



# CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

## COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

**AGENDA DATE:** September 12, 2013

**TO:** Mayor and Councilmembers  
Planning Commission

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

**SUBJECT:** Joint Council And Planning Commission Work Session  
Planning Division Workload And Program Activities

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council hold a joint work session with the Planning Commission to receive status reports and discuss major work program activities in the Planning Division, including: Long Range Planning & General Plan Implementation; Zoning Information & Enforcement; Design Review & Historic Preservation; and Development & Environmental Review.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Over the last several years, joint work sessions on the Planning Division workload have been held with the Council and Planning Commission approximately every six months. For today's meeting, staff will review all programs in the Planning Division, highlighting accomplishments, major work underway, and projects on hold or pending. The Chairs of the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) and Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) are also invited to attend the meeting; in particular their participation is important for discussion of the Average Unit Size Density Incentive Program.

A primary goal of the work session is to establish a shared understanding of the Division's workload, including the status of projects or programs that may be active, pending, or on the back burner. Adjustments in priorities occur when issues arise and program improvements are needed. Council and Planning Commission feedback is invaluable for staff to stay the course or make changes as necessary.

This report and attachments provide information on particular projects within each program and some information on regular assignments (i.e. plan check). The main topics for discussion at the work session will be: the Average Unit Size Density Program, Design Review completion of existing project and the next project to be Multi-Unit Design Guidelines, the steps for the New Zoning Ordinance project, and Zoning Information Reports.

## **General Plan Implementation**

The General Plan Implementation Program is essentially divided into two phases: Phase I (1-5 years, 2012-2016) and Phase II (6+ years), which includes all the remaining projects. The primary focus of today's discussion is on Phase I, including review of major projects completed, active project status and schedules, and implementation of the Average Unit Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program. The schedule overview is shown in Attachment 1, and Attachment 2 outlines considerations for possible process changes to implement the AUD Program and the roles of the ABR, HLC and Planning Commission.

State law (Senate Bill 2) requires that jurisdictions designate at least one zone in which a year-round emergency shelter is allowed by right. In compliance with this mandate, the 2011 Housing Element contains a program directing amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to permit emergency shelters by right in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone within one year of adoption of the Element. Due to other workload priorities and limited staff resources, zoning ordinance amendments to implement this program have not yet been brought forward for Council initiation. Staff expects that Council will consider initiating changes to the Municipal Code in order to comply with SB2 in late Fall 2013.

Implementation of the General Plan amendments in the Coastal Zone requires certification by the Coastal Commission, and specifically amending the Local Coastal Program (LCP). Coastal Commission staff has expressed reservations about simply amending the LCP to reflect the General Plan and Zoning maps without at least updating all land use policy designations and any associated policy references. City staff is actively working with the Commission staff to identify the needed changes.

City staff has also applied for a Coastal Commission grant to comprehensively update the Land Use Plan portion of the LCP (which has not been updated since the original certification in 1982) and a portion of the Implementation Plan. Should the City be awarded this grant, the scope of the current effort would be expanded considerably, and would require further direction from the Council. Announcement of the grant recipients is expected in November 2013.

A key component of the General Plan Update (GPU) is the new Growth Management Program (GMP) for non-residential development. On March 5, 2013, the Council adopted a Zoning Ordinance amendment including a Traffic Management Strategy that specified allowed traffic impacts based on location in four different areas (e.g. Downtown, Upper State Street) and type of development (e.g. Small Addition, Transfer, Community Benefit).

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and traffic model prepared for the GPU found that, based on current thresholds for cumulative traffic impacts, up to 26 intersections would become adversely impacted as a result of city wide development (residential, non-residential, other). These significant and unmitigated cumulative impacts were

overridden by City Council with adoption of the General Plan Update. The traffic strategy designed to reduce the overall traffic impact of land use growth explains the City policy for where and when land development is appropriate and under what level of impact. The strategy allows most developments, but limits those that use too much of the remaining roadway and intersection capacity. During the GPU and GMP processes, Staff explained that a project-specific impact is the tipping point when one project's traffic generation is taking too much of the remaining capacity.

Staff will be returning to Council before the end of the year with a resolution further explaining this traffic threshold and the basic procedures for determining traffic impacts. Council adoption of a resolution explaining this policy will be helpful to support environmental determinations for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

### **Zoning Information & Enforcement**

Workload activity is constant for this program with responsibility to manage and coordinate with other Land Development Team groups on public counter services, permit plan check, and enforcement. The plan check function is understaffed and in order to reduce backlog and late plan checks we use overtime with other staff in the Division when possible. There are two P3 goals that measure plan check activity. The first is to complete 65% of initial zoning plan check reviews within the target timeline. In FY13, we completed 66% of the initial zoning plan checks on time. The second is to complete 75% of resubmittals within the target timeline. In FY 13, we completed 80% of resubmittals on time.

In the last few weeks we hired two part-time hourly employees (combined total of 0.75 FTE) to provide more resources to enforcement and, where possible, assist with plan check and Zoning Information Reports (ZIRs). This program also handles the modification requests for the Staff Hearing Officer (SHO) where bi-weekly hearings usually have 3 to 5 agenda items each for mostly minor requests, such as setback encroachments, fence height, open yard reductions.

Council initiated an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance standards for fences, walls, screens and hedges. To date, staff has received initial direction from the Council Ordinance Committee and the Neighborhood Advisory Council. Additional public input and feedback on proposed amendment language will be solicited from the Single Family Design Board on September 23, 2013 and from the Planning Commission later this fall.

A major update to the Zoning Ordinance has been funded in the Capital Program starting January 2014 with a new Project Planner position, \$35,000 for City Attorney support and \$200,000 for consultant services. Early next year staff will begin working with a new City Attorney and the Planning Commission to refine the scope of the update, develop a public involvement process, and issue a Request for Proposal for the consultant. We expect that Council will consider a contract and the scope of work in

late Spring 2014. A draft summary of the next steps for the New Zoning Ordinance effort is attached (Attachment 3).

Consideration of possible changes to the ZIR process was discussed at Council on August 13, 2013. The Council heard concerns from many realtors regarding the ZIR requirement, cost, timeliness, discrepancies between prior ZIRs and current ZIRs, and enforcement. The realtors requested that the Zoning Ordinance be amended so that attaining a ZIR before close of escrow would no longer be required but would be made optional. Staff explained that we shared some of the same concerns as the realtors, such as resolving discrepancies that sometimes occur between ZIRs, and staff also explained the value of the ZIR and gave reasons why ZIRs should remain a requirement rather than an option. Council indicated that changes in the process should be made to improve timeliness and resolution of problems, but Council felt that ZIRs should continue to be required rather than an option.

Council directed staff to put the matter on today's agenda for a brief discussion between Council and the Planning Commission, and to schedule further consideration at the Planning Commission meeting on September 17<sup>th</sup>. Staff contacted the Santa Barbara Association of Realtors (SBAOR) to explain that some public comment at today's meeting is certainly welcome, however, we expect to have limited time today and more time next week at the Planning Commission hearing.

The Staff Report for the Planning Commission meeting will contain background information on ZIRs from staff and SBAOR, an explanation of the issues, and staff's recommendations to address the issues including the exploration of: the pros and cons of the use of private planning consultants or other consultants to prepare ZIRs; an Ordinance amendment to create more administrative authority to resolve record discrepancies and minor code deviations; and, a formal appeal process on the findings of the ZIR. In addition, more information will be provided on the discrepancies that arise between ZIRs, including responses to some of the realtors case examples. Some statements from realtors were incomplete with regards to prior ZIRs, City records, and/or staff's efforts to identify and resolve issues.

In response to Council's concern regarding the scheduling of ZIR inspections, management is immediately pulling in additional staff from zoning enforcement to prepare ZIRs to address scheduling concerns. Staff will monitor what it takes to maintain the increased service level. In addition, management suggests that Council authorize the waiving of Planning fees for modifications and design review, if needed, in cases where it is clear an error was made in the previous ZIR. Applicable building permit fees would still apply.

After the Planning Commission discussion and staff follow up on possible changes, we will return to Council in November for direction on administrative changes and, as necessary, bring possible Zoning Ordinance Amendments to the Ordinance Committee. Staff anticipates further discussion with the Ordinance Committee in January 2014.

