



City of Santa Barbara

Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

October 5, 2006

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair John Jostes called the meeting to order at 1:04 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Present:

Chair John Jostes

Vice-Chair Charmaine Jacobs

Commissioners Stella Larson (arrived at 1:20 P.M.), Bill Mahan, George C. Myers, Addison S. Thompson (left at 3:13 P.M.) and Harwood A. White (arrived at 1:06 P.M.)

Absent:

None.

STAFF PRESENT:

Bettie Weiss, City Planner

Irma Unzueta, Project Planner

Laurie Owens, Project Planner

Chelsey Swanson, Assistant Planner

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

Kathleen Goo, Alternate Commission Secretary

I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

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

Project Planner Irma Unzueta announced Staff's request to tentatively re-schedule the agendized appeal of 3408 & 3412 State Street to the October 19, 2006, Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. James Kahan, appellant, made a statement and submitted a letter to explain his request for postponement of his appeal to the November 2, 2006, Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Jostes opened discussion to the Commission and a motion was made.

MOTION: White/Mahan

To postpone the appeal for 3408 and 3412 State Street to the November 2, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.

This motion carried by the following vote: 6/1

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

B. Announcements and appeals.

Ms. Unzueta announced that 601 E. Micheltorena (Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital Workforce Housing Project) has a pending appeal before the City Council on November 21, 2006. Commissioner Mahan will attend on behalf of the Commission.

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

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:15 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:16 P.M.

Chair Jostes announces a recess at 1:19 P.M. and reconvened at 1:21 P.M.

II. RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:21 P.M.

AIRLINE TERMINAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT UPDATE

Recommendations to the City Council on revised site and floor plan for the Airline Terminal Improvement Project.

Case Planner: Laurie Owens, Project Planner

Email: lowens@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Laurie Owens, Project Planner, gave a brief general staff presentation of the proposed project.

Joseph Grogan, HNTB Architecture Inc., and Fred Sweeney, Phillips, Metsch, Sweeney, Moore (PMSM) Architects, gave the applicant presentation with an update of the proposed project.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Requested further details on the vertical window fins on the rotunda.
2. Requested clarification of the location of the initial south jet bridge, the location of the other subsequent three jet bridges in relation to the fenestration, and the

- accessibility of these gates for pedestrian and handicap use prior to installation of the jet bridges.
3. Requested clarification of the rental parking lot's positioning, screening, and landscaping.
 4. Requested clarification on pedestrian crossings and walkways.
 5. Asked if the access road might be lowered to allow pedestrians to cross without encountering traffic.
 6. Requested further clarification on pedestrian access from the terminal to the plans on the tarmac in terms of distance, temporary and in the future.

Mr. Sweeney stated that the vertical window fins on the rotunda are a proposed solution to deal with the large amount of expected south-to-west natural sunlight on the westerly side of the building without blocking the northerly views of the mountains.

Mr. Sweeney explained that, since the entire terminal will be raised an additional 2 ½ feet above the current grade to address the floodplain, the jet bridge will have to slope downward approximately 17 ½ feet from the second-floor to the sill of a 5-foot high regional jet doorway (approximately 200 feet of jet bridge). The locations of the second, third and fourth jet bridges were identified and Mr. Sweeney stated they will be better delineated for the next update. Mr. Sweeney also explained that, before construction of all the jet bridges, the west-facing gates without jet bridges will utilize a staircase and elevator to the aircraft parking ramp, while the northerly gates will utilize an elevator and escalator to a covered trellis ramp leading out to the ramp to smaller planes.

Mr. Sweeney clarified that only partial landscape screening can be achieved for the rental car parking lots from second-floor passenger views since most of the lot is subject to TSA security landscape restrictions. In terms of long-term planning, the rental car parking lot is regarded as future terminal expansion space and therefore temporary until the southerly leased lot can be utilized for additional terminal parking.

Mr. Sweeney stated that currently pedestrian crossings are being provided to improve accessibility, but the access road cannot be lowered because of the water table, and raising the pedestrian crossings cannot be accommodated in the budget.

Mr. Sweeney explained that the walking distances on the aircraft parking ramp from the terminal to the smaller planes will be similar to the present situation, and the covered trellis will allow passengers more time under shelter from inclement weather.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:57 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:58 P.M.

Commissioners' comments:

1. Supported the present plans which meet the challenges of the current budget, phased construction, the north-south linear orientation of the site, the need to architecturally breakup the massing and heat loading, circulation plan, and internal terminal function.

