual time: 1:42 p.m.

Present: Renee Brooke, City Planner; and Jaime Limón, Design Review Supervisor

Public comment opened at 2:08 p.m.

Kellam de Forest stated that he would like to see the jurisdiction of the HLC expanded so that it reviews any AUD projects that may impact historic resources.

Public comment closed at 2:10 p.m.

**Discussion held.**

Commission comments:

1. The Commission thanks the participants of the ad hoc subcommittee for their work, particularly Planning Commissioner Sheila Lodge.
2. The timing and momentum of the subcommittee's work is important; the Architectural Board of Review should be included, but after the formulation of HLC guidelines.
3. The Commission supports the preparation of infill design guidelines in the short-term and redrawing the AUD Map to ensure protection of historic resources in the long-term.
4. The Commission agrees that the ad hoc subcommittee has done good work so far and should continue to work on the following:
  - a. Infill design guidelines should address projects that block the views and sunlight of adjacent buildings.
  - b. Respecting adjoining neighborhood development patterns should be emphasized in the guidelines.
  - c. Sensitivity to historic resources outside of El Pueblo Viejo needs more emphasis.
  - d. Proposal to redraw the AUD Map.
  - e. Better integration of AUD projects into neighborhood character is essential.
5. The Commission requested the following revisions to project submittal requirements:
  - a. Identify the characteristics of a "livable" unit.
  - b. Consider a requirement for applicants to identify important views from significant portions of the City.
  - c. Applicants should provide 3-D modeling from aerial and pedestrian views.
6. The Commission had the following comments on the AUD Program in general:
  - a. If affordability is a goal of the program, there should be tools to ensure it.
  - b. Show goals and current status of meeting those goals.
7. The Commission should more actively utilize all available review tools, especially when the project appears incompatible.
8. Make sure applicants understand compatibility, perhaps by providing them with visual representations.

**MISCELLANEOUS ACTION ITEM****3. 225 CALLE MANZANITA**

**(2:45)** Assessor's Parcel Number: 053-272-004

Owner: Mark & Maren Johnston

(Recommendation to consider adding the 1928 English Vernacular style house to the City's Potential Historic Resources List as it was found to be eligible as a Structure of Merit by the HLC Designations Subcommittee.)

Actual time: 2:50 p.m.

Staff comments: Mr. Eng summarized the Urban Historian's memo recommending that the HLC place the house on the Potential Historic Resources List.

Public comment opened at 2:54 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it was closed.

**Motion:** To add the structure located at 225 Calle Manzanita to the City's Potential Historic Resources List as it was found eligible for Structure of Merit designation.

**Action:** La Voie/Orías, 9/0/0. Motion carried.

### CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW

#### 4. 225 CALLE MANZANITA

E-3/SD-2 Zone

(2:50)

Assessor's Parcel Number: 053-272-004  
 Application Number: MST2016-00321  
 Owner: Mark & Maren Johnston  
 Applicant: Dale Pekarek

(Proposal for 60 square feet of additions to an existing 1,218 square foot, one-story, single-family residence with a 324 square foot detached two-car garage. Proposed alterations include the relocation of an existing fireplace and chimney from the east elevation to the south elevation, a new oriel bay window and roof form at the east elevation, enclosure of a covered side porch off of the dining room, a new roof over a raised entry porch, and replacement of existing windows. The project includes a remodel and reconfiguration of interior spaces. The proposed total of 1,602 square feet on a 6,920 square foot lot is 53% of the maximum allowed floor-to-lot area ratio [FAR]. This project will address a violation identified in Zoning Information Report #18732.)

**(Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Project requires Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance findings.)**

Actual time: 2:55 p.m.

Present: Dale Pekarek, Applicant

Public comment opened at 3:04 p.m.

Kellam de Forest stated that the relocation of the chimney would be a major alteration and would change the historic integrity of the house and the streetscape.

Public comment closed at 3:05 p.m.

*Straw vote:* How many Commissioners would like the chimney to remain on the east elevation in some form? 8/1 Passed

**Motion:** Continued two weeks with comments:

1. Study alternatives to moving the chimney to the south elevation, perhaps shifting it within the east elevation or rebuilding it in its existing location to meet current seismic standards and to retain the historic integrity of the building.
2. The chimney cap should be reused or re-created.
3. Retain all existing dormers.
4. The corbels on the new bay window should emulate the existing corbel end cuts, or should be eliminated, bringing the bay to the ground.
5. The new bay window should emulate the existing bay window, replicating the shed roof.
6. Mullions in windows need revision to be more consistent with English Vernacular style and the existing original windows.

7. The existing porch is exquisite and should not be modified.
8. Archival photos should be required and filed with the appropriate entity.
9. Drawings should show existing and proposed elevations side by side.
10. The Commission can support the south elevation porch infill.
11. The Commission appreciates the effort in replacing the non-original windows that are not historically appropriate for the building.