## **Design Review & Historic Preservation**

A list of assignments in this program prepared for this report is Attachment 4. As has been the case for many years, the number of special assignments in this section is considerable. Major progress has been achieved with the adoption of the Historic Resources Element and development of a 5 year work program for historic preservation. Projects underway are listed and include: survey completion, potential list determinations, draft Historic District Ordinance and historic district design guidelines.

Several special projects related to design review have been initiated and we are looking to complete the active ones soon so that early next year we may begin to develop design guidelines for multi-unit projects. The need for multi-unit design guidelines has been identified in the Housing Element dating back to 1995, and the need has been further intensified with the adoption of the AUD. Staff anticipates that this effort will primarily involve the ABR, but we also believe the guidelines will be helpful to the HLC used in conjunction with the Urban Design and El Pueblo Viejo Guidelines. We have indicated that some funding may be necessary to prepare illustrations and graphics, but that is to be determined as we have yet to develop a work program.

## **Development & Environmental Review**

Private development activity has been relatively slow, but steady, for the last several years. While the Planning Commission agendas and meetings have been sparse recently, application submittals are increasing and staff has been involved in many pre-application meetings and Planner Consultations, indicating that development activity is picking up. Some larger projects were recently completed (El Encanto) or are currently under construction (Alma del Pueblo, Foothill Triangle, Victoria Hall Theater). Others are very near commencement (La Entrada) or are in the process of seeking revisions to previously approvals (Sandman Inn). Attachment 5 summarizes the major pending or active private development projects. Some staff in this section are also working on several Capital-funded projects (Mission Creek bridges and El Estero improvements), not included in the attached list.

- ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. General Plan Implementation Schedule
  2. AUD Process Considerations
  3. New Zoning Ordinance – Next Steps
  4. Design Review & Historic Preservation Section Assignments as of August 2013
  5. Pending and Active Development Projects

**PREPARED BY:** Bettie Weiss, City Planner

**SUBMITTED BY:** Paul Casey, CDD & Assistant City Administrator

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

## General Plan Implementation Program: Phase I Schedule

Project Ranking	Project Description	FY12/13 2012-2013 <sup>1</sup>	FY14 2013-2014	FY15 2014-2015	FY16 2015-2016
1	Housing Element Certification by HCD	✓			
2	Historic Resources Element	✓			
3	Average Unit Size Density Program	✓	✓ *		
4	Nonresidential Growth Management Prgm	✓			
5	Zoning Map Amendments LCP (Coastal Zone) Map Amendments	✓	✓ X	X	
6	Highway 101 Air Quality Setback	X	X	X	
7	SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy 2014 Housing Element Update	✓	✓ X	X	
8	Climate Action Plan	✓			
9	Safety Element	X	X		
10	Adaptive Management Program	✓	X	X	X
11	Emergency Shelter Zoning		X		
12	Building Height Over 45 Feet	✓	✓		
13	Alternative Transportation Demand Analysis	postponed			
14	Arts Master Plan	X			
15	Environmental Resources Element			X	X
16	Local Coastal Program Update		X	X	X
17					

✓ = Completed

X = In Progress

\* Project review process under discussion

<sup>1</sup> Fiscal Year is from July 1 to June 31<sup>st</sup>.

## **Average Units Size Density Incentive Program (AUD) Project Review Process**

### **Introduction**

It has been suggested that Council consider if process changes should be made requiring review of certain AUD rental projects by the Planning Commission (PC) because of the complexity and community interest in these projects. This is an important consideration for implementation of the AUD program, and Staff requests that it be the primary topic for discussion at the Joint Meeting of the Council and Planning Commission. Representatives from the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) and Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) will also be participating in the meeting.

The approach taken to develop the AUD Program involved policy tradeoffs (size, density, parking, etc.) that naturally make AUD projects potentially more controversial. Currently, apartment developments do not go to the Planning Commission. Some feel that the HLC and ABR are not prepared to handle the controversy and intent of AUD projects, and that the PC may provide a better forum for community input and working through the policy purpose and controversy.

