



CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

AGENDA DATE: November 17, 2015

TO: Mayor and Councilmembers

FROM: City Administrator's Office

SUBJECT: Request From Councilmembers Hotchkiss And Francisco Regarding The Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council consider the request from Councilmembers Hotchkiss and Francisco regarding the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program.

DISCUSSION:

Attached is a memorandum from Councilmembers Hotchkiss and Francisco requesting that Council discuss the implementation of the AUD incentive program based on information from City staff at the joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting and on recent appeals of AUD projects.

ATTACHMENT: Memorandum from Councilmembers Hotchkiss and Francisco

PREPARED BY: Nicole Grisanti, Administrator's Office Supervisor

SUBMITTED BY: Paul Casey, City Administrator

APPROVED BY: City Administrator's Office



City of Santa Barbara
City Administrator's Office

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "Dale".

Memorandum

DATE: October 13, 2015

TO: Paul Casey, City Administrator

FROM: Councilmembers Hotchkiss & Francisco

SUBJECT: Average Unit Density

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "S", with a large, sweeping flourish extending downwards and to the right.

Pursuant to Council Resolution 05-073 regarding the Conduct of City Council Meetings, we request that an item be placed on the Santa Barbara City Council Agenda regarding the Average Unit Density program trial period.

- Summary of information to be presented:
Discuss the implementation of the Average Unit Density (AUD) trial program based on information from City staff at the joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting and on recent appeals of AUD projects.
- Statement of Specific Action:
The Average Unit Density (AUD) program was authorized for a trial period of either eight years or 250 residential units to be constructed (as evidenced by issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy). The demand for the provisions of the program has exceeded expectations such that it appears possible that there could be applications for a large number of new units deemed complete prior to the expiration of the program that may be able to proceed under AUD rules. This could lead to a much larger number than 250 units to be approved under this trial period.

Also, there have been recent projects that followed the AUD parking guidelines of 1 space per unit that appeared to be severely underparked. Council should clarify under what circumstances 1 parking space per unit will be allowed.

Related to this, areas in which the Planning Commission has expertise, such as parking, have been dealt with less than successfully by the design review boards. Council may need to consider a greater role for the Planning Commission in AUD projects. How to achieve that and maintain a relatively streamlined process is a difficult policy issue that only Council can resolve.

- Statement of the Reasons Why it is Appropriate and Within the Jurisdiction of the Council to Consider this Subject Matter and to Take the Requested Action:

Council should weigh in and provide policy direction with regard to the applications that exceed the 250 unit threshold for the trial period, a more

nuanced version of the parking requirements under AUD, and clarification of the role of the Planning Commission in the AUD process.

We are requesting that this be scheduled for a November 17, 2015 Council meeting.

cc: Mayor and Council
City Attorney
George Buell, Community Development Director



Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program

Discussion & Direction



City Council Agenda Item #8
November 17, 2015



Presentation Overview

- ◆ Purpose of Today's Discussion
- ◆ History
- ◆ Issues
- ◆ Policy Direction to Staff

Purpose of Today's Discussion

- ◆ Review intent and history of program
- ◆ Discuss results so far
- ◆ Direction to staff to improve program



INTENT AND HISTORY

AUD Purpose

To create new housing within city limits affordable to people working in Santa Barbara.

INTENT AND HISTORY

Higher Density, Lower Costs

- ◆ Other things being equal, higher density should create lower costs per housing unit.
- ◆ Caveat: Higher density can create higher “external” costs to neighborhood: congestion, reduced street parking, problems with “too large” buildings.

INTENT AND HISTORY

Variable Density

- ◆ Variable density: Allowing higher density levels based on design criteria.
- ◆ Old criterion: The lower the number of bedrooms per unit, the higher the allowed density.
- ◆ New criterion: The smaller the average unit size, the higher the allowed density.

INTENT AND HISTORY

Criterion: Number of Bedrooms

- ◆ 10,000 square foot lot in R-3 zone.

Criterion	Maximum Units
Base zoning	3
2-bedrooms only	4
1-bedrooms only	5
Studios only	6

INTENT AND HISTORY

Criterion: Average Unit Size

- ◆ 10,000 sq ft lot, R-3, High Density.

Criterion	Maximum Units
1240 sq ft	6
1090 sq ft	7
970 sq ft	8

INTENT AND HISTORY

General Plan Update

- ◆ Density the most contentious issue.
- ◆ Ad hoc Council committee of Francisco, Hotchkiss, and Williams (later White).
- ◆ Compromise: Higher densities allowed, but areas limited and test period imposed.

ISSUES

Compatibility & Parking

- ◆ Appeals to City Council a sign of problems.
- ◆ Large buildings in neighborhoods of small, one-story bungalows.
- ◆ Increased density with potential underparking in neighborhoods with limited on-street parking.

ISSUES

Design Review

- ◆ No required Planning Commission review, no ability for Planning Commission to deny AUD projects.
- ◆ Conflicting direction to design review boards—asked both to perform PC functions and to stick to design.

ISSUES

Test

- ◆ Too many projects in pipeline before test period complete?
- ◆ How do we evaluate the results?

DIRECTION TO STAFF

City Council Discussion

- ◆ What should be done?
 - Policy direction to staff, Planning Commission, and design review boards.
 - Ordinance changes as necessary.