Action: Mahan/Orías, 9/0/0. Motion carried.

### **CONCEPT REVIEW – NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **5. 3135 CALLE MARIPOSA**

**E-3/SD-2 Zone**

**(3:20)**

Assessor's Parcel Number: 053-175-001  
 Application Number: MST2016-00330  
 Owner: Hauptert-Harris Family Revocable Living Trust  
 Architect: Becker Henson Niksto Architects

(Proposal for additions and alterations to an existing 1,096 square foot, one-story, single-family residence with a detached 315 square foot, two-car garage. The project includes a 272 square foot second-floor addition and four new roof dormers at an existing and expanded attic space, 110 square feet of ground-floor additions for a potting shed and outdoor storage, and permitting 159 square feet of "as-built" additions at the rear of the garage. The project also includes the demolition of an unpermitted 198 square foot patio cover, and construction of a new 192 square foot concrete patio, site walls, pedestrian gate, and new walkways steps. The proposed total of 1,952 square feet of development on a 10,890 square foot lot is 51% of the maximum allowed floor-to-lot area ratio [FAR]. The structure is on the City's Potential Historic Resources List.)

**(Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Project requires Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance findings.)**

Actual time: 3:41 p.m.

Present: Tom Henson, Architect

Public comment opened at 3:48 p.m.

Kellam de Forest commended the proposed design.

Public comment closed at 3:50 p.m.

**Motion: Project Design Approval, with final drawings to return to the Consent calendar, with findings and comment:**

1. The Commission finds that the project is consistent with required Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Findings: a) The proposed development is consistent with the scenic character of the City, will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood, and poses no significant change; b) The proposed development is compatible with the neighborhood, and its size, bulk, and scale are appropriate to the site and neighborhood; c) The proposed building is designed with quality architectural details, matching those of the existing building; d) The public health, safety, and welfare are appropriately protected and preserved, along with the preservation and reuse of the resource; and e) The project generally complies with the Good Neighbor Guidelines regarding privacy, landscaping, noise, and lighting.
2. The Commission expresses appreciation to the owners for their stewardship and commends the architect for a job well done.

Action: La Voie/Orías, 8/0/0. (Murray absent.) Motion carried.

The ten-day appeal period was announced.

**\*\* MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:55 P.M. \*\***



# City of Santa Barbara California

## CITY OF SANTA BARBARA PLANNING COMMISSION

### RESOLUTION NO. 024-16

#### CITYWIDE

#### RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

SEPTEMBER 6, 2016

### AVERAGE UNIT DENSITY (AUD) INCENTIVE PROGRAM

The Planning Commission discussed the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program (Santa Barbara Municipal Code Chapter 28.20). The purpose of the meeting was to review the AUD Incentive Program policy objectives in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, consider whether the stated objectives are being met, and/or if minor ordinance amendments should be considered, and provide a recommendation to City Council.

The AUD Incentive Program carries out a key program directed by the 2011 General Plan. The Program facilitates the construction of smaller housing units by allowing increased density and development standard incentives in selected areas of the City. Housing types that provide housing opportunities to the City's workforce are encouraged and facilitated by the program.

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission has held the required public hearing on the above topic.

**WHEREAS**, 7 people appeared to speak on the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program, and the following exhibits were presented for the record:

1. Staff Report with Attachments, August 30, 2016
2. Correspondence received:
  - a. Oswald Da Ros, via email
  - b. Joe Rution, via email
  - c. Anna Marie Gott, Allied Neighborhoods Association, via email
  - d. Citizens for Livable Neighborhoods, signed petition with 93 signatures
  - e. Kellam de Forest, via email
  - f. Pauline Cooney, hand-delivered at meeting
  - g. Lindsey Baker, League of Women Voters, hand-delivered at meeting

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the City Planning Commission:

- I. Recommend that the City Council move forward on improvements to the Project Review Process with:
  1. Increasing support to the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) and Architectural Board of Review (ABR) with staff reports, site visits, and analysis;
  2. Additional consideration for historic resources; and
  3. Preparing Multi-unit / Mixed-Use Guidelines.
  4. Any recommendations for ABR or HLC guidelines that impact Policy and Land Use should be reviewed by the Planning Commission before going to City Council.

This motion was passed and adopted on the 6th day of September, 2016 by the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Barbara, by the following vote:

AYES: 7 NOES: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

- II. Recommend that City Council form a Task Force to facilitate employer-sponsored housing and limited equity housing cooperatives under the AUD program, as well as affordable housing.

This motion was passed and adopted on the 6<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016 by the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Barbara, by the following vote:

AYES: 5 NOES: 2 (Pujo, Lodge) ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

I hereby certify that after review of the meeting video, this Resolution correctly reflects the action taken by the city of Santa Barbara Planning Commission at its meeting of the above date.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

*10/6/10*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date