The design review boards generally do not take on the density issue (i.e., # of units); their primary charge is to focus on the physical building (size, bulk, and scale) and ensure that the aesthetics are appropriate and the building “fits” within the context of its neighborhood. Questions with respect to the AUD Program are whether the objective is to produce a specific number of units, and whether the boards and commissions have the ability to reduce this number. Staff believes that while there is no specific number, the objective should be to allow as many units as possible. The project design is also expected to be appropriate, and if the design review process reduced the size of the buildings, it may also reduce the number of units, making it difficult to advance the goals of the AUD Program. Hence, we all must work together as best we can to see that the goals are not mutually exclusive.

### **Background**

One key objective of the AUD Program is to support non-subsidized rental housing development. Recently the development market is such that rental projects are becoming more attractive to funding entities and developers. Rental housing demand is very high in Santa Barbara (61% of households are renters), and rental housing is an important factor in the jobs/housing equation. Rental housing is allowed in all three density tiers of the AUD Program – Medium High (15-27 du/ac); High (28-38 du/ac); and the Priority Housing Overlay (39-63 du/ac).

The AUD Program has several different components from which some projects will be subject to review and approval by the PC (any condominium project of 5 units or more, any project proposing a building height greater than 45 feet); others do not require PC review (any rental project, or condominium of less than 5 units). Historically, rental projects have not been subject to PC review because they do not involve a land use decision per se (PC typically reviews land use with Conditional Use Permits, Coastal Development Permits, subdivisions, zone changes, etc.). The Zoning Ordinance has

just a few exceptions to this general rule, and some of those standards have also changed with regard to PC review of modifications.

State housing element law requires the City to identify both incentives and constraints that affect the development potential of needed housing. The City's Housing Element explains that the development review process can be both an incentive and constraint, depending on the objective. With regard to community acceptance of development we believe the process is beneficial; however, with regard to time, money and risk to developers the process is a constraint.

The AUD is a new program and considering the role of the PC is an open and valid question in Staff's opinion. During the last few weeks Staff has been developing a recommendation on whether we believe that, on balance requiring PC review of more significant rental housing projects would benefit the AUD process. We started by identifying objectives; then considered how the process is currently working towards those objectives; what challenges exist in achieving the objectives; and then options or solutions to change the process, including the PC role.

### **Review Process Objectives**

- The process should further the objectives of the General Plan to support rental housing projects.
- Decision makers should have a full understanding of the AUD Program goals, objectives, tradeoffs, inherent tension, and the mechanisms that have been put in place to achieve the objectives and deal with the tensions.
- Help the boards and commissions understand and communicate what their roles are and are not. Develop an understanding and database for boards and commission of past projects explaining their successes or short comings.
- Have a coordinated land development review that is appropriate for the project type and size.
- The process should be: easily accessible to the public, one that listens well, and where the public concerns/comments are addressed.
- The process should be realistic, within staffing resources and implemented quickly.
- Increase certainty for applicants.

### **Review Process Challenges**

- The Land Development Team (LDT) process is underutilized by "design review only" projects. PRT is useful in providing a coordinated review to identify issues and concerns as well as avoid late hits, ensure staff efficiency and provide comments.

- Project information provided to the ABR and HLC is limited. Unlike the PC, Staff Reports with recommendations are not provided to design review boards.
- Design review boards have limited time to review projects and associated issues prior to review of the project.
- The public participation process is different between the design review boards and PC.
- The design review process is focused on design and aesthetic issues, and may not be conducive to broader planning issues.

### **Potential Solution Options**

Option 1. Enhance support to design review boards. This is necessary no matter what the role of the Planning Commission. Staff is planning a review with the design review boards related to the CEQA process and findings adopted for the GPU, and additional discussions on the AUD program and associated policies.

Option 2. Make use of the existing code provision that allows the ABR and HLC to refer projects to the PC for advice. Currently the Municipal Code allows the ABR or HLC to refer projects that they determine to be “highly visible to the public”, to the PC for comments. The PC comments will then be used by the ABR or HLC in their deliberations of the project. For the purposes of the AUD Program, to meet the criteria of “highly visible to the public”, Staff believes there should be a combination of concerns related to the location, public views, size and parking associated with the project.

This option would also involve Staff review of projects through the Land Development (LDT) process for projects of 10 new units or more &/or 3-4 stories. Staff would prepare a report to the ABR or HLC with recommendations on General Plan consistency and whether to refer the project to PC for comments. ABR or HLC would decide if the project is referred to the PC, and if so the report, along with questions and concerns would be forwarded to the PC. The project would be scheduled at the next available PC meeting consistent with noticing requirements.

Option 3. Amend the recently adopted AUD ordinance and establish a requirement for PC review. Also consider if certain Staff Hearing Officer procedures should be changed to refer projects to the Planning Commission.

Setting clearer triggers adds certainty to the process for requiring PC review or when the ABR/HLC to refer projects to the PC for comments as part of their review is a judgment call that is hard to make to balance the time and resources expended with the value achieved. If the trigger is far-reaching, it may result in a constraint, and the AUD is meant to be an incentive program. Staff believes a more limiting trigger for PC review of even a few projects can still be useful to the ABR and HLC’s review of a project.

## Staff Recommendation

At this time staff recommends the following and based on the discussion at the Joint Meeting we will follow up. It is important to note that public input, including potential applicants was important in developing the AUD and this is a new topic that has not had much consideration to date. Therefore, Staff believes should process changes be further explored it is necessary to seek additional input before implementing changes.

Staff recommends that Options 1 and 2 be implemented first before taking on a new ordinance amendment (Option 3) to create a new requirement for PC review. Formal PC review would most likely involve an Ordinance amendment to the recently adopted AUD Program. This option would take a minimum of 4-6 months (PC draft ordinance; PC hearing; Ordinance Committee; Council Introduction & Adoption).

## Process Steps

- Hold work sessions with the ABR and HLC on the AUD Program objectives and roles.
- Require a LDT review for more significant projects (a minor change in the process is necessary to establish a new requirement and associated fees).
- Allow one design review without a LDT review and require a LDT review prior to the second review at ABR or HLC.
- As part of the LDT process, Staff reviews the project for code and policy consistency, meets with the applicant; and prepares the staff reports for design review board/commission (and possibly PC).
- Review the schedule agreed to by staff and the applicant – generally both design board & PC meeting would occur within two months of the LDT review.
- The ABR or HLC reviews Staff Report and, if needed, forwards the project for comment by the PC.
- The PC review is for direction to applicant with the expectation that they render a majority opinion on specific issue areas. The Staff and design review board may include recommended conditions of approval. No action is taken by the PC, and their direction to the ABR or HLC is not appealable.
- The project returns to the ABR or HLC for Project Design Approval and other steps in review process as usual.

## Summary of Next Steps to Create the New Zoning Ordinance

- 1) Research other jurisdictions with recently adopted Zoning Ordinances (partially completed already)
- 2) Obtain statements of qualifications from consultant firms
- 3) Hire Project Planner funded by CIP, and assign a Project Planner to the Zoning Ordinance Project.
- 4) Very Early in this process (perhaps as soon as January 2014), we would like to hold discussion meetings to get a consensus direction from the Planning Commission and Council on several points in terms of the general approach to the update, including:
  - a) Consistency with the General Plan
  - b) Balancing the protection of neighborhoods, limited growth, and economic vitality/development
  - c) Simplified standards addressing most (but not all) situations and variations, and reducing nonconforming situations (such as: uses allowed, setbacks, corner lots, parking, location of accessory buildings and open yards, consolidation of similar zoning designations)
  - d) Administrative tools to resolve discrepancies and lack of clarity in City records (like problems found through ZIRs and plan checks)
  - e) City Attorney's Office involvement
  - f) Oversight Committee
    - i) Should there be one, other than the Planning Commission? If so, who should be on it?
  - g) Public Process. What should the public process be, other than input at regular public hearings?
    - i) Focus groups?
    - ii) Survey?
    - iii) Public input forums?
    - iv) Community meetings?
  - h) Request for Proposal (RFP) language
- 5) Prepare RFP for Council's approval (projected late spring 2014)
- 6) Send RFP to qualified consultants
- 7) Review proposals
- 8) Choose consultant
- 9) Begin the process of drafting a new Zoning Ordinance
- 10) Hold various discussions, focus groups, hearings and meetings (TBD in the Planning Commission discussions), culminating in public hearings at the Planning Commission, Ordinance Committee and Council on adoption of the New Zoning Ordinance.

