



# City of Santa Barbara

## Planning Division

### PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

January 11, 2007

#### CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Charmaine Jacobs called the meeting to order at 1:02 P.M.

#### ROLL CALL:

##### **Present:**

Chair Charmaine Jacobs

Commissioners Bruce Bartlett, Stella Larson, Addison S. Thompson, and Harwood A. White, Jr.

##### **Absent:**

Vice-Chair George C. Myers

Commissioner Bartlett arrived at 1:03 P.M.

Commissioner White arrived at 1:04 P.M.

#### STAFF PRESENT:

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

Barbara Shelton, Environmental Analyst

Debra Andaloro, Environmental Analyst

Susan Reardon, Project Planner

Victoria Greene, Project Planner

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

#### I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

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

None were made.

- B. Announcements and appeals.

Ms. Hubbell made the following announcements:

1. 1443 San Miguel Avenue has been appealed to City Council and is tentatively set for a hearing in March.

2. The Architecture 2030 presentation that was scheduled before City Council on January 23, 2007, has been moved to January 30, 2007.
3. The 3408-3412 State Street appeal to City Council has been moved to February 27, 2007. Commissioner Jostes will represent the Planning Commission.
4. Tully Clifford, Supervising Transportation Engineer, has accepted the position of Public Works Director for the City of Solvang.

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

Chair Jacobs opened the public hearing at 1:04 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the public hearing at 1:04 P.M.

## II. ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING:

### ACTUAL TIME: 1:04 P.M.

#### APPLICATION OF BRENT DANIELS, L&P CONSULTANTS, AGENT FOR HERB BARTHELS, 1837 ½ EL CAMINO DE LA LUZ, APN 045-100-065, E-3/SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL AND SD-3/COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, 5 UNITS PER ACRE (MST2002-00214) (CDP2002-00008).

The purpose of this hearing is to receive public comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared for this project. The proposal consists of the construