



# CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

## COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

**AGENDA DATE:** October 27, 2016

**TO:** Mayor and Councilmembers  
Planning Commission

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

**SUBJECT:** Joint City Council And Planning Commission Work Session:  
2016 General Plan Implementation And Adaptive Management  
Program Report

**RECOMMENDATION:** That Council:

- A. Hold a joint work session with the Planning Commission to review the 2016 General Plan Implementation and Adaptive Management Program Report, and receive status reports on major Planning Division work program activities; and
- B. Provide direction to Planning Division staff on possible ordinance amendments or other adjustments to the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program to address the initial trial period, annual survey, residential parking standards, and design boards' tools and support.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Joint work sessions are held with the Council and Planning Commission approximately every six months as a means to establish a shared understanding of the Planning Division's workload. Further, it is an opportunity to discuss and confirm or make any needed adjustments to major work efforts and/or regular activity priorities. The Chairs of the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) and Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) are also invited to attend the work sessions. The last joint work session was held on April 7, 2016.

The primary topic for discussion at this meeting will be the 2016 General Plan Implementation and Adaptive Management Program Report, which was provided previously under separate cover. Brief status reports on the New Zoning Ordinance project and Historic Resources Work Program will also be provided.

This report and attachments provide an overview of major work efforts within the Division and list of significant active development projects.

## **DISCUSSION:**

### **Long Range Planning**

In the Long Range Planning section, significant resources are dedicated to the update of the Local Coastal Program and the production of the General Plan Implementation and Adaptive Management Program (AMP) Report, both described below. Other work items include Housing Element Implementation (e.g., state reporting requirements, Average Unit-size Density Program monitoring, etc.), regular Nonresidential Growth Management Program tracking, and various GIS and mapping efforts. The most significant current work efforts for the Division are listed in Attachment 1 (Planning Division Major Work Efforts).

#### General Plan Implementation and Adaptive Management Program Report

Since 2013, an annual General Plan Implementation and AMP Report (previously distributed under separate cover) has been prepared to ensure that the General Plan is being implemented effectively and towards achievement of its Vision, and to provide an opportunity through adaptive management for timely policy and implementation action adjustments. Encompassed within this effort are the Climate Action Plan (CAP) Implementation Status Report and 2011 General Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) Implementation Status Report.

Following input from the Planning Commission over the past year, the 2016 Report includes a number of improvements, comprising an expanded Growth Management section with a significant focus on the status of the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program, streamlined discussions of topic areas addressed in other reports and formats, cross-referencing between the CAP Implementation Status Report and General Plan Program EIR MMRP Implementation Status Report to reduce redundancy, and a new section that recommends considerations for future General Plan format, text, and/or policy review and possible adjustments.

The primary finding of the 2016 Report is that the City is generally on track with implementing the General Plan, CAP, and MMRP. A few possible work items are identified to advance the community toward the General Plan's Vision, more completely implement the General Plan Program EIR's mitigation measures and the CAP strategies, and improve usability of the General Plan; however, no possible work items identified are so substantial as to warrant amendments to the General Plan at this time.

The AMP portion of the Report focused on whether the AUD Incentive Program is meeting its three key objectives (i.e., unit size, location, and affordability), Staff received input on the AUD Incentive Program from the Planning Commission, Historic Landmarks Commission and Architectural Board of Review over the course of the past several months and meeting minutes are attached (Attachment 2). The AMP concludes

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 AMP recommends that the AUD Incentive Program continue until additional data is available regarding its effectiveness to provide housing affordable to the City's workforce, and that consideration be given to possible ordinance amendments or other adjustments to the program to address the initial trial period, annual survey, residential parking standards, and design boards' tools and support.

On October 6, the Report was presented to the Planning Commission for public input and discussion prior to the October 27 joint City Council and Planning Commission work session. There was one public speaker, generally in support of the AUD Incentive Program but concerned about the affordability of the rental units. Planning Commission discussion focused mainly on the AUD Incentive Program, including objectives, data collection, initial trial period, parking, design, and other considerations. The presentation at the October 27 joint Council and Planning Commission work session will include a summary of Planning Commissioners' input on staff recommendations regarding ordinance amendments or other potential adjustments to the AUD Incentive Program to address the initial trial period, annual survey, residential parking standards, and design boards' tools and support.

#### Comprehensive Local Coastal Program (LCP) Update

In February 2016, staff produced a Preliminary Draft Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP) that modernizes the 1981 Coastal Land Use Plan, incorporates relevant changes from the 2011 General Plan, and adds much needed guidance in certain emerging issue areas. In April 2016, staff of the California Coastal Commission (CCC) submitted extensive written comments on the plan that have required significant research, coordination with the City Attorney and other departments, and additional meetings with CCC staff.

On September 27, 2016, City Council received a status report on the LCP Update and directed staff to continue working with CCC staff for the next few months on remaining major issue areas, followed by release of a Public Review Draft Coastal Land Use Plan and commencement of a public outreach program in January 2017. Adoption of the plan by City Council is now scheduled for late summer/fall 2017, which represents a six-month delay from the previously reported schedule. The document would then be forwarded to the CCC for certification through an LCP Amendment process.

On September 27, City Council also accepted \$285,892 in grant funds awarded from the CCC to conduct public outreach on the LCP Update and undertake a Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plan and a Lower-Cost Visitor-Serving Accommodation Program between January 2017 and September 2018. The public outreach, review, and approval process for the majority of the Draft Coastal LUP would proceed as described above, while the Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plan and Lower-Cost Visitor Serving Accommodations Program are developed, processed, and certified on a separate schedule. These additional work efforts will delay initiation of the Environmental Resources Management Element update and

review of an amendment to Santa Barbara Municipal Code Chapter 22.65 (Design Standards for Development near Highway 101) to the beginning of 2018.

### **Design Review & Historic Preservation**

The Design Review & Historic Preservation section has been focused on implementing the Historic Resources Five-Year Work Program, and most recently has been engaged in the drafting of interim infill design guidelines. Other work items include assisting with the recent ordinance amendments to bring the Wireless Facilities Ordinance into alignment with federal law, and a similar amendment process to align the City's Sign Ordinance with a recent Supreme Court ruling. Progress on these assignments has been possible partially because, unlike last year's unusually high number of design review-related appeals to Council (12), this past year only three Council appeals have been filed. As mentioned during recent budget hearings and in the Development Review section below, it is important to note that significant staff resources are required to manage applications for new, larger mixed-use and multi-unit projects. Given that their physical contexts are typically within established neighborhoods and many times within close proximity to historic structures and/or within El Pueblo Viejo, these projects are very complex and require more time to guide through the review process.

#### Historic Resources Five-Year Work Program

Most recently, implementation of the Historic Resources Five-Year Work Program has been focused on drafting amendments to Santa Barbara Municipal Code (SBMC) Chapter 22.22 (Historic Structures) needed to facilitate the creation and designation of new historic districts, which are referenced in the Draft Historic Resources Design Guidelines. Working with the City Attorney's office, staff has created a work plan involving several public hearings to produce a draft ordinance with these amendments in the coming months.

In addition, mapping of all the city's historic resources was recently completed, which identified new areas of sensitivity for parcels that are in close proximity to historic resources. As a result of this mapping, parcel tags were added to advise staff and potential developers of adjacent existing historic resources and that proximity to the existing historic resources should be a consideration when designing new development projects.

A consultant contract was approved by Council in April 2015 to integrate the City's historic resources database into the City's website. The database is now functional, and survey information is available to the public online. Minor additional work is ongoing to ensure the survey forms print accurately.

#### Multi-Unit / Mixed-Use Design Guidelines

Preparing multi-unit/mixed use design guidelines to address multi-unit residential development remains a top priority toward implementing the City's Housing Element,

particularly given the importance of neighborhood character and compatibility associated with larger, multi-unit housing projects. Last year, Planning staff reported that due to other priorities, staffing constraints, and no current funding budget allocation, extensive work on the guidelines had yet to be undertaken.

However, within the last few months, the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) formed an ad hoc subcommittee to develop additional design guidelines due to concerns regarding the design of Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program projects. The HLC was particularly concerned with the need for “additional tools” to achieve more open space, improved site design, and more compatible designs when reviewing AUD Incentive Program projects already in the development pipeline. Additionally, improvements to the application submittal requirements have been incorporated in an effort to increase the amount and type of information that is provided to the HLC to aid its review and decisions on projects. The interim infill design guidelines would serve to better inform the HLC and the community of the types of acceptable development designs, including multi-story designs, and amenities suggested for multi-family developments. The HLC subcommittee has now completed a draft interim infill design guidelines document, which will be forwarded to Council for review and possible adoption in the near future.

A subcommittee of the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) has also been formed as a result of similar concerns regarding the design of AUD Incentive Program projects. The ABR subcommittee is reviewing the HLC’s draft infill design guidelines and evaluating possible options to develop similar infill design guidelines for projects in its purview.

Given the interest in having more design guidelines in place in the short term to provide design guidance for AUD Incentive Program projects, staff supports these interim infill design guideline efforts. However, additional consultant assistance may be necessary to complete the originally envisioned multi-unit/mixed use design guidelines properly and to consolidate all applicable City guidelines in a coordinated manner. Currently, there are no funds approved in the Planning Division’s budget to hire a consultant to assist in these efforts.

## **Zoning & Enforcement**

### New Zoning Ordinance (NZO)

The NZO project is an effort toward a comprehensive update of the City’s Zoning Ordinance. Dyett & Bhatia, the consultant firm contracted to develop the NZO, began working on the update in October 2014. Dyett & Bhatia’s first work product was an Issues and Options Paper, which was presented to the Planning Commission in March 2015. The second work product was Module 1: Land Use Regulations, which was presented to the Planning Commission on June 25, 2015. The third work product was Module 2: Development Standards, which was presented to the Planning Commission on March 18, 2016. The most recent product, Module 3: Administration, Parking, and Temporary Uses, was reviewed by the NZO Joint Committee on August 29, 2016 and

by the Planning Commission on October 14, 2016. Module 3 addresses administrative procedures, criteria, required findings of the discretionary review authorities, updates to definitions, and a new section on rules of measurement. Module 3 also includes parking regulations, which were originally programmed for Module 2: Development Standards.

When the NZO project began in January 2014, it was expected to be complete in fall of 2016. Due to the extent and complexity of Modules 2 and 3, the overall project is currently behind the original schedule. Staff anticipates release of a comprehensive draft of the New Zoning Ordinance for public review in early January 2017 and a final ordinance adoption in late spring 2017.

### Zoning Enforcement

Due to staffing issues, Zoning staff dedicated to enforcement duties currently consists of 2.0 FTE of hourly staff. In August 2015, Council appropriated funds to hire one permanent, full-time staff member, and one part-time, hourly staff member; Planning staff was unable to successfully hire a permanent, full-time enforcement officer in Fiscal Year 2016, but is now in the process of filling that position. A portion of the funding for the full-time position was carried over into Fiscal Year 2017 and is being used to hire additional hourly staff. As of October 11, 2016, enforcement staff has dedicated 1.25 FTE towards the vacation rental enforcement program. The remaining 0.75 FTE is spent on other enforcement priorities. When enforcement staff is fully staffed, a total of 4.0 FTEs will be assigned to enforcement, with 3.0 FTEs assigned to vacation rental enforcement. In Fiscal Year 2018, the enforcement staffing level is scheduled to be reduced to 2.0 FTEs.

As of October 6, 2016, Zoning Enforcement staff have 115 cases open (52 of which are vacation rentals) and a backlog of 590 unassigned cases (468 vacation rental cases and 122 non-vacation rental cases) that have not yet been investigated, and an additional 568 complaints from a legislative subpoena to Craigslist.org. Enforcement staff continues to triage and assign priority levels to the incoming zoning complaints. The majority of very-high priority complaints are investigated within 21 days of receipt; however, it may take much longer before low-priority complaints are investigated. Because of the influx of vacation rental cases and the overall number of unassigned cases, the amount of time required to start investigations of low-priority cases is much higher than the historical norm. A detailed update on the vacation rental enforcement program was provided to the City Council on October 11, 2016.

### Zoning Information Reports (ZIRs)

Since February 2015, Planning staff has completed the implementation of the ZIR process improvements recommended by the Planning Commission and ZIR Working Group. Since the last joint City Council and Planning Commission work session in April 2016, Planning staff has:

- Completed written procedures for ZIR inspection staff
- Updated the ZIR application intake and inspection scheduling staff procedures

- Implemented a new City webpage to help homeowners navigate the ZIR process
- Provided information to homeowners on the City's ZIR program through the City News in Brief, Water Bill Insert, and the LDT Land Use Bulletin

Staff will continue to conduct public outreach using funds previously allocated for this effort.

### Accela Implementation

This major work effort was previously referred to as the Tidemark Advantage Replacement Project (TARP). In June 2016, the City signed a contract with Accela, Inc. to replace the Tidemark Advantage permit tracking system with Accela Civic Platform, a state-of-the-art permit tracking system. The implementation kickoff meeting will occur on October 24, 2016, and the project is anticipated to take 14 months. Zoning & Enforcement program staff are heavily involved with this work effort, and Council allocated funds to back-fill key positions in the section. At the higher staff levels, the back-fill plan will primarily draw staff from other sections within the Planning Division. Lower-level back-fill will be filled with hourly staff. The transition of bringing new staff up to speed is anticipated to cause some discontinuity in various aspects of the Division, with most disruption being expected within the Zoning and Enforcement Section.

## **Development & Environmental Review**

### Development Activity

Similar to the Design Review Section, Development activity continues to be robust primarily due to the Pre-Application Review Team (PRT) review required of certain Average Unit Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program High Density tier and Priority Housing Overlay projects and other mixed-use projects in the pipeline. A number of applicants with projects that do not require Planning Commission review are also choosing to do a voluntary PRT as a way to receive early coordinated review by the Land Development Team.

Attachment 3 (Significant Development Review Projects) shows that there is a number of large projects in early review including, for example, a new mixed-use project with nine large residential condominium units at 1062 Coast Village Road, a new mixed-use AUD Incentive Program project with 27 apartment units at 214-226 E. De La Guerra Street, a 66-room hotel addition project at 1601 State Street (La Quinta Inn and Suites, formerly El Prado), and a large mixed-use project with 125 apartments (including 14 affordable units) and various commercial uses at 121 E. Mason Street.

Other major developments of note include the Maserati/Alpha Romeo luxury auto dealership at 350-352 Hitchcock Way, which received final approval by the ABR in June, and an addition to the BMW/Audi dealership at 402 S. Hope Avenue, which is scheduled for Planning Commission review on November 10. A new light industrial park of approximately 47,000 square feet was approved by the Planning Commission this month for the Airport at 6100 Hollister Avenue.

Recent polling shows that Proposition 64 (The Adult Use of Marijuana Act) is likely to be approved by the People on November 8, 2016. In response and in conjunction with the City Attorney's office and the Police Department, drafting of the moratorium and an ordinance addressing the potential need for land use regulations related to non-medical marijuana is also being managed by Development Review staff. At a minimum, the issues that would need to be addressed in a new ordinance include:

- Locations where the land uses (e.g., cultivation, manufacture, sales) would be allowed
- Operational standards for various aspects of the businesses
- Process for permitting various aspects of the businesses and opportunities for appeal
- Potential regulatory fees
- Level of enforcement effort and policing

As with the process for developing the ordinance for medical cannabis, a significant amount of work, including extensive community engagement, is likely to be required. Details of this were presented to the City Council on October 18, 2016.

In addition to working on these major development projects, Development Review staff continue to assist in the review of NZO and LCP Update work efforts.

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

There is a number of significant work assignments in the Planning Division currently underway and that will continue for the next few years, as noted in this report. Before initiating most new major projects, staff considers current and expected workload, existing staff resources, and concurrence from the City Council on workload priorities of the Division. If additional funding is required to initiate a new major project, staff typically returns to a regular Council meeting to discuss a scope of work and seeks appropriation of funds at that time.

- ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. Planning Division Major Work Efforts
  2. Minutes from Planning Commission, Historic Landmarks Commission and Architectural Board of Review
  3. Significant Development Review Projects

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

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

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

### Planning Division Major Work Efforts

Project Description	FY15 2014- 2015	FY16 2015- 2016	FY17 2016- 2017	FY18 2017- 2018	FY19 2018- 2019	FY20 2019- 2020
Adaptive Management Program	✓	✓	X	X	X	X
Average Unit-Size Density Program (Monitoring)	X	X	X	X		
Local Coastal Program Update	X	X	X	X	X	
New Zoning Ordinance	X	X	X	X		
Vacation Rental Enforcement		X	X	X		
ZIR Process Improvements	X	✓				
Historic Resource Design Guidelines	X	X	X			
Tidemark Advantage Replacement Project	X	X	X	X		
Multi-Unit /Mixed-Use Design Guidelines		X	X			
Historic Districts Ordinance		X	X			
Communitywide GHG Emissions Inventory		X	X			
Marijuana-Related Business Ordinance			X	X		
Environmental Resources Element				X	X	X
Highway 101 Air Quality Setback				X		

✓ = Completed      X = In progress or ongoing

**Major Recent Accomplishments:** Noise Ordinance Amendments (2016); Minor Zoning Exception Process (2016); Housing Element Certification (2015); AUD Ordinance Adoption (2013) and Amendment (2014); Emergency Shelter Ordinance (2014); Safety Element Adoption (2013)



# City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

July 21, 2016

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Campanella called the meeting to order at 1:03 P.M.

### **I. ROLL CALL**

Chair John P. Campanella, Vice-Chair June Pujo, Commissioners Jay D. Higgins, Mike Jordan, Sheila Lodge, Deborah L. Schwartz, and Addison Thompson.

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Debra Andaloro, Principal Planner  
Beatriz Gularte, Senior Planner  
Rosemary Dyste, Project Planner  
Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner  
Irma Unzueta, Project Planner  
N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney  
Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

### **II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:**

A. Requests for continuances, withdrawals, postponements, or addition of ex-agenda items.

None.

B. Announcements and appeals.

Ms. Gularte made the following announcements:

1. The Planning Commission meetings of August 4, 2016, and August 18, 2016, are cancelled.
2. The Planning Commission's decision on 1417 San Miguel Avenue will be heard on appeal by City Council on Tuesday, July 26, 2016.

C. Review, consideration and action on the following draft Planning Commission Minutes and Resolutions:

1. July 7, 2016

2. PC Reso No. 017-16  
1925 El Camino de la Luz – FMND

Commissioner Higgins requested clarification of the format used for the minutes. Planning Commission Secretary Julie Rodriguez responded that the format is to record the action of the Commission, which is often a motion, with inclusion of a summary sentence for any Commissioner found in the minority position of the motion.

**MOTION: Lodge/Thompson**

Approve the minutes and resolution.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 1 (Jordan). Absent: 0

- D. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda.

Chair Campanella opened the public hearing at 1:06 P.M. and the following comments were made:

1. Denise Spangler Adams, Montecito Vista, spoke to the land development agreement made by the City after the Sycamore Fire that required land owners within the Montecito Vista development to maintain twenty six conditions that were to run with the land. All original property owners have these conditions. As properties have been sold, these conditions are not being made known to new property owners, which is a concern due to the development being in a high fire area. She request that the Planning Commission improve communication so that all future owners understand the responsibilities of the conditions that run with the property.
2. Lee Moldaver, Citizens Planning Association (CPA), intended to speak about CPA's Annual Meeting at the Pico Adobe on Saturday, July 23, 2016. Instead, he was inspired to share a tribute to Sue Higman and provided recollections of her contributions to CPA.

With no one wishing to speak, the hearing was closed at 1:13 P.M.

**III. DISCUSSION ITEM**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:13 P.M.**

**AVERAGE UNIT DENSITY (AUD) INCENTIVE PROGRAM**

Staff will discuss the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program (Santa Barbara Municipal Code Chapter 28.20). The purpose of the meeting will be to review the AUD Incentive Program policy objectives in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and consider whether the stated objectives are being met and/or if minor ordinance amendments should be considered.

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.

Contact: Rosemary Dyste, Project Planner

Debra Andaloro, Principal Planner

Email: RDyste@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 4599

DAndaloro@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 2569

Debra Andaloro, Principal Planner, gave the Staff presentation. Rosemary Dyste, Project Planner; Irma Unzuerta, Project Planner; and Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner, were available to answer any of the Commission's questions.

Members of the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) and Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) were invited to attend and provided the following comments:

1. Bill Mahan, Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) Member, approved of Staff's report. He referenced HLC's challenges with 2 recent AUD projects: 800 Santa Barbara Street and 1032 Santa Barbara Street where they considered the projects to be too dense. A general rule of architecture is that "form follows function". If the function is to put as many units as possible in a building and the HLC has no say on the function, then the building starts to bulge and the HLC senses it when looking at the architecture's size, bulk and scale pushing out. He wishes that the ordinance provided more breadth with tools to give the HLC some discretion, such as with parking requirements. It is good if the developer and the reviewing body can be on the same wave length. Presently the AUD seems to give the Applicant the ability to make larger building, while the HLC is challenged with maintaining the size, bulk, and scale and resulting in a struggle between the Applicant and the reviewing body.
2. Judy Orias, HLC, was delighted to see that AUD is taking into account grocery store and bus service. One thing that is missing is consideration for children that will live in the AUD units. Parks and facilities for children need to be considered. Recently HLC saw a project that proposed a 4-bedroom unit and suggested to either limit the number of bedrooms in a unit or increase the parking. She is concerned with compatibility of proposed buildings with adjoining buildings, particularly in the El Pueblo Viejo. She suggested that consideration be given to the location and the possibility of children in the units; the number of bedrooms and the parking requirement; and design compatibility in the area. There needs to be flexibility in the AUD to allow projects to succeed in the quality of life for the people who will live in them. We also need to make sure that the units are for workforce housing.
3. Howard Wittausch, Architectural Board of Review (ABR), stated that the AUD projects fall into two parts. One part is in the commercial district on large lots adjacent to other buildings on large lots. The other part is projects proposed in neighborhoods zoned R-2 and R-3. Projects in commercial zones seem appropriate to those districts. In the neighborhood areas, the AUD projects are 4-stories, packed to the property lines, at grade-level parking, and usually adjacent to 1 or 2-story single family residences. Many neighbors appear at meetings objecting to the projects. ABR is

challenged to hear the neighborhood comments and not be influenced. He asked for consideration in reducing building height in neighborhood projects, not allowing the projects to be exempt from the setbacks, and from other architectural nuances that would allow ABR to review a project for size, bulk, and scale in that neighborhood. The way AUD projects are being developed is an intrusion to the neighborhoods and is shocking. In the neighborhoods, one project came to ABR that was more like a dormitory with 10 bedrooms, each of which constitutes a unit. Work force housing is not for families and not for children. Because the projects are so packed on the lot, the amount of open space, individually and collectively, is minimal.

Chair Campanella opened the public hearing at 2:01 P.M.

The following public comments were made:

1. Michael Noland, purchased a unit on West De la Guerra, adjacent to a proposed AUD development. He is concerned with the loss of sunshine, views, privacy, noise, and parking. This is near De la Guerra and Chapala Street where there is already no parking. He is concerned with the impact the project will have on his home and with the increased density. He does not want Santa Barbara to become like West Los Angeles.
2. Mark Sheridan, asked that all neighborhoods, not just El Pueblo Viejo, be protected. Asked that the AUD program take a pause and evaluate real data. He stated that Staff seems biased in support for the program and that their concerns are being patronized. He asked that staff question the assumptions made on parking exemptions. He asked that Staff look at the unintended consequences of the policies that are destroying neighborhoods. He questioned the special districts and streamlining of projects.
3. Kathy Houlihan has followed an AUD project proposed for her neighborhood. There is one parking space, with possible tandem parking, for 1-bedroom units. The parking does not take into account the business in the building or service providers to the building. HLC cannot deal with parking, but the City needs to address it. Affordability is a major reason for the AUD program, yet these units are not affordable in Downtown as architects bulge the buildings. Trees will be lost. Light will be sacrificed. Individual outdoor private space for recreation and enjoyment is sacrificed for communal out door roof congregation.
4. Lindsey Baker, League of Women Voters, initially supported the AUD program to relieve the City's chronic shortage of affordable housing and recognized adaptive management as a key element of the program. This experiment is not even close to completion. There are 900 reported units in the planning pipeline. It is estimated that it will be 3 years before we see the results and not know how many projects will be in the pipeline by then. The number of applications submitted was never anticipated and not triggering adaptive management. The league recommends that the City take a pause in taking any more projects in the high density and priority housing categories until the initial projects have been properly analyzed and adjustments made to the program. Changes may need to be made more immediately in such areas as size, bulk,

- scale and compatibility, parking, whether the occupants are part of the work force, and water. This experiment has come off the tracks and needs to be put back on the rails.
5. Joe Rution acknowledged Santa Barbara's long tradition of growth management. In recent years, we have eased up on this to create local workforce housing. This community consent is conditioned on whether or not these projects will work. If they do not work, then it does not matter how many development applications are in the pipeline. He is concerned that the program is based on huge assumptions. One assumption being that if we build small units that they will go to Santa Barbarians. It is possible that the units will go to people out of the area and why adaptive management is so important. He suggests a pause to be able to do the adaptive management analysis to see how the program is working. We can then either modify, or terminate the program.
  6. Mark Kirkhart, Design Architects, stated that to judge this program on the 'breadth taking number of units that will be built', is not accurate. Getting a product application submitted is a far cry from actually getting the unit built. Beyond design board approval, the Applicant has to contend with financing, economic variables, etc. He suggested that we need to keep the pace and get to 250 units of certificates of occupancy. This may take longer than what has been anticipated. Regarding parking and cars, he said that we are in an unprecedented part in history to know how cars will be effecting our lives. There will be autonomous vehicles in the near future. There are fewer 16 year olds even applying for licenses due to diminished interest in driving. He suggested a permit parking program for off hour parking for Downtown AUD projects as a stop gap. He noted that The Marc took 6 months through the entitlement process and the streamlined process was helpful. It took a year total to get to building permit.
  7. Mary Louise Days, request that AUD map be looked at carefully with regard to areas near historic buildings and El Pueblo Viejo. If the backlog of proposed projects are constructed in outer State Street area, the traffic and parking will be unbearable. The architectural renderings of some proposed projects show that the ABR is forgetting its mandate about respecting Santa Barbara's heritage and recognizing its architectural character.
  8. David Myers, 1032 Santa Barbara St., submitted a memo with recommendations. He stated that in Downtown there are city lots going unused at nighttime as well as a city permit program. If City staff would recommend that AUD tenants be able to use a Downtown parking permit to the closest parking lot structure when it is not in use, then it could help with parking utilization. He also asked Staff to review the seventy-five minute restriction on Saturdays that could allow families to use parking when it is not being used for business purposes. He cited a University of Michigan study that found only thirty-one percent of households only have 1 vehicle. Not everyone uses more than one vehicle. It is expected to go from 2.1 vehicles per household to 1.2 per household with use of shared vehicles, Uber, and autonomous driving. With regard to size, bulk, and scale, AUD is less restrictive than developing under mixed use or commercial.

9. Kellem de Forest said the look of Santa Barbara is what make unique and attractive, as well as a magnet for tourists that support the economy. The AUD program works counter to this because it encourages bulky, oversized, structures located in inappropriate spots. This will detract from the look of Santa Barbara, making Santa Barbara look like any other city, and detour tourists from wanting to come to Santa Barbara.
10. Naomi Green stated that the AUD program conceptually is admirable. Somewhere along the way, it has gotten out of control. A proposed project on 711 Milpas Street is bulging at 4-stories in a neighborhood of low mom and pop stores and 1-story houses. This will look like a monstrosity in the neighborhood. The neighborhood already has congested parking. The idea of eliminating parking is not realistic when transit does not exist today to support this concept. We think about parking, but should be thinking of transit options with these developments
11. Steve Harrel could not stay but is in support of the AUD program
12. Natalia Govoni, said that the Sahara Desert, Easter Island and Santa Barbara all share something in common. They were all once lush green space. She cautioned against damaging our eco-system and held up pictures of recent AUD projects stating that someone has to say “stop”, “enough”, “not on my watch”. We have to consider the consequences of what we enact.
13. Brian Barnwell submitted written document and supports Mr. Mahans comments on the limitations of the ABR and HLC . They do not do site visits which would be needed to allow for compatibility judgment of neighborhoods. Agrees with Mr. Wittausch that there needs to be a difference between commercial zones and R-2 and R-3 zones. There are few appeals seen because there are few neighbors in C-2 areas or neighbors not invested in the neighborhood. It doesn't mean the neighborhood is behind the project. Design dictates the rent rate. There is no restriction on how the developer designs the units. The rent rates are going to go up because the units are being well-designed and will not attract the intended renter that the units were built for. It is OK for the City to create wealth for multi-unit owners, but the City should step into the process and nuance it so that it is not left to the design review boards that are handcuffed. On size, bulk, and scale, there should not be 3-bedroom designs. Direction should be given to design boards on how to interpret the laws. With regard to parking, suggest doing a red curb study to see what may need repainting and restriping.
14. Anne Peterson, Executive Director of Trust for Historic Preservation, remains concerned with the potential effects of AUD projects in the sensitive historic area of El Pueblo Viejo. Requests that the AUD process include review of the map of properties which are allowed to request AUD projects. There are properties that are in the El Pueblo Viejo District, and in some cases adjacent to historic properties.
15. Mickey Flacks spoke to the fear of density being misplaced, citing reference to New York which has the most energy efficiency per capita than any city and also has residents with longer life spans than any city in the country. Most residents in Santa Barbara are renters, so should not be feared. The AUD program could use some improvements: 1. Lease agreements should restrict use for only primary residents. 2.

No subletting would be allowed. 3. Inclusionary units should be included, even with a workforce notion. 4. Rent rates should be presented to the City in the pro forma so that we know what the intended rates will be charged by the developer. Agreed with Mr. Barnwell that the City has the right to make certain demands of the developer.

16. Maggie Campbell, Downtown Santa Barbara Executive Director, has lived in dense downtown areas and wanted to comment on how she thinks this kind of development will play out in a historic neighborhood. Saw developers obtain entitlements and concessions under mixed use, but did not bring mixed use. Instead maximized their projects for optimum housing. She does not see apartment developments adjacent to commercial areas as bringing walkability. State Street will not provide residential serving retail. You will see this on side streets or ground floors of projects. If developers are only developing 500-1000 square feet commercial spaces, it will not be enough for retail tenants to be able to pay the rent. You will end up with liquor stores on the corners and multiple car trips. Think about holding developers to mixed use, besides having units.
17. Jan Banister, shared three points: 1. Of the 270 units shown as more than likely to be done, 90 units (Hope Avenue) were left out bringing the number to 360 units. 30 parking spaces were allowed for 90 units. 2. The AUD program was to be spread over the city, however, over 50% of the development is pegged for the Upper State Street commercial zoning corridor. She questioned how all this development could go on when there no parking up there now. 3. All assumptions about this development being appropriate to support affordable rentals for workforce housing does not seem to be happening. If there were families that were to go into the approved 300 units, there are no parks to support the families. Urged to close the program now that there are 300 approved units to review the downsides.
18. Lisa Plowman Coastal Housing Coalition Board Member, reflected on all the work done during the General Plan to come up with the AUD program. Data is needed before we can tweak the program or we will encounter unintended consequences. Size, bulk and scale is working as a project goes through the process. With regard to parking, we are in a transitional point in our lifetime with car ownership. Instead of increasing parking requirements, let's talk about using car shares, transit, bike facilities, Uber, we are trying to encourage a change. Also, we are speculating about rents and need to look at whether the projects will support the desired rents. She suggested that there is no need to amend the standards to honor El Pueblo Viejo because the HLC review works to ensure projects are compatible and projects that are struggling should be referred to the Planning Commission.
19. Bob Ludwick represents 8 1-bedroom units that were built in the 1970's on East Gutierrez, near a transit center. They have had 12 parking spaces and at no time in the last fourteen years, have we had more than 5 cars using the parking spaces. He does not think that we should use qualifiers such as affordable housing or workforce housing. We should just build housing. May not agree with Ms. Flacks suggestions, but does think that some review of the AUD program should be done.

20. Lee Moldaver, Citizens Planning Association (CPA), thanked staff for the overview. He supports many of the comments made by Mr. Mahan and Mr. Wittausch, and the four suggestions made by Ms. Flacks. He is also supportive of Ms. Plowman's suggestion for car sharing. He did note that many suggestions of one car per unit are dependent on public transit and public transit is under a lot of funding stress. He supports the AUD test areas and looking for more affordable test areas. He asked that as the Commission reviews the AUD, that it reflect on when the SD-2 Overlay was created for Upper State Street, the Council committed to the residents that savings of congestions through traffic and mobility improvements would not be used to create new development to create new congestion.
21. Christine Neuhauser lives on the 900 block of East Canon Perdido and when she sees all the four story Milpas developments being built, they take away from the free sky views. Asked that the Commission not mar the sky line. The bulk is way too large and creates ghettos.
22. Greg Reitz, Rethink Developers (The Marc on Upper State Street), says that their projected median rent falls in the target range of 120-200% AMI. That projection is based on the market, though they have not rented anything yet. This will be the first AUD project to come on the market. Also missed in the big picture is comparing what these AUD projects do in the context of the overall market which is taking people out of older units and increasing the supply. Forty nine percent of the entire City population own 1 car or less, based on the census.
23. Ken Oplinger, Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce Executive Director, noted that the discussion fell into people that are concerned with size, scope and compatibility of projects, while others are concerned with whether the housing will meet the need that we have. He supports Staff in the need to continue the AUD program to be able to get the data to see if it is working. There are 15-20,000 people commuting from the south into Santa Barbara each day because there is not enough housing available. We need housing built for meeting the needs of the business community. We need to either build out or build up and we can only build up.
24. Ellen Bildsten, AIA Member and Coastal Housing Coalition (CHC) Board Member, said that a CHC Study found that fifteen years ago, people were easily able to afford buying or renting housing in Santa Barbara. This is no longer the case. As an architect, she has worked on AUD projects that are fewer units and smaller square footage than AUD prescribes and finds that to be the maximum that can fit on a typical Santa Barbara lot. The AUD regulations are fine and the process is appropriate.
25. Denise Adams agrees with prior speakers that we are creating an alternative community. Suggested the City do market research. People want smaller units that they can afford and still have quality of life. She asked why we would want to go beyond the HUD or standard guidelines of 540 square feet. She would like the City to look at a street width ordinance. If a street is not a certain width, then no off-street parking should be allowed.
26. Chair Campanella read into the record Leslie Colasse's comments that Milpas and Haley need design guidelines in order to provide the ABR with tools and direction regarding context and neighborhood compatibility. ABR is not demanding

appropriate levels of compatibility regarding bulk, scale, and architectural character. Without stricter guidelines in the neighborhoods, they will lose their underlying architectural character. Current pending projects should not be allowed to proceed until such guidelines are put in place as they are putting the neighborhoods at risk.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 3:25 P.M.

Chair Campanella called for a recess at 3:25 P.M. and reconvened the meeting at 3:42 P.M.

The Planning Commission was asked to comment on whether the AUD Incentive Program was meeting its objectives; advocating for a multi-use/mixed use design guidelines; studying a parking requirement ordinance amendment; and monitoring unit affordability, as well as general comments.

Commissioner's Comments:

Commissioner Higgins:

1. We are in a crazy real estate market where every coastal city in CA is undergoing a real estate boom, so how do we separate what effect pent up housing demand is having on AUD versus a normalized real estate market
2. Would like to see the Housing Subcommittee meet in the future to review some of these AUD issues in further detail, preferably before the report is written.
3. The AUD program is meeting its goals.
4. The Commission or public speakers are not apartment dwellers, so it would be nice to hear from apartment occupants that this effort appears to be curtailing. We need to speak to the occupants of these projects.
5. In terms of parking, he sees the mixed-use design guidelines as having a parking requirement component to it or coming from a parking ordinance amendment. He is not sure that this will solve the problem.
6. The bedroom counts is a tough issue. If you limit 3-bedroom units, or say that you need to add another parking space to a 3-bedroom unit, then you are stifling the concept that families can live in these projects and because there will not be incentive to build 3-bedroom units. He would be interested in studying it.
7. Sounds like ABR and HLC would like more teeth in their discretion with regard to parking or other development standards. He does not think this is necessary. It would be nice to have projects kicked up to the Planning Commission in the form of a Use Permit so that where additional parking requirements could be added by the Commission, it could be an option. He would be inclined to hear more from Staff on how this request could be accommodated.
8. Would never have supported connecting the affordability of these new AUD projects as a comparison to rents for existing apartments.

9. In this market, people will increase the income that goes toward housing up from 30%. Then we should discount the rents on new product for a better comparison on whether AUD is creating affordable units.
10. He does not support having to do additional environmental review. It has already been done. These are CEQA exemptions that have been mandated by the State for infill housing and the reason why our hands are tied.
11. Regarding parking, he thinks we can ask Applicants to do a better job with showing parking demand. It's nice to have that disclosure as part of the file. If possible, would like to ask Applicants' to include right of way availability in their projects, like was done with the bike lane project on Micheltorena for the Bicycle Master Plan, quantifies availability of ROW parking in neighborhoods.
12. If we are not doing the AUD program or modifying it, then asked what are we doing in terms of a Housing Element or policies in the General Plan for residential second units, or inclusionary housing, or opportunity sites, or do we have an affordable housing facilitator, as outlined in the General Plan.
13. Regarding pacing, he would want to look at the reasonable number of units that we are expecting to be built under the program if there are no changes, peeling away the market demand, peeling away the pent up demand, and peeling away the fact that all the easier project sites are in the AUD queue.

Commissioner Jordan:

1. The AUD program has been wildly successful, but only based the on number of units increasing.
2. The problem with the concept is that this is the only measurement we have and we are not able to measure the impact. It is not premature to do a measurement, only too late in hindsight, because no one anticipated the large number of units proposed.
3. We have not done a good job on addressing the non-policy concerns. We have not given the people with non-policy concerns a fair shake. This has been reflected in some of the anecdotal stories heard.
4. Design review boards find themselves going through the motions on compatibility. They are seeing the policy driver and are focusing on that as a dead end to looking at compatibility. This is Ok if we acknowledge that we are willing to live with the impacts (parking impacts, neighborhood compatibility impacts, adjacent business district impacts, etc.) for the gain of more housing. If this is the case, we should stand up and say that.
5. The measurements for success have been based on the number of units and we have not set ourselves up to worry about measuring the impacts. We have not put resources into actually determining what the conditions on the ground are or have been before the project was put in place. Then when we begin to measure, in a year or two after the project has been occupied, we will not have a clear picture of what was there three years before.
6. He also finds missing, is the case where residential uses have been impacted with what was on the site to begin with versus what is being replaced on the site. We are missing

the human element. Where did the people that lived there before go? He wondered if it is an acceptable consequence for the goal and the gain of the rental units.

7. He wondered what happens when this program gets closer to sunseting and how we can tweak it. He would like to see his list in a future meeting for the Housing Subcommittee and maybe a work session for the Planning Commission:
  - a. Likes the suggestion on a requirement for car share.
  - b. Likes the suggestion on parking on off hours in public lots. This could give people with a second car an option and serve as an incentive for moving into a unit if they knew they could keep their second car.
  - c. We need to resolve the data collection survey issues. The data will be essential to where this goes in the future.
  - d. Would like future water use to be a requirement in these projects to be sure that assumptions made years before were correct versus what's being used.
  - e. We need to accelerate the protections for our historical and cultural sites. This is important enough that a criteria should be set for any project in the two highest categories within some criteria of adjacency to a historic or cultural site come to the Planning Commission for comments in addition to going before the HLC.
  - f. Look at putting better requirements on indoor and secure bicycle storage, not just a room where people throw bikes in. Invest in a controlled secure area, such as the Granada garage, with adequate bike storage.
  - g. A contribution to Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) for bus stop improvements, maintenance on bus stop facilities on the street, and for existing or new shuttle routes.
  - h. Funding improvements on livability for street scape trees. We are increasing the number of people, but not increasing the livability standards around them. Add street trees, parks, community rooms, playgrounds, human space.
  - i. Review the whole relationship between 3-bedroom, 2-bedroom, and 1-bedroom and how it relates to parking.
  - j. In general, wants a conversation on 3-bedrooms as a component of AUD entitlements.
  - k. Lot of good suggestions for the recommended Housing Subcommittee meeting or the Planning Commission Work Session that were made on the sheet submitted by Brian Barnwell and should be used as a part of the meeting.
  - l. On pacing, he is less interested in a numbers standpoint, but more interested in the components of a future AUD program. Each one added becomes a financial burden on a potential project. This could organically begin to limit the infusion of those projects. He could live with it if it was agreed that those would be components of future projects.

Commissioner Lodge:

1. Was puzzled with why this project has been so popular and enormously successful that developers want to come up with rental housing. Her theory is that previously under 45', you could only have three stories. With the AUD program, we allow up to four stories. That is the equivalent of giving developers in these zones one third more property in their development. Developers would not be proposing these projects if they did not see them as profitable. The four stories within 45' projects are resulting in projects that are occupying every cubic foot of space over land. Then common open space ends up on the roof and the result is buildings that are out of place.
2. As the Planning Commission's Liaison to HLC, she has watched them struggle. There is no staff report provided or back up, only a set of plans. The compatibility issue is difficult for HLC. The Multi-Unit Design Guidelines would be helpful, but if they are limited to one parking space per unit, they have nowhere to go.
3. Suggested amending the ordinance to use the standards used by the Marck One(1.3 parking spaces per unit, regardless of size) and the Marc Two (1.5 parking spaces per unit). Also recommended that there be a maximum of 2 bathrooms per unit.
4. On the sunseting of the AUD program, she could never understand why the AUD program was set to go back to variable density when it was preferable to variable density and encouraged smaller units.
5. Agrees with Commissioner Jordan on looking at the impacts to historic resources.
6. With regard to pacing, no one expected that the program would have this interest. We need to look at stopping the receipt of applications as a part of pacing.

Commissioner Thompson:

1. We have had good discussion and ideas presented. Thanked members of the public. Looking back to the reason the program was started was to incentivize smaller rental units, so in regard to the numbers, we have been successful.
2. Agrees with Commissioner Jordan that we have to start evaluating the impact of the success of getting the additional units. There have been unintended consequences that have surfaced. We need to look at tweaking:
  - a. The differences in commercial zones as compared to the R-3 zones.
  - b. Evaluating the liability of parking. Agrees with a parking study. We need to look at parking based on either a factor such as what has been suggested or based on bedroom count, not unit count.
  - c. Look at the viability for AUD projects at decoupling parking from the units and rent the parking separately from the units.

- d. Look at possible amendment to the way the program is implemented in R-3 zones for better neighborhood compatibility.
- e. ABR and HLC should get full staff reports and site visits to help them better understand neighborhood compatibility issues before decisions are made.
- f. We should start looking at a unit limit for annual projects going through the process. We have done this with condo conversions. We need to control the pacing of this by how many projects we put through each year, starting now, so that we do not get overwhelmed and we know how to proceed.
- g. Agrees with other Commissioners that we should relook at the impacts on historical/cultural areas
- h. We should take water into consideration. Basically, we are giving away water that we are saving to new projects.

Commissioner Schwartz:

- 1. Does not believe that pacing is needed. We have a stringent review and approval process and it is working.
- 2. We need to fast track completion of success criteria. The trial period is going to sunset in the next 24 months and we cannot revert to variable density.
- 3. The AUD program is meeting its objectives. Many properties are ripe for redevelopment and the ordinance was crafted in a way that is attractive.
- 4. Would like to see multi-unit design guidelines. Watches ABR and HLC struggle with making decisions using outdated design guidelines.
- 5. Regarding the parking requirements, she mentioned looking at the City parking structures for use during non-peak periods. She asked that the Saturday parking restrictions be revisited. She wondered if there was any way to loosen the ADA parking requirements so that we are not further reducing the number of non-handicapped spaces per unit.
- 6. Was intrigued at Ms. Flack's suggestion of 'no subletting' and would like it considered.
- 7. In terms of the Planning Commission's relationships and the process between Planning Commission and the review boards, she would like to suggest that we need more work. We have improved, but as she watches ABR and HLC meetings more refinement is needed for the Applicants and for the process to make the design review boards as comfortable as possible within their scope of authority. She is not in support of expanding their roles to mini-Planning Commission bodies.

Commissioner Lodge left the dais at 5:06 P.M. and did not return.

Commissioner Pujo:

1. We are meeting our objectives. Yes, the AUD program has been very successful in terms of numbers. Even in terms of numbers formed and the type of development, there has been success.
2. Of the numbers that have been given, we have the responsibility to report back and understand how this program has been working. We have 2 years to get this done.
3. We need to start working on preparing for that review now and put a lot more focus and energy now.
4. In terms of parking, she stated that it is premature to look at an ordinance now. What we have now is a lot of comment about what may or may not happen when those units are built. But we don't yet have facts. There is no analysis of relevant baseline data that first started from the General Plan and what that anticipated; how that may or may not have changed in these neighborhoods where we are getting the units, and is that still the same as when the General Plan was adopted and the EIR for the General Plan was adopted. Then take a look at the potential build out for the units we are actually getting and how it works together as to what we really were hoping to get.
5. Without baseline data to build from, instead of trying to pick out a new ordinance number, we need to actually look at what we have and get a study group. We have a Housing Subcommittee and an AUD Committee. We need to formalize and broaden these things. The budget request that would go to working on initiating an ordinance needs to go to addressing these other issues. It goes beyond parking, as we have heard today. We need to look at issues of compatibility with multi-unit mixed design guidelines, water, and amenities.
6. We need to recognize that within the AUD overlay areas, there may be different distinguishing features neighborhood to neighborhood that we should take a fresh look at.
7. In terms of parking, it's not just the parking ratio, it is also the support services and alternatives to parking. We need to look at those and compare it to baseline. We need to compare to a very well-studied overview of where we are in our adaptive management approach. It should be that type of study and not just pick whatever got the most comments, do an ordinance, and change something.
8. Regarding pacing, if we had a study group looking at this and had a closer look at projects on the ground, we might be able to get better info on what the number of units is and how fast we are getting there. She questions the feasibility of pacing mechanisms. Without the review of where are resources are that would support the need to pace it, she questions the success of a pacing mechanism and what it would be based on.

Commissioner Campanella:

1. We have forty-nine projects in the process. There have been four appeals with two of the four on affordable projects.
2. Need to keep in mind in medium high density areas where the square footage represents about 50% of the land area, intentionally so we wouldn't have big buildings, if you start adding 2-car parking to 2-bedrooms, you are creating garages and going up two-stories front-to-back or you lose units. You need to balance parking against size, bulk, and scale in areas of medium, high density areas. He suggested talking to some of the architects to ask what it would look to add two cars per every 2-bedroom.
3. We have a Housing Element implementation item that encourages 3-bedroom units and that we report on each year to HCD. We don't want to eliminate them, but if a developer wants to put them in, then there should be consideration for some additional room for parking on site.
4. The AUD program is meeting its objectives. We have not created more stories, they were already allowed under the framework that existed before. We are trying to carve out these buildings so that they are not luxury condos.
5. The purpose for multi-unit, mixed-use design, is good. We should have someone facilitate this because it is a different type of product.
6. Regarding parking, not every site facilitates tandem parking. He would not go to the extent of requiring 2-bedrooms to have more parking, but would consider more parking for 3-bedrooms and allow the developer to decide :
7. A design guideline would be a good facilitation and answer questions, such as where can you best use Spanish Colonial revival, or modern design.
8. On affordability by requirement, under the ordinance, there are employee housing programs that can be done, co-ops that can be done, and state bonus density that is either voluntary or required in certain situations. Perhaps we can see if people want to run a parallel track and see if there is program that can be used to incentivize rent restricted product without burdening a market rate project on the rents. Before we burden the projects with inclusionary housing, we need to look at other programs, like the employer workforce housing program.
9. We need to accelerate the review of what is being created. Let's review the projects that have come in. Let's look at the rents. Let's look at underwriting in the landlord community in this market and what they are approving for someone to move in. Review product and see what rents are reasonable. Then let's set this all up to monitor when we do see these projects come in.

10. As far as pacing, he is not sure what that means or how you would do it short of a complete moratorium that would in turn create a situation that might not be in keeping with our Housing Element in what we are trying to produce. He suggested shortening the review period and accelerating the process.

## **II. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

### **ACTUAL TIME: 5:29 P.M.**

- A. Committee and Liaison Reports
  1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report  
None was given.
  2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports  
No reports were given.

## **III. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Campanella adjourned the meeting at 5:30 P.M.

Submitted by,

---

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

**ABR MINUTES- September 12, 2016**  
**DISCUSSION ITEM**

**1. AVERAGE UNIT-SIZE DENSITY (AUD) INCENTIVE PROGRAM**

**(3:17)** 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 Architectural Board of Review.)

Actual time: 3:16 p.m.

Present: Renee Brooke, City Planner, City of Santa Barbara; and Jaime Limón, Senior Planner II, City of Santa Barbara.

**Discussion held.**

Individual Board Members made the following comments:

1. All AUD applications should include the following standard submittal requirements:
  - a. An aerial photo encompassing a minimum 1.5 block radius that highlights (in different colors) where two and three story buildings are located, to establish neighborhood compatibility.
  - b. A thorough photographic survey of the neighborhood to show all the building types in the surrounding area, not just buildings of similar size.
  - c. On elevations, an outline of buildings on adjacent parcels should be sketched over the elevation of the proposed new building. This will provide a general idea of the relationship between the proposed building and any buildings adjacent to it.
  - d. Site sections showing a half block in from each side of the proposed property.
2. Some applicants submitting AUD projects should be required to put up story poles prior to the item being reviewed so that the Board can make educated decisions regarding compatibility, size, bulk, and scale.
3. Requiring more parking for units with two or more bathrooms seems acceptable because of the possibility of a dorm room effect; however, requiring more parking for units with 2-3 bedrooms does not, since it will increase the cost of housing for people with young families that may not need extra parking.
4. The Board suggest reviewing projects based on a VAR (volume-to-area ratio) scale rather than a FAR (floor-to-lot-area ratio) scale. This will encourage taller buildings to be placed on larger lots instead of smaller.
5. One Board Member would like the City to study ways to regulate affordability in the AUD projects to aid in the housing deficit the City faces.
6. One Board Member would like staff to study ways to control the AUD project development rate.

**Gradin and Hopkins were appointed as the AUD subcommittee members; Wittausch and Cung were appointed as alternates.**

**HLC MINUTES August 24, 2016**  
**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.



# City of Santa Barbara

## Planning Division

### PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL WORK SESSION MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 6, 2016

#### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Campanella called the meeting to order at 8:41 A.M.

#### **I. ROLL CALL**

Chair John P. Campanella, Vice-Chair June Pujo, Commissioners Jay D. Higgins, Mike Jordan, Sheila Lodge, Deborah L. Schwartz, and Addison Thompson.

#### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Renee Brooke, AICP, City Planner  
Beatriz Gularte, Senior Planner  
N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

#### **II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:**

A. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda.

Chair Campanella opened the public hearing at 8:2 AM. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

#### **III. RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL:**

#### **ACTUAL TIME: 8:43 P.M.**

#### **AVERAGE UNIT DENSITY (AUD) INCENTIVE PROGRAM**

The Planning Commission will discuss the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program (Santa Barbara Municipal Code Chapter 28.20). The purpose of the meeting is 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.

Contact: Renee Brooke, AICP, City Planner  
Email: RBrooke@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5564

Renee Brooke, AICP, City Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Chair Campanella opened the public hearing at 9:14 A.M.

The following people provided comments on the AUD program:

1. Lindsey Baker, League of Women Voters, submitted written comments. She was concerned with the City's water shortage and traffic.
2. Brian Cearnal, Architect, supports continuation of the AUD program. He suggested reducing the size of the units and review possible rent control for some units. The discretionary process is robust and should be trusted.
3. Anthony Grumbine, Historic Landmarks Commissioner (HLC), wanted to add 'open space' to some of the earlier issues that HLC has voiced. He provided an example for the Commission showing the compactness of the added density in El Pueblo Viejo. Judy Orias gave her speaking time to Mr. Grumbine.
4. Anna Gott, Allied Neighborhood Association, submitted written comments and questioned the allowance of AUD rental units as short term vacation rentals and the potential to convert to condominiums. . She also stated that there is nothing in the conditions that require AUD rental unit to remain rental units for the life of the project. Survey questions are inconsistent. Saturnino Moreno and Sue Mellor gave their speaking time to Ms. Gott.
5. Lisa Plowman, Coastal Housing Coalition, stated that the AUD is producing much needed housing at a time when the median home price has reached \$1 million. The program is successful and may need tweaks, but will depend on data that is not yet available. Supports the HLC and ABR, agrees with adaptive management, and supports car sharing.
6. Naomi Greene, Eastside resident, urged the Planning Commission to go back to the drawing board with the AUD program and Plan Santa Barbara. She has not seen that the neighborhood needs are ever considered when approving these projects and they should be. Milpas Street could become a good walking corridor if consideration is given to scale, harmony, trees, benches, and shuttle transit. Natalia Govoni gave her speaking time to Ms. Greene.
7. Mickey Flacks commented on how this meeting concerns renters but is held at a time when most renters are at work. She agrees with Mr. Cearnal and called for rent stabilization or rent control as part of the approval process.

Ellen Bildsten, AIA, Coastal Housing Coalition, was unable to remain for the duration of the meeting, but submitted a speaker slip in support of the AUD goal.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 9:38 A.M.

## **PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS**

Commissioner Schwartz was concerned with rushing a discussion on a number of proposed ordinance amendments and suggested the Chair take the temperature of the Commission on the largest sets of considerations.

### **MOTION: Pujo/Schwartz**

**Assigned Resolution No. 024-16**

Recommend that City Council move forward on improvements to the Project Review Process, such as:

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.

Commissioner Lodge would like to see the ability for the HLC and ABR to make more far-ranging decisions regarding density and parking on these projects. Commissioner Higgins concurred.

Commissioner Thompson stated that the HLC and ABR should have staff reports and site visits in advance, as is done for the Planning Commission, and be given more discretion in making approvals.

Commissioner Schwartz wanted to be clear in her support of the motion that the ordinance should include support for the boards, but not change the scope of authority in decision making. Commissioner Higgins concurred.

Commissioner Pujo said the first three items in the motion are tools currently missing from the ABR and HLC's review of projects for design and compatibility.

Commissioner Lodge would like to see the ability for the HLC and ABR to make decision, not just comments on these projects. Commissioner Higgins concurred.

Chair Campanella stated that understanding the goal of the developer and the project will provide a better understanding through the approval process and what constraints they are operating under. Multi -Unit and Multi-Use Guidelines will have an effect on land use and should be balanced. He asked the motion makers for consideration in including that when subcommittees come up with their proposals, that the Planning Commission have the opportunity to review any recommendations that impact Policy and Land Use.

The makers of the motion amended the motion to include Chair Campanella's request.

Brian Cearnal, Architect, commented that Multi-Unit and Multi-use Guidelines are a major planning effort and it is unrealistic to think that they could be developed quickly. He

suggested bringing a consortium of architects and others together to discuss the items that need more teeth.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

### **ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM REPORT**

Commissioners Thompson and Jordan said use of the word ‘impacts’ carried a negative connotation and suggested the word ‘differences’ be used.

#### **MOTION: Thompson/Schwartz**

Recommend to Staff that the Adaptive Management Program Report include evaluating differences in projects proposed in commercial zones vs. residential zones, with recognition given to designated neighborhood areas.

Commissioner Pujo asked the motion makers to include recognition be given to designated neighborhood areas.

The motion makers agreed to include Commissioner Pujo’s request.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

#### **MOTION: Schwartz/Higgins**

Recommend that the Planning Commission Housing Subcommittee put together a list to bring back to the Planning Commission on what “on the ground” conditions for AUD projects might be monitored and evaluated.

Commissioner Pujo hoped that flexibility includes not just on ground conditions of the lot being developed, but also a comparison of adjacent lots.

Chair Campanella thought that this request could be addressed at the Subcommittee level.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

**MOTION: Campanella/Schwartz**

**Assigned Resolution No. 024-16**

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 carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 2 (Pujo, Lodge) Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

Commissioner Lodge asked when we would stop accepting AUD project applications. If we continue to keep developing we do not have the benefit of seeing the effects of the projects developed.

Commissioner Schwartz left the dais at 10:57 A.M. and did not return to the dais.

**MOTION: Jordan/Lodge**

Continue discussion of potential AUD ordinance amendments.

Commissioners Lodge and Jordan had interest in discussing the topic of potential Ordinance Amendments, which required more time for discussion.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Campanella adjourned the meeting at 11:19 A.M.

Reviewed via video and submitted by,

---

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary



# 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 certain housing types.

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

---

Date

D  
R  
A  
F  
T



# **City of Santa Barbara Planning Division**

## **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**October 6, 2016**

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Campanella called the meeting to order at 1:00 P.M.

### **I. ROLL CALL**

Chair John P. Campanella, Vice-Chair June Pujo, Commissioners Jay D. Higgins, Mike Jordan, Sheila Lodge, Deborah L. Schwartz, and Addison Thompson.

Absent: Commissioners Michael Jordan and Sheila Lodge

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Renee Brooke, AICP, City Planner  
Beatriz Gularte, Senior Planner  
Andrew Bermond, AICP, Project Planner  
Steve Greer, Environmental Project Planner  
Hazel Johns, Airport Director  
Dan Gullett, Supervising Transportation Supervisor  
Chelsey Swanson, Associate Transportation Planner  
Debra Andaloro, Principal Planner  
Rosemary Dyste, Project Planner  
N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney  
Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

### **II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:**

A. Requests for continuances, withdrawals, postponements, or addition of ex-agenda items.

None.

B. Announcements and appeals.

Ms. Gularte made the following announcements:

1. The Planning Commission's decision on 1925 El Camino de la Luz has been appealed to City Council and will be heard on December 6, 2016.
2. The Regular Planning Commission meeting of October 20, 2016 has been cancelled.

C. Review, consideration and action on the following draft Planning Commission Minutes and Resolutions:

1. September 1, 2016
2. PC Resolution No. 022-16  
3407 Sea Ledge Lane
3. PC Resolution No. 023-16  
100 Clyde Adams Road

**MOTION: Schwartz/Thompson**

Approve the minutes and resolutions.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Jordan, Lodge)

4. September 6, 2016
5. PC Resolution No. 024-16  
Recommendations to City Council – AUD Program

**MOTION: Thompson/Pujo**

Approve the minutes and resolutions as corrected.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Jordan, Lodge)

6. September 8, 2016
7. PC Resolution No. 025-16  
1414 Park Place
8. PC Resolution No. 026-16  
2912 De la Vina Street

**MOTION: Pujo/Schwartz**

Approve the minutes and resolutions.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 1 (Thompson) Absent: 2 (Jordan, Lodge)

D. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda.

Chair Campanella opened the public hearing at 1:03 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

**III. NEW ITEM:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:03 P.M.**

**APPLICATION OF LEIF REYNOLDS, PROJECT ENGINEER FOR SANTA BARBARA AIRPORT, 6100 HOLLISTER AVENUE, APN 073-080-065, AIRPORT INDUSTRIAL ZONES (A-I-1/A-I-2) AND AIRPORT INDUSTRIAL AREA SPECIFIC PLAN ZONE (SP-6), GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: AIRPORT (MST2016-00044)**

The proposed project involves a proposal to construct a light industrial park totaling 50,046 square feet on an approximately 14.43 acre Santa Barbara Airport site. The project will include two 4,021 square foot retail buildings and seven light industrial buildings of modular nature for one or more tenants. The minimum unit size ranges from 2,002 square feet to 2,500 square feet. The development will include 153 parking spaces including six accessible spaces, and approximately 100,000 square feet of landscaped area with a detention basin designed to accommodate both on-site and Wallace Becknell Road storm water run-off.

The discretionary application required for this project is a Development Plan to allow the construction of 50,046 square feet of nonresidential development (SBMC Chapter 28.85).

The project requires an environmental finding pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15183.

Contact: Andrew Bermond, AICP, Project Planner  
Email: ABermond@SantaBarbaraCA.gov Phone: (805) 564-5470, extension 4549

Andrew Bermond, AICP, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Hazel Johns, City of Santa Barbara Airport Director, provided an introduction and was joined by Jaime Valencia, Kupiec Architects PC; Mike Viattone, Civil Engineer; and Derrik Eichelberger, Acadia Studio, who gave the Applicant presentation.

Chair Campanella opened the public hearing at 1:33 P.M.

Marty Milan, City of Goleta Principal Engineer, referenced a letter submitted by the City of Goleta requesting additional conditions of approval be included by the Planning Commission. She also requested that the last condition, associated with the agreement that has expired, is a condition of the EIR and should be kept in place.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:43 P.M.

**MOTION: Thompson/Schwartz** **Assigned Resolution No. 027-16**  
Approved the project, making the findings for the Development Plan, as outlined in the Staff Report, dated September 29, 2016, subject to the revised Conditions of Approval distributed to the Planning Commission on October 6, 2016.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Jordan, Lodge)

Chair Campanella announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

Chair Campanella called for a recess at 2:29 P.M. and reconvened the meeting at 2:38 P.M.

**IV. DISCUSSION ITEM**

**ACTUAL TIME: 2:38 P.M.**

**2016 GENERAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM REPORT**

Staff will present the 2016 General Plan Implementation and Adaptive Management Program Report in advance of the October 27, 2016 Joint City Council and Planning Commission Work Session.

Contact: Renee Brooke, City Planner

Email: [RBrooke@SantaBarbaraCA.gov](mailto:RBrooke@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

Phone: (805) 564-5470, extension 5564

Renee Brooke, City Planner, gave the Staff presentation, joined by Debra Andaloro, Principal Planner, and Rosemary Dyste, Project Planner.

Chair Campanella opened the public hearing at 3:42 P.M.

Lindsay Baker, League of Women Voters Co-President, submitted written comments asking that the Commission reevaluate the Average Unit Density Program, make changes to the program using Adaptive Management, and not accept additional projects into the development process until all problems have been resolved. She also announced that the League of Women Voters was holding a panel discussion on rental housing on Wednesday, October 12, 2016 at noon at the Louise Lowry Davis Center.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 3:45 P.M.

Commissioner's comments: (at 4:22 p.m., Campanella mixed questions and comments)

Commissioner Thomson:

- Agrees with initiating an ordinance amendment by end of 2017 because of the length in process.
- Sees 3 outcomes 1. Scrap and go back to variable density. 2 adopt AUD permanently, or 3. Tweak and return to some version of the AUD.
- Suggest that Staff and the Council do 2 steps: 1. Interim ordinance to tweak AUD ordinance, and 2. By end of 2017, initiate a long term ordinance
- Parking, especially in R3 and R4 is raised frequently.
- Consider putting in place something to mitigate the flow of some of the projects going through now. There is precedence with condo-conversions.
- One way to deal with part of parking issue is to decouple parking from the unit rental.

Commissioner Higgins: 4:27 pm

- Agrees with Commissioner Thompson that we should initiate an ordinance soon so that we do not revert automatically to the variable density.
- Would be good if we could get some survey responses back sooner.
- Ask design review boards if they want to see land use issues, etc.
- 
- Not opposed to having one parking space per unit. This is one of the reasons why we are seeing such success with the program.
- Does not think that we need to do anything with height.
- With regard to open space, if there are projects that are not near parks or have open space, then this could be a trigger to come to the Planning Commission.
- Would like to see an economist confirm whether the rents are appropriate. There is still uncertainty with where the rents are landing.

Commissioner Schwartz:

- Initial Trial Period: wants to be sure that an amendment only means we need more time to gather data to decide whether the program is successful.
- We have to continue to work on and provide recommendations to the City Council on success criteria.
- Until we have a decent data set of facts, would like to see data on zip codes of applicants and employers to see who is renting these units.
- We have not defined 'affordable' which is contributory to some of the misunderstanding on what the program can provide.
- Annual survey, zip codes
- Residential parking standards: we do not have empirical data on the parking demands on these properties. What impacts and demands are there after construction? Not in support of a focus ordinance amendment.
- Supports providing tools to design boards, without expanding the scope of authority that could conflict with the Planning Commission's scope of jurisdiction.

Commissioner Pujo:

- Agrees that the end of 2017 is the right time frame to be ready to make some determination with what kind of ordinance we should move forward with on the AUD ordinance. This means we need to do preparatory studies beforehand to get to there.
- Annual survey. Supports. This will help get us there.
- Residential Parking standards: We are not yet able to make a decision on whether to have any ordinance on parking standards. Not sure if this is limited to a parking ration.
- Concerns we are hearing from the public is about the impact to on-street parking. We need to get an understanding of what the potential is of that kind of impact to on-street parking to AUD, especially high-priority areas, and what are other options available. So we are not in need of an ordinance now.

- Compatibility, design compatibility, is additional facet to the tools of support to the boards, then supports.
- 4:51 p.m. Rental pricing restrictions – would like to learn more about San Jose’s mitigation fees. Would like to see this added as a bullet and whether this could at some point be an option.

Commissioner Campanella: (4:42 p.m.)

- If this is a placeholder. Would not agree with cutting down the pipeline.
- Given the maximum square footage that you can provide....
- Requiring garages on multi-family areas can be problematic if they have to park 2 cars per unit).\
- To add costs for garages, then it presents neighborhood compatibility issues. Stud parking, why the parking has helped the project. Look at the projects that have been approved (out of 315 in the test area, there are 10 3 bedrooms, see if this is an issue, see what the baseline is, unbundle parking, could they have put more parking on their site. Would not call this an ordinance amendment, but just get facts together.
- We have 629 units in the test. 215 were submitted. Once the incentive came out, . There are 200 that are expiring or on hold. Do we want them on a ..density project.
- We need an earlier date to evaluate at the same time as keeping the pipeline going to get more rentals on the ground.
- Continue to get the data as we can.
- Re: design boards: information that was garnered while watching a meeting, showed what consideration goes into making a project.
- Open space: the project he saw had open space on the ground. ABR commented positively on the roof deck because this was an area where everyone could gather and also not be a nuisance to neighbors.
- Recommends that we get a file on why we approved projects. When it comes time to get to the end of 2017, we have a narrative that goes with a project on why it was developed, etc.
- Building height: Compatibility has to get done. Height to get 2 bedroom units...may need to have a 4<sup>th</sup> story. We are causing a sea of one-bedroom units because of fewer floors. Opportunities for families and roommates is being limited because we are creating fewer multi-bedroom units.

Commission would support an ordinance amendment extending the time.

Continue to collect annual survey data.

Will provide support to design boards.

Height : Study before initiating. Have Council initiate an amendment that includes conducting some studies.

Chair Campanella thanked Staff for the work done to bring this to the Commission prior to the

**V. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

**ACTUAL TIME: 4:55 P.M.**

A. Committee and Liaison Reports

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

None was given.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

- a. Commissioner Schwartz reported that she and Commissioner Lodge attended the El Carrillo Ten Years Later event on September 15, 2016.
- b. Chair Campanella reminded everyone that it is First Thursday and encouraged all to enjoy the events.
- c. Chair Campanella reported that the next Planning Commission meeting is October 13, 2016.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Campanella adjourned the meeting at 4:58 P.M.

Submitted by,

---

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

## Significant Development Review Projects

Current as of October 6, 2016

### Pre-Application or Conceptual Design Review

1. **414 and 420 E. Carrillo Street** – Proposal for a new four-story **mixed use** development with 21 residential units and an 850 square foot commercial addition on two lots with existing development. A 4,903 square-foot building at 414 E. Carrillo would be demolished and an existing 11,700 square foot commercial building would be maintained. The project is proposed under the **AUD (Medium-High) Density** and is requesting a parking modification from the Staff Hearing Officer.
2. **813 E. Carrillo** – Proposal to demolish the existing two-story single-family residence and construct a 7,386 square-foot 16-unit three-story apartment building with a community center, restricted for Veterans. The average unit size would be 357 square feet under the **AUD (Medium High) Program**. A 950 square-foot, two-story manager's unit is also proposed. Modifications for parking and residential density are requested.
3. **610 – 618 Castillo Street** – Proposal for an addition of 8 new apartments on a site with three existing units. One of the existing units will be demolished for a total of 10 units proposed. The project is being developed under the **AUD (High Density) Program**
4. **414 Chapala Street** – Proposal for a new four-story **mixed use** building with 22 residential apartments and 800 square feet of commercial. The project is proposed under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program**.
5. **1250 Cliff Drive** - Proposal for a **six-lot subdivision** of a 1.76-acre parcel. The existing, potentially historic, residence would remain. The new lots would each be approximately 11,250 square feet and access would be provided by a private driveway from Cliff Drive.
6. **1062 Coast Village Road** - Proposal to demolish a 14-unit apartment building, and construct a new 37,302 square foot, three story **mixed use development** with nine three-bedroom **condominium units**, and a 1,000 square foot commercial condominium. The project is being developed under **variable density** because in the coastal zone.
7. **113 W. De la Guerra Street** – Proposal for a new **mixed-use** three-story building with 23 apartments and 2,138 square feet of commercial floor area. The project is proposed under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program**.
8. **214-226 De la Guerra Street** – Proposal to demolish three existing residential buildings and construct a 3-story, 33,437 square foot **mixed-use** building including 4,698 square feet of commercial floor area and 27 AUD rental apartments. The project is proposed under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program**.
9. **825 De La Vina Street** – Proposal for a four-story **mixed-use** development comprised of 21 apartments and 1,000 square feet of commercial space, on a 17,835 square-foot lot. The project is proposed under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program**. The lot is currently being used as private a parking lot.

10. **24 W. Gutierrez Street** – Proposal for new **mixed-use development** with 8 apartment units and 400 square feet of commercial square footage. The project is proposed under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program** project.
11. **125 E. Gutierrez Street** - Proposal to demolish an existing one-story, 1,100 square-foot single family dwelling and detached 220 square-foot garage, and construct a 10-unit, three-story apartment building under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program**. The building consists of 10 parking spaces in a parking garage, five units on the second floor, five units on the third floor, and a roof deck on the third floor.
12. **219 E. Haley** – Proposal for a 31,137 square-foot **mixed-use development** under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program** with 63 du/acre. The project comprises 2,520 square feet of commercial space and 46 parking spaces on the ground floor and 36 two-bedroom units on the second and third floors, on a 25,113 square foot lot. The six existing buildings on the parcel will be demolished.
13. **316 W. Micheltorena/1516 Castillo Street** – Proposal for a new 21 unit residential project developed under the **AUD (Medium High Density) Program**. Two existing units would remain on site. 21 new parking spaces are proposed.
14. **418 N. Milpas** – Proposal to demolish eight existing residential units on the site and construct a four-story **mixed-use** development consisting of 31 apartments and 114 room hotel under the **AUD (High Density) Program**, with 145 parking spaces.
15. **1601 State Street** – Proposal to demolish the existing 6,206 square-foot hotel annex and construct a three-story, 17,904 square-foot addition to the existing **hotel**. The first floor will have at-grade parking and the second and third floors will house the 66 new hotel rooms.
16. **6210 Hollister Avenue** – Proposal to construct two buildings (totaling 45,381 sf) separated by a service driveway to be used as an **automobile dealership and service center** on Santa Barbara Airport property. Both buildings would be oriented with show rooms toward Hollister Avenue with parts and service components located behind the showroom to the north. The west building would be a two-story building and the east building would be single story.

#### **Active/Continuing Design, Staff Hearing Officer or Planning Commission Review**

1. **915 E. Anapamu Street** – Proposal to construct 24 residential apartments under the **AUD (Medium-High Density) Program**, with an average unit size of 833 square feet. The project requires ABR review.
2. **32-26 W. Carrillo Street** – Proposal to demolish the existing 5,750 square foot one-story building (formerly the Greyhound Bus Terminal); and construct a total of 11,277 net square feet of **commercial development** within two buildings. Twelve vehicle parking spaces and three bicycle parking spaces are proposed. Project requires Planning Commission approval for a Development Plan.
3. **116 E. Cota Street** - Proposal for a new four-story **mixed-use** building on a 10,865 square-foot vacant lot adjacent to Plaza Vera Cruz. The project includes 15 residential units and approximately 738 square feet of commercial space under the **AUD (Priority Housing**

- Overlay) Program.** ABR granted Project Design Approval on June 6, 2016. Project design revised, needs new Approval. ABR continued project on September 26, 2016.
4. **2609 De La Vina Street** - Proposal for a **Medical Marijuana** Storefront Collective Dispensary Permit. Interior and exterior tenant improvements are proposed for the dispensary. Planning Commission (on appeal) denied the project and referred any new applications back to the SHO on January 14, 2016.
  5. **1837 ½ El Camino de la Luz** - Proposal for a new **single-family residence** on a vacant bluff top lot. Second Revised Draft EIR is currently in public comment period. A Coastal Development Permit and certification of EIR is required.
  6. **1925 El Camino de la Luz** – Proposal for a new **single-family residence** on a vacant bluff top lot. The Planning Commission denied the Coastal Development Permit for the project on August 25, 2016. The project was appealed and will be considered by the City Council on December 6, 2016.
  7. **402 S. Hope Avenue** - The proposed project consists of the addition of 3,584 square feet to the existing BMW showroom and 673 square feet to the Audi showroom for a total of 4,257 net new square feet. The site is currently operated by Santa Barbara Auto Group as a 41,607 net square-foot **Mercedes/BMW/Audi automobile dealership**, including showrooms, service areas, offices and parking. The City Council approved a Community Benefit allocation on January 12, 2016. Planning Commission review is scheduled on November 10, 2016, for the required Development Plans.
  8. **926 Indio Muerto** - Proposal to demolish an existing 12,000 square-foot commercial building and construct an approximately 55,000 square-foot, three-story **hotel** with 115 to 120 rooms on a 38,122 square foot lot. The project also includes a 90-space subterranean parking lot with supportive amenities. The project requires a Coastal Development Permit, TEDR and Development Plan at the Planning Commission.
  9. **121 E. Mason/121 Santa Barbara/122 Gray/120 E. Yanonali** – Proposal for a new 134,076 square-foot, four-story, 56-foot tall, **mixed-use complex** with 125 apartments, retail commercial, restaurants, and arts-oriented uses. The project includes 14 affordable units and 166% density bonus under State Density Bonus Law. Development standard waivers are requested under State Density Bonus Law to exceed the three-story, 45 foot zoning height limitation, to allow the required common outdoor living space to be located above grade, and to waive the 70% floor area limitation on residential uses in the OC Zone. The project requires review of conformance with State Density Bonus Law; a Tentative Subdivision Map and Coastal Development Permit at the Planning Commission.
  10. **800 Santa Barbara Street** - Proposal to demolish an existing 1,965 square-foot one-story building and construct a 20,448 square-foot, four-story **mixed-use** development on a 18,568 square foot lot. The project consists of 1,383 square feet of commercial floor area above a subterranean parking garage and 23 rental units under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program**. Project had a PC Concept Review and requires HLC approval.
  11. **301 E. Yanonali Street** - Proposal to construct a new 44,330 square-foot, two-story building to include a **market and retail** spaces with 186 parking spaces on the 3.16 acre lot in the Cabrillo Plaza Specific Plan area (Area D), located at the corner of Garden and

Yanonali Streets. Project requires Planning Commission review for a Development Plan and Coastal Development Permit.

12. **Las Positas Multi-Use Pathway** - The proposed project involves design of a 2.6 mile-long separated **multiuse pathway for bicyclists and pedestrians** in City right of way along Modoc Road from Calle de Los Amigos to Las Positas Road and along Las Positas Road from Modoc Road to Cliff Drive. The project requires a Coastal Development Permit.

### Other Agency Projects

(Note: Some projects are on hold and others are documents prepared by other jurisdictions)

1. **Airport Master Plan** – Draft EIR prepared; currently working on response to comments.
2. **Highway 101 South Coast High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes Project** – Certified final EIR was challenged and is being revised and recirculated by CalTrans, with estimated release for public review before the end of the year. The project requires Planning Commission review of a Coastal Development Permit for the portion in the City's jurisdiction.
3. **Tajiguas Resource Recovery Program** - On July 12, 2016, the County Board of Supervisors certified the Final Supplemental EIR, approved the Resource Recovery Project at the Tahiguas Landfill, and approved a contract with MSB Investors, LLC to build and operated the project. Waste delivery agreements with cities and release of public funding package pending this Fall.

### Approval by Design Review, Planning Commission, SHO and/or Council

(Note: Projects either on hold, getting time extensions, and/or awaiting plan check submittal)

1. **630-634 Anacapa Street** - The proposed project consists of demolition of existing development and construction of a **mixed-use** building with of 4,496 square feet of commercial space (restaurant and retail space) and 30 rental units on the second and third story under the **Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) (Priority Housing Overlay) Program with an average unit size of 743 square feet**. The project's concept was reviewed by the Planning Commission on November 12, 2015. On August 3, 2016, the SHO approved a Lot Area Modification to allow an additional unit above the allowed Average Unit Size Density of 29 units and a Setback Modification of the five-foot variable front setback to allow two trellises to be located within the compensating area. HLC Final Design Approval is anticipated in November 2016.
2. **116 Castillo Street (Day's Inn)** - Replacement of an existing single-story hotel with a new three-story, **38-room hotel**. Planning Commission approval July 14, 2016.
3. **1818 Castillo Street** – Proposal to demolish an existing single-family home, studio apartment, detached garage, and two sheds, and construct a three-story residential **apartment building** under the **AUD (Medium High) Program**. The proposed density is 25 dwelling units per acre with an average unit size of 938 square feet. City Council (on appeal) approved the project on March 8, 2016.
4. **517 Chapala Street** - Proposal for a three-story, **mixed-use** development on an 11,500 square foot lot, with six residential **condominiums** and one commercial condominium. City Council (on appeal) granted approval and HLC last granted Review After Final approval on July 30, 2014.
5. **200 Helena Avenue** – Proposal to construct a new 2,833 square foot, 2-story **commercial building** with a third story rooftop patio. The proposal will include a new parking lot with nine parking spaces, bicycle parking, and landscape improvements, and a separate valet parking lot. New sidewalk, curb, and utility improvements are also included. Planning

Commission approved July 14, 2016; ABR granted Project Design Approval on August 29, 2016.

6. **350 Hitchcock Way** – Proposal for a lot split and new 39,000 square-foot **automobile dealership** for Maserati, Alfa Romeo, and a third high line make. Community Benefit square footage was allocated by Council. The project was approved by Planning Commission on April 7, 2016 and received ABR final approval on June 20, 2016.
7. **6100 Hollister Avenue** - Proposal to construct a **light industrial park** totaling 47,146 square feet on an approximately 14.43 acre Santa Barbara Airport site. The project will include two 3,775 square foot retail buildings and seven light industrial buildings of modular nature for one or more tenants. The modular commercial buildings range in size from 2,002 square feet to 2,500 square feet. Project approved by the Planning Commission on October 6, 2016.
8. **15 S. Hope Avenue** – Proposal for 48 apartments under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program** and 780 square feet of **retail** space on a 35,514 square-foot parcel abutting Arroyo Burro Creek. ABR granted Project Design Approval April 11, 2016.
9. **251 S. Hope Avenue** - Housing Authority proposal for a 45,400 square-foot, 90-unit apartment building for **very low- and low-income frail elderly** on a vacant property. Project was approved by the Planning Commission on February 18, 2016 and approved by Council on appeal on May 3, 2016. ABR granted Project Design Approval on September 19, 2016.
10. **711 N. Milpas** - Proposal for a new four-story, 57,721 square-foot **mixed-use** development under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program**. Two existing residential units and commercial buildings totaling 33,000 square feet will be demolished. A total of 6,656 square feet of non-residential use is proposed with the 73 residential units. ABR granted Project Design Approval on June 20, 2016.
11. **Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History (2559 Puesta del Sol) –Master Plan project with** amended Conditional Use Permit focused on rehabilitation of existing buildings and incorporation of adjacent Museum-owned parcels to be annexed. City Council (on appeal) approved the CUP on March 24, 2015; Council approved the annexation, General Plan Amendment and Zone Change in August/September 2015. Project received Final Approval from HLC on September 7, 2016.
12. **801 Cliff Drive** – (Enforcement Case) The project consists of as-built building remodeling, site work, tree removals, and landscaping alterations at the 97-unit apartment complex. The unpermitted work also included removal of mature Eucalyptus trees that provided Monarch butterfly habitat. Proposed new improvements include **restoration of Monarch butterfly and riparian habitat**, tree mitigation planting, a habitat maintenance and monitoring program, and minor building alterations. The Planning Commission approved the Coastal Development Permit on August 11, 2016.

## Pending Building Plan Check or Permit Issuance / Under Construction

1. **412-414 Anacapa Street** – Proposal for a three-lot subdivision and construction of a three-story **mixed-use** development. Building permit plans submitted February 18, 2014. Building permit issued December 22, 2015.
2. **Library Plaza (40 E. Anapamu)** - Proposal to upgrade landscape and hardscape areas in front of the Santa Barbara Public Library and the Faulkner Gallery along with the lower plaza area at the westerly end of Library Ave. No changes to the building are proposed. The project is in plan check.
3. **Arlington Village (1330 Chapala Street)** - Proposal for a three-story, **mixed-use** development on a 91,000 square-foot parcel. The project comprises 33 residential apartments, two commercial units, and a 13,400 square-foot partially below-grade parking garage. Building permit was issued on December 16, 2015. Currently in for review of a lot split and residential units will then be developed under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program** standards. Currently under construction.
4. **617 Bradbury Avenue** – Proposal to demolish an existing 392 square foot single-family residence and construct a 4,320 square foot, three-story, **mixed-use** building. The residential units are 1,257 square-foot, two-bedroom units at the rear of the lot. The proposal includes 2,015 square feet of green roof and upper level landscape plantings. Building permit plans submitted February 16, 2016.
5. **Cabrillo Pavilion Arts Center and Bathhouse (1118 E. Cabrillo Boulevard)** – Renovation of the existing building and surrounding site improvements. Planning Commission approved the CDP on August 20, 2015. Project scheduled for HLC Project Design Approval on March 23, 2016.
6. **Cancer Center of Santa Barbara (540 W. Pueblo Street)** - Proposal for a new comprehensive **outpatient cancer treatment facility** consisting of a new 53,407 square-foot, three-story medical building, a four-tier parking structure with 180 parking spaces, and six rental housing units. The project received a Substantial Conformance Determination to include a learning center on Junipero Street. Building permit issued and under construction.
7. **Children’s Museum-MOXI (125 State Street)** –Proposal for a 16,691 square-foot, three-story building to be used as the Children's Museum of Santa Barbara with indoor and outdoor galleries, a courtyard, and roof terrace. Grading permit issued July 17, 2014; building permit issued January 15, 2015. Currently under construction.
8. **604 E. Cota Street** - Proposal to construct a new, 20,426 square foot, three-story mixed-use building with 29 residential units under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program** and 2,080 square feet of commercial space. ABR granted Project Design Approval on November 24, 2014. Building permit was issued and project is under construction.
9. **La Entrada (35, 36 and 120 State Street)** – **123 room hotel** and 22,320 square feet of commercial space with 246 parking spaces; found to be in Substantial Conformance with prior-approved project on June 27, 2013. HLC granted Project Design Approval on August

- 14, 2013 and Final Approval on May 21, 2014. All building permits have been issued. Currently under construction.
10. **210 - 216 Meigs Road – Five lot subdivision** that included a rezone and General Plan Amendment to residential use. Submitted for building permit plan check in March 2015. A permit for site work was issued July 16, 2015; currently under construction.
  11. **Montecito Country Club (920 Summit Road)** – Revisions to reduce the scope of the project found to be in Substantial Conformance with the prior-approved project that was approved by Planning Commission on September 10, 2009. ABR approval granted March 17, 2014; HLC approval granted May 14, 2014. Permits have been issued. Currently under construction.
  12. **510 N. Salsipuedes Street (People’s Self-Help Housing)** - Proposal for a three-story, 40-unit **restricted-income multi-family development** with an attached 46-space garage and 3,300 square-foot community center. ABR granted Final Approval with conditions on February 10, 2014; City Council (on appeal) granted approval on May 20, 2014. Building permit plans submitted in May 2014.
  13. **Sandman Inn (3714-3744 State Street)** – Proposal involves demolishing the existing 52,815 square-foot, 113-room hotel (Sandman Inn) and restaurant, and constructing 5,110 square feet of **office** space and 72 **residential condominiums**. Planning Commission approved the revised project on April 3, 2014. Currently under construction.
  14. **Santa Barbara Museum of Art (1130 State Street)** – Approximately 8,000 square-foot addition to the existing 64,510 square-foot building; reconfigure interior gallery, circulation and office space; comprehensive electrical and mechanical upgrade, and waterproof the roof. HLC granted Project Design Approval on December 17, 2014. Building permit plans currently in plan check
  15. **101 State Street** - Proposal to demolish an existing 714 square-foot laundry building and 40 space parking lot and construct a new 22,133 square-foot, three-story **hotel** with 34 guest rooms and a 33 space, at-grade parking garage. HLC granted Final Approval on November 6, 2013. Building permit has been issued.
  16. **3617 State Street** - Proposal for a **Medical Marijuana** Storefront Collective Dispensary Permit. The dispensary will be located in an existing tenant space in Ontare Plaza. Interior improvements are proposed. Building permit plans submitted July 30, 2015.
  17. **3869 State Street (Grace Village)** – Proposed new **affordable, senior, rental housing** project by the Housing Authority of the City of Santa Barbara consisting of a 44,029 square-foot, three-story residential building with 57 one-bedroom units, a manager's unit, community room, administrative office, and laundry facilities. The project is developed under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program** with a density of 56 units per acre and average unit size of 489 square feet (net). Building permit plans submitted December 21, 2015.
  18. **3880 State Street** – Proposal to construct 13 new **apartment** units in a 13,323 square-foot two-story building, attached to the existing 5,442 square foot **one-story office** building at the center of the site. ABR granted PDA/Final Approval on January 21, 2014. Building permit issued October 16, 2015; currently under construction.

19. **3885 & 3887 State Street** - Proposal for a mixed-use residential and commercial project including: demolition of the 22,500 square foot existing two-story commercial building; demolition of the existing 4,990 square foot motel; replacement of 4,500 net square feet of commercial space; the addition of **89 apartment units** under the **AUD (Priority Housing Overlay) Program**; and a new subterranean parking garage. Building permit issued August 31, 2015; currently under construction.
20. **Waterfront Hotel (433 E. Cabrillo Blvd.)**– Building permits were issued for a 150-room hotel. The applicant is exploring revising the project to a smaller boutique hotel, requiring a new **Development Agreement**, potentially a Coastal Development Permit and some level of environmental review. In the interim, the applicant is seeking approval of a new Development Agreement to extend the expiration of the current approvals, and an associated amendment to the TEDR Ordinance. City Council approved the Development Agreement on May 24, 2016. Conceptual design plans being reviewed by ABR and HLC.
21. **6100 Wallace Becknell Road (6100 Hollister Avenue)** - Proposal to demolish all buildings on-site and construct a new facility for **Direct Relief**, including a new 130,000 square-foot warehouse with an attached two-story, 25,000 square-foot administrative office building, secure truck yard loading area, and approximately 152 parking spaces. The project received a designation as a Community Benefit project by the City Council and an allocation of 80,000 square feet (plus a reservation of 30,000 square feet) of non-residential floor area. The project was approved by the Planning Commission on March 17, 2016. The Demolition Permit has been issued.
22. **118 N. Milpas Street** - Proposal for a **Medical Marijuana Storefront Collective Dispensary** in an existing commercial building. The building is legally non-conforming with no parking on site. Interior tenant improvements are proposed. On March 17, 2016, the Planning Commission, on appeal, upheld the SHO's approval. Project is in building plan check.