## **Design Review & Historic Preservation Section Assignments as of August 2013**

### ➤ **Design Guidelines & Special Assignments- Active**

- Fire Sprinkler Valve/Backflow Prevention Design Guidelines
- Wireless Facility/Antenna Database update and mapping
- Solar system permits-Database update and mapping- (No awards presentation ceremony this year)
- Sign program database & parcel tag updates
- Sign application submittal staff training
- AUD Training for Design Review Boards
- Env. Training Plan SB EIR/CEQA

### ➤ **Pending – Short Term-Pending**

- Ord. Committee Revised Chapters 15.24 and 22.11
- Landscape tree removal permit issuance procedures-New handouts
- Chapala Street Design Guidelines- Addendum Update
- Building inspector training guide presentation
- Sign Committee- Subcommittee to review recent sign approvals
- Multi-Unit Design Guidelines (Funding allocation req'd for graphics/illustrations)

### ➤ **Pending - Long Term-On Hold**

- ~~Multi-Family Design Guidelines~~
- ABR Guidelines Update- Additional Photo Images
- Haley/Milpas Design Manual Update
- Wireless Facility/Antenna Ordinance Amendments

### ➤ **Historic Preservation Work Program-Active 5 Year Plan**

- MEA Appendices Resource List Updates
- Citywide Historic Resource Guidelines & Architectural Styles
- Ord. Committee discussions Re: Citywide Historic Districting Plan & Administrative Guidelines
- Historic District Designations
- Parcel tag and street file updates- Planning Intern
- Historic Resources Database Update –Planning Intern

➤ **Historic Preservation Work Program-Active cont'd**

- City Landmark & SOM designations-Planning Intern
- City Website updates

➤ **Pending – Short Term- Pending**

- Proximity to historic resources mapping –Waiting for completion of all potential list and parcel updates
- Website update for addition of Historic Database Search Functions

➤ **Pending – Long Term-On Hold**

- Historic Resources Element Implementation
- Revisions to the City's MEA Guidelines
- Other Zoning & Code Relief Incentives for Historic Resources- Return to Ord. Committee
- Demolition by Neglect Ordinance

H:\Group Folders\PLAN\Ji\WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENTS\DESIGN REVIEW as of 8-2013.doc

## Pending and Active Development Projects

### Pre-Application or Conceptual Design Review

1. **Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History (2559 Puesta del Sol)** – Master Plan project is on indefinite hold. Museum Team and staff will continue discussing options/process to rehabilitate the existing buildings.
2. **Santa Barbara Museum of Art (1130 State Street)** – Approximately 8,990 sq. ft. addition to their existing 60,000 sq. ft. building; reconfigure interior gallery, circulation and office space; comprehensive electrical and mechanical upgrade, and waterproof the roof. Will request Community Priority square footage.
3. **Library Plaza (40 E. Anapamu)** - Proposal to upgrade landscape and hardscape areas in front of the Santa Barbara Public Library and the Faulkner Gallery. No changes to the building are proposed.
4. **Grace Lutheran Church of Santa Barbara (3869 State Street)** –Proposed new 39,071 square-foot, three-story, 60-unit building for affordable, senior, rental housing.
5. **251 S. Hope Avenue** - Proposed 84-bed Alzheimer's Care Facility on vacant property identified as Area A-2 in the Rancho Arroyo Specific Plan. Includes a request to City Council to initiate a Specific Plan Amendment.
6. **301 E. Yanonali Street** - Proposal to construct a new 43,937 square-foot, two-story building to include a market, offices, and retail spaces with 150 parking spaces on the 3.16 acre lot located in the Cabrillo Plaza Specific Plan area.
7. **128 Anacapa Street** – Proposal to construct two condominium units on vacant lot.
8. **1925 El Camino de la Luz** - new SFR on vacant bluff top lot.

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

1. **Sandman Inn (3714-3744 State Street)** – Revision to the previously approved mixed-use development. The revised project involves demolishing the existing 52,815 square-foot, 113-room hotel (Sandman Inn) and restaurant, and construction of 5,299 square feet of office space and 72 residential condominiums.
2. **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.
3. **240 W. Alamar Road** – Demolish existing single-family residence and construct four restricted-income ownership units (to replace units lost at 535 E. Montecito Street).
4. **101 S. La Cumbre Rd** – Proposal for a new, one-story, 4,737 square-foot commercial building and 27 space parking lot, on a 25,764 square-foot lot. The existing 1,737 square foot gas station, surface parking lot, and related structures will be demolished.