2. One Commissioner suggested methods to reduce jet noise for personnel and passengers in the rental car parking lot should be studied and addressed.
3. Commented it may not be a profitable commercial venture to place a restaurant at the north end as a solution for integrating historical and new terminals together, since other food vendor options will already be located within the terminal building.
4. A majority of the Commission approved architectural integration of the historic structure with the new, circulation plan, and the use of linear design and natural light elements for a more efficient building. A majority also suggested attaching the historic terminal to the main terminal.
5. One Commissioner supported the proximity of the baggage to the rental car operation and securing second-floor amenities; but questioned the security of the staircase areas to the tarmac.
6. One Commissioner stated it should also be possible to have shorter pedestrian access to bus stop areas across from short-term parking.
7. Supported direction of using funds from the previous temporary terminal structure toward the proposed plan, and commented favorably on the drop-off parking and security issues.
8. Supported the revised site plan, closer proximity of the terminal to the roadway, for the historic and new terminal buildings to be similar to the Courthouse, and suggested the interior courtyard have more open and intimate building elements like an arcade or similar open façade and roofline to the Santa Barbara Mission.
9. One Commissioner found the proposed project pleasing and complimented the architectural, planning, and management teams on the revised site plan and infrastructure.

MOTION: Mahan/Jacobs

Assigned Resolution No. 040-06

To recommend the proposed project to City Council for review of the plans and elevations, with the consideration that the Commission approves the revised site and floor plan.

This motion carried by the following vote: 7/0

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0) Absent: 0.

Chair Jostes announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

III. NEW ITEMS:

ACTUAL TIME: 2:20 P.M.

A. APPLICATION OF DIANE NORMAN, 612 ALSTON ROAD, APN 015-171-014, A-2 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, 2 UNITS PER ACRE (MST2005-00184)

The project involves the subdivision of a 87,991 square foot parcel (net) into two parcels totaling 50,490 net square feet (Parcel A) and 37,501 net square feet (Parcel B) in the A-2 Zone. An existing single-family residence would remain on proposed Parcel A and no new

development is currently proposed for Parcel B. A modification would be required for Parcel B to have less than the required 100 feet of frontage on a public street.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Modification to allow less than the required street frontage for a newly created lot in the A-2 Zone (SBMC §28.15.080 and §28.92.110.A); and
2. A Tentative Subdivision Map to allow the division of one parcel into two lots (SBMC 27.07).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15315 (minor land divisions).

Case Planner: Chelsey Swanson, Assistant Planner

Email: cswanson@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Chelsey Swanson, Assistant Planner, gave the staff presentation.

Chair Jostes asked the applicant if they would like to address the Commission, but the applicant declined to address the Commission until after the public comment.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 2:26 P.M.

Burt McCormick, adjacent neighbor at 243 Rametto Road, stated he had no problem with the requested lot split, but did express opposition any work which might provide poor or natural drainage or a constant source of water or dampness that promotes the growth and infestation of the "home-eating" fungus called *poria incrassata* which deteriorates wood in homes.

The public hearing was closed at 2:32 P.M.

Chair Jostes again asked if the applicant would like to address the Planning Commission.

Diane Norman stated that Mr. McCormick never expressed his concerns regarding a home-eating fungus problem to her at any time. She stated that he only confronted her regarding cutting down trees on her property, and of his belief a spring existed on her property (an alleged source of the fungus).

Ms. Swanson reported that she responded to Mr. McCormick's concerns submitted to her last week by conducting a site visit, took photos of site vegetation, determined through researched site maps and Creeks staff that ice plants were not indicative of a natural spring on the site, and indicated there is a natural drainage course on an adjacent parcel. It was discovered that three known sites in the area, 302 & 310 Alston Road and Mr. McCormick's house at 243 Rametto Road, had fungus damage and after she consulted with a Mr. De La Cruz, a Pest Control Operator, Ms. Swanson found that the fungus lives in soil and feeds on dead wood on-site. Therefore, she suggested the applicant could dispose of the tree trunks on her property. During construction of the new house, preventative measures such as using a waterproofing membrane and incorporating standard Building Code measures, such as air

circulation and separation of building (wood) and soil, should help prevent the fungus from occurring, according to Mr. De La Cruz. Furthermore, obtaining a soils report as per the Conditions of Approval for her proposed project should identify whether or not a water source existed on the property.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Expressed concern on the damage that such fungus can do to a home.
2. Requested Conditions of Approval address drainage concerns by requiring all future buildings consider or study a retention basin as part of its drainage plan.
3. Regarding Conditions of Approval D 3 on retention, recommended there be some indications of minimum peak flows of a 25 year storm level.
4. Asked if there is a general location that a future retention basin could be located with regard to topography.
5. Asked whether it would be better to have the geology report at final map recording when it is suspected a fault line crosses the site.
6. Requested clarification on runoff, catch basins, and drainage impacts of Parcel B.

