

**IV. DISCUSSION ITEM:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:06 P.M.**

**REVIEW AND COMMENT ON PROPOSED INFILL DESIGN GUIDELINES TO BE USED BY THE ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW AND THE HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

The proposed design guidelines are applicable to projects proposed under the Average Unit Size Density Incentive program (AUD), but are also applicable to other large multi-unit residential, mixed use, and commercial buildings proposed as redevelopment, or new development on vacant sites, in areas of the City where compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood is an important consideration. The proposed Infill Design Guidelines will be inserted into the existing ABR and HLC General Design Guidelines & Meeting Procedures documents. The Planning Commission will also consider supplemental design guidelines for AUD projects related to configuration of dwelling units and provision of additional parking spaces for larger units, and possible Planning Commission review and comment on AUD projects proposing five or more dwelling units. Staff is requesting comments to the ABR, HLC, and Council on the proposed design guidelines.

Contact: Jaime Limon, Senior Planner

Email: JLimon@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, extension 5507

Contact: Tony Boughman, Assistant Planner

Email: TBoughman@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, extension 4539

Tony Boughman, Assistant Planner, gave the Staff presentation. Jaime Limon, Senior Planner, was available to answer any questions.

Chair Higgins opened the public hearing at 1:29 P.M.

The following people provided comment:

1. Lindsey Baker, Co-President, League of Women Voters, submitted written comments in support of the proposed design guidelines.
2. Alex Pujo, stated that proposed Historic Resources guideline number nine on page 7: eaves and ridge lines should be “compatible” rather than “consistent”, therefore not have to be the same. He spoke in support of the AUD program incentive for one parking space per dwelling, and opposed to the supplemental AUD guideline to provide additional parking.
3. Lisa Plowman, Coastal Housing Coalition, submitted written comments and ceded her time to Detlev Peikert.
4. Detlev Peikert submitted written comments and said that the guidelines need more study. He suggested the use of “compatible” rather than “consistent” to adhere to their meanings and provided examples.
5. Christine Newhauser submitted written comments and asked that more parking be required and adequate green space.

Planning Commission Minutes  
February 16, 2017

6. Ellen Bildsten, AIA, will provide comments and recommendations to staff. The word “should” is too prescriptive, and suggested “could.”
7. Jan Hochhauser supports the comments made by Mr. Pujo and Mr. Peikert, and advocated for more involvement by the Planning Commission in AUD projects, citing his experience with his project at 800 Santa Barbara Street.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:46 P.M.

Staff asked the Commission to comment on the following four questions:

**Question No. 1:**

Do the guidelines adequately address the design concerns often expressed by members of the public and neighbors of proposed infill development projects?

Commissioners were evenly divided with three in agreement (Jordan, Lodge, Wiscomb) and three that were not (Campanella, Higgins, Schwartz).

Commissioners in support of the guidelines commented that though there were areas that could use additional clarification, such as use of “compatible” and “consistent” and “livability”, the guidelines at least provided the design review boards with a tool they presently do not have.

Commissioners who did not agree expressed concern with the absence of updated Haley/Milpas Design Guidelines. Some Commissioners thought that the suggested supplemental AUD guidelines regarding bathroom limitations and parking should be addressed with an ordinance amendment.

**Question No. 2:**

Do the guidelines provide the needed tools to the ABR and HLC to ensure compatible projects while advancing the objectives of the AUD Program?

Commissioners were split with three in agreement (Campanella, Higgins, and Lodge) stating that it was a step in the right direction, but too soon to tell if it would work.

Two Commissioners (Schwartz, Wiscomb) commented that there was not enough ‘teeth’ in the guidelines for the design review boards to address compatibility. Commissioner Jordan could not comment, stating that the language could be stronger and should also include more language in the last two sections (Livability and Privacy, and Historic Resources) to explain why those guidelines sections are important. The guidelines related to Historic Resources should include the physical consequences on loss of sunlight, loss of air, or loss of views that effect historical resource buildings.

**Question No. 3**

Is the approach of having the ABR and HLC consider bathroom limitations, unit configuration, and the potential to require additional parking a reasonable application of design guidelines?

Commissioners were evenly divided with three in agreement (Jordan, Lodge, and Wiscomb) and three that were not (Campanella, Higgins, Schwartz).

Commissioners in support of the guidelines stated that the guidelines could be overwritten by an ordinance amendment in the future, but until the Housing Task Force completes its work, this provides a tool for the design review boards on an interim basis.

Commissioners who did not agree had varied responses ranging from wanting to see the issues addressed by the supplemental AUD guidelines reviewed at the Task Force level first, while one Commissioner was not convinced that the guidelines are consistent with the General Plan.

**Straw Poll:** Is the approach of having the ABR and HLC consider bathroom limitations a reasonable application of design guidelines?

Ayes: 3 Noes: 3 (Campanella, Higgins, Schwartz)

Commissioners in support commented that guidelines could be an interim measure while the AUD program is under review.

**Question No. 4:**

Does the Planning Commission wish to review and provide comments to the ABR and HLC on all AUD projects proposing five or more units?

The Commission was unanimous in commenting “no” on providing comments for a small number of units. Commissioners stated that it was not an effective use of the Planning Commission’s time to provide comments only and, if AUD projects were referred to them, they would prefer to have decision-making authority.

Overall, the Commission was appreciative of the work done by the design review boards. Ms. Brooke took a moment to acknowledge the word of Jaime Limon and Tony Boughman who have worked in a short time and limited budget on these drafts.