## Environmental Review

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

1. **El Estero Drain** – consultant preparing Remedial Action Plan/ Habitat Restoration Plan; then environmental review
2. **1837 ½ El Camino de la Luz** – new SFR on vacant bluff top lot – Revised Draft EIR (response to comments stage)
3. **Hillside House (1235 Veronica Springs Road)** – Final EIR prepared. Applicant is proposing a revision to the project, which includes a 100% rental project instead of a mix of rental and ownership. Changes were presented at a Planning Commission conceptual review, and the next step is to submit a formal application for the revision.
4. **Highway 101 High Occupancy Vehicle Lane** – coordination with SBCAG and Caltrans on the Draft EIR; CDP application expected in 2014.
5. **Resource Recovery Facility (including Marborg Alternative)** – coordination with County on alternatives, technical studies, and Draft EIR.
6. **Mission Canyon EIR** – EIR prepared by County Staff for a Specific Plan for portions of the unincorporated Mission Canyon. Joint City and County Planning Commission review of the Specific Plan pending.

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

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

1. **Arlington Village (1330 Chapala Street)** - Proposal for a three-story, mixed-use development on a 91,000 square-foot parcel. The project will comprise 33 residential apartments (totaling 28,302 sq. ft.) and two commercial units (931 sq. ft.), and a 13,400 square-foot partially below-grade parking garage. HLC granted Project Design Approval on August 14, 2013 [*Note: Appeal filed 8/26/13*]
2. **La Entrada** – Revisions found to be in Substantial Conformance with prior-approved project. HLC granted Project Design Approval on August 14, 2013.
3. **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. SHO granted approval on June 26, 2013.
4. **Children’s Museum (125 State Street)** – Proposed 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. HLC granted Final Approval on May 23, 2012.
5. **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 Project Design Approval on July 17, 2013.
6. **1936 State Street** – Proposal for a new 3,500 square foot, one-story, non-residential building with 18 parking spaces on a 22,466 square foot lot. HLC granted Project Design Approval on August 14, 2013.

7. **Montecito Country Club (920 Summit Road)** – Expecting a Substantial Conformance Determination request to modify previously approved project: proposed major renovations to the Montecito Country Club, including facade improvements to the existing clubhouse, four new tennis courts, a new tennis pro-shop, a new golf pro-shop, modified parking lots, new patios and landscaping. Planning Commission granted approval on September 10, 2009.

**Pending Building plan check or permit issuance**

1. **Waterfront Hotel** – Building permits were issued for a 150-room hotel. The property owners are exploring revising the project to a 50-room boutique hotel. This will require a new Development Agreement, CDP and some level of environmental review.



# City Council Planning Commission Joint Worksession



Planning Division  
Community Development Department  
September 12, 2013



# Agenda

## General Plan Implementation

### Overall Schedule

- AUD Program – Review Process

## Historic Preservation & Design Review

Assignments – Active, Pending, On-Hold

## Development/Environmental Review Activity

## Zoning Projects

- Hedge Ordinance & New Ordinance
- Zoning Information Reports

# GP Implementation Report

ATTACHMENT 1

## General Plan Implementation Program: Phase I Schedule

Project Ranking	Project Description	FY12/13 2012-2013 <sup>1</sup>	FY14 2013-2014	FY15 2014-2015	FY16 2015-2016
1	Housing Element Certification by HCD	✓			
2	Historic Resources Element	✓			
3	Average Unit Size Density Program	✓	✓ *		
4	Nonresidential Growth Management Prgm	✓			
5	Zoning Map Amendments LCP (Coastal Zone) Map Amendments	✓	✓ X	X	
6	Highway 101 Air Quality Setback	X	X	X	
7	SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy 2014 Housing Element Update	✓	✓ X	X	
8	Climate Action Plan	✓			
9	Safety Element	X	X		
10	Adaptive Management Program	✓	X	X	X
11	Emergency Shelter Zoning		X		
12	Building Height Over 45 Feet	✓	✓		
13	Alternative Transportation Demand Analysis	postponed			
14	Arts Master Plan	X			
15	Environmental Resources Element			X	X
16	Local Coastal Program Update		X	X	X
17					

✓ = Completed

X = In Progress

\* Project review process under discussion

<sup>1</sup> Fiscal Year is from July 1 to June 31<sup>st</sup>.