Ms. Swanson stated that a preliminary hydrology report was prepared for the project, which provides estimated drainage calculations associated with a new home. She clarified that the report suggested a retention basin be located on Parcel A; however, staff would like the retention basin for the new house to be located on Parcel B. With regard to a geology report and fault line concerns, a fault line identified on the City's maps approximately where the existing house sits at the northern portion of the lot, and that the building envelope for Parcel B would likely not be affected.

Ms. Swanson stated that there didn't appear to be any impacts on Parcel B.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. A majority of the Commission prefer a geological report be done on the site prior to approval of the project.
2. One Commissioner felt the type of streetlight should be confirmed whether it is to be cobra head or not.
3. A majority of the Commission stated they felt that the setback from any identified fault line and a surface retention basin should be part of the Conditions of Approval.
4. Expressed concern regarding the drainage, and location of the proposed lot split which seemed to somewhat favor Parcel A, and suggested moving the lot line further west.
5. One Commissioner resisted the idea of creating "flag-lots", but given the larger building envelope for Parcel B, the suitability issues for him are resolved, but expressed concern about the proposed lot line between Parcels A and B.
6. Commented that the location of the lot line between the parcels is determined by the view resources down the canyon.
7. Suggested an easement crossing the Parcel A to provide driveway access for Parcel B as a solution, with the fault line conditional as not being on the property, but may require confirmation of a geological study, and a two-lot configuration could be feasible with a north and south lot configuration so that Parcel B is "land-locked".

8. As summarized, there was support for a two-lot subdivision with a continuance until: 1) A preliminary geological report can be made to address some of the issues raised such as determining the location of the fault line if it exists and how it relates to building envelopes, utilities, etc.; 2) Explore an alternative layout relating more to an east-west lot-line configuration, as opposed to a trapezoidal lot configuration, which could be supported if there were easements necessary to provide access to Parcel B and view protection for Parcel A to the north giving greater latitude for locating a dwelling unit on the southerly portion; and 3) Get more details on the feasibility and location of a retention area whether subsurface or superficial.
9. Suggested the applicant utilize a larger "cut-out" (lot shape) instead of trapezoidal-shaped lot split configuration in order to produce larger setbacks which would in turn control the view corridor.
10. Asked staff if there were any obstacles the Commission would be placing in the way of the proposed project by suggesting that Parcel A would need to grant Parcel B an easement for driveway access, and that Parcel B would therefore not have any street frontage.

Ms Unzueta stated that the lot split is dictated by the existing home located on Parcel A, and that it would be the applicant's decision to move the lot line to enlarge Parcel B as long as both parcels meet the lot area requirement.

Ms. Swanson clarified that, within the building envelope of Parcel B, a secondary dwelling unit is not allowed since the lot is located within a high fire area, and an additional dwelling unit would not be allowed due to insufficient lot area. Only a 500 square foot accessory building could be permitted in addition to a new single-family dwelling.

Ms. Unzueta requested clarification by Mr. Vincent for determination if changes can be legally be made to the lot split configuration of the proposal and parcels at this time.

Mr. Vincent stated that the proposal of providing access to Parcel B over an easement is an allowable configuration of a potential subdivision. The current proposal presented by the applicant was probably at the direction of staff in an attempt to give effect to the requirement that new lots must have street frontage. In either configuration, a street frontage waiver would not be necessary because the driveway services only one lot. In comparing the current and proposed configurations, under the current proposal, Parcel B would have control over driveway access while the proposal without street frontage for Parcel B would require an easement over Parcel A for access.

Ms. Swanson clarified that, in consideration of the suggested easement through Parcel A, there exists a conditions of approval for tree protection measures where the driveway would be located.

STRAW VOTE:

Accept the parcel map and lot-split as currently proposed.

Ayes: 1 Noes: 5 (White,/Mahan/Jostes/Jacobs/Larsen) Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Thompson)

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. One Commissioner felt that "requiring" instead of "requesting" clarification on the lot line would place an unnecessary burden on the applicant.
2. A majority of the Commission preferred to improve the utilization of the lot to require an east-west lot line and easements, and to require a geological study to locate the fault line to determine feasibility for the lot split.
3. East-west lot line and easements would benefit Parcel B and allow a future owner of Parcel B to build a home which would not impact adjacent neighbors to the east or west.
4. Stated that Parcel B should get ownership of driveway and concurs with staff recommendation.
5. East-west lot line and easement request would also give opportunity to restudy the building envelope for a more functional envelope, as opposed to ones just ten feet off the property line.
6. Suggested that the future owner of Parcel A could create a view easement and then sell Parcel B with the view easement to ensure that the views would be maintained.
7. Believed that views should not be a contentious issue since, given the size of Parcel B, quite a sizable house could be built without blocking any views.
8. General consensus of the Commission to support the two-lot subdivision, but with the requirements of a geological study, hydrology report on drainage, location of a proposed retention basin, east-west orientation of a parcel line and easements, and questioned if the applicant would prefer a denial of the proposal and the option of appeal to the City Council or a continuance of the present proposal.

An invitation was issued to the public regarding the suggested change of configuration. There were no comments from the public.

Ms. Norman explained that staff had originally requested the geological report prior to application completeness; however, she felt that this was an unfair delay since it wasn't requested in the initial PRT review. Staff re-evaluated the application, and decided to defer the requirement of the geological report to the Building Permit stage. She explained she preferred to do the report now and also to receive a continuance of her current proposal.

MOTION: White/Mahan

To continue the proposed project for the purpose of requesting the applicant to: 1) Explore an east-west property line to create a north lot Parcel A and a south lot Parcel B, with appropriate easements. 2) Obtain geologic information to confirm whether a fault is on or off-site, and if on-site then the location must be noted so the appropriate setbacks and arrangements can be made for the building envelopes. 3) Present a drainage plan showing a

feasible location for retention on-site. 4) Change the Conditions of Approval to include a street light in accordance with Architectural Board of Review approval.

This motion carried by the following vote: 6/1

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

B. APPEAL BY JAMES KAHAN OF A STAFF HEARING OFFICER APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION OF DAVID TABOR, AGENT FOR ROBERT D. AND DEBORAH D. HART, 3408 & 3412 STATE STREET, APN 053-322-009. C-2/SD-2: COMMERCIAL AND UPPER STATE STREET AREA OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL COMMERCE (MST2004-00704) Continued to November 2, 1006.

The project consists of a proposal to convert an existing two-story, mixed-use building into five condominium units. The existing building consists of 3,436 square feet (net) of office space on the first floor, four (4) two-bedroom apartments on the second floor and eighteen parking spaces. An exception to the physical standard requirements for condominium conversions, to allow only one parking space for each residential unit instead of two, is requested.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Modification to allow encroachments into the front yard setback along State Street (SBMC§28.45.008);
2. Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision for the conversion of four residential units and one commercial office space into five condominium units (SBMC§27.07); and
3. Condominium Conversion Permit to convert one commercial space and four residential apartments to five condominium units, including an exception to the parking requirements (SBMC§28.88).

On July 19, 2006, a public hearing was held and the Staff Hearing Officer made the required findings and approved the project. This is an appeal of that decision.

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15301 (Existing Facilities).

Case Planner: Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner
Email: kkennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

- A. Committee and Liaison Reports.
None were given.

- B. Review of the decisions of the Staff Hearing Officer in accordance with SBMC §28.92.026.

None were requested.

- C. Action on the review and consideration of the following Planning Commission Minutes and Resolution.

1. Draft Minutes of September 7, 2006.
2. Resolution 037-06
412 Old Coast Highway CDP.

MOTION: Mahan/White

Approve the minutes and resolutions as submitted.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 3 (as noted below) Absent: 0

Chair Jostes, and Commissioners Larson and Thompson abstained from the September 7, 2006, minutes and resolutions.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mahan/Jacobs

Adjourn the meeting.

This motion carried by the following vote: 6/1

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

Chair Jostes adjourned the meeting at 3:26 P.M.

Submitted by,



Kathleen Goo, Alternate Commission Secretary