# AUD Review Process

- ◆ Invited ABR & HLC to Participate
- ◆ Consideration of AUD objectives
  - Encourage Rental Projects
  - Simplify Process
  - Quality Design



# AUD Review Process

- ◆ Change & Improve Staff Support at ABR & HLC
- ◆ Coordinated staff review & response to public input/questions
- ◆ Memo with recommendations – consistency with AUD & General Plan; project specific conditions of approval; referral to PC for comments



# AUD Review Process

- ◆ Planning Commission referral for highly visible projects and desire for hearing on wide range of issues
  - Same staff report and attendance at PC by ABR or HLC members
  - Planning Commission comments focused on ABR/HLC questions and public concerns
  - Majority direction given; not an appealable action



# AUD Review Process

- ◆ Other Options for process changes?
  - Require PC review – Ord Amendment
- ◆ Next Step ABR & HLC Training



# Design Review

- ◆ Several special projects underway
  - Design Review – AUD & CEQA training discussions
  - Review of sign process, Chapala Guidelines amendment (sidewalk material), landscape ordinance, solar data base (no awards this year), antenna/wireless data base & mapping
  - Looking forward to new project – Multi-Unit Design Guidelines – ABR, HLC, residential and mixed use



# Historic Preservation

- ◆ Urban Historian & Interns – progress on designations , database, and guidelines
- ◆ HLC – updating Potentials Lists
- ◆ Staff and City Attorney at Ordinance Committee – Historic Districts
- ◆ Parcel tags and mapping per General Plan

# Development & Environmental Review

- ◆ Revising Environmental Review Procedures (MEA) for Traffic Analysis Consistent with Plan Santa Barbara EIR and Growth Management Program
- ◆ On-going update process for Initial Study, MEA and environmental thresholds
- ◆ CEQA Process using PlanSB EIR
- ◆ Case Planners provide more support to AUD Projects



# Zoning

- ◆ Staff for Enforcement – recent hiring of part time hourly staff
- ◆ Plan check challenges
- ◆ Hedge/Fence Ordinance
- ◆ New Zoning Ordinance – Start January 2014
- ◆ ZIRs



# Hedge/Fence Ordinance

- ◆ Intent of hedge/fence height regulations
  - Privacy?
  - Safety?
  - Solar Access?
  - Views?
  - Neighborhood Compatibility?
- ◆ Enforcement/Application challenges
  - Vegetation is not static
  - Site topography
  - Lack of administrative discretion



# Hedge/Fence Ordinance

## Approach to Amendments

- Exceptions to height limits
  - Guardrails
  - Decorative elements
  - Entry Elements
- Guidelines/templates for elements adjacent to driveways and street corners
- Administrative Authority
- Address topographical differences
- Additional definitions



# Hedge/Fence Ordinance

## Tentative Schedule:

- ✓ June 25, 2013 - Ordinance Committee
- ✓ August 14, 2013 - Neighborhood Advisory Council
- September 23, 2013 - Single Family Design Board
- November 2013 - Planning Commission
- December 2013 - Ordinance Committee
- Jan/Feb 2014 - City Council



# New Zoning Ordinance

- ◆ Current steps – soft start: research, recruit staff, prepare request for qualifications
- ◆ January 2014 – funded start, next steps: prepare report for first PC discussion on scope, approach, etc.
- ◆ City Attorney's role
- ◆ Council/PC check in & RFP (April)

# Zoning Info Reports (ZIRs)

- ◆ Council initial discussion – ZIRs remain a requirement, not optional per SBAOR
- ◆ Today Council Debrief with PC
- ◆ PC full discussion next week
  - Staff Report Info: background, immediate and mid-term actions
- ◆ Next steps – Staff’s immediate responses, Ordinance Committee, Planning Commission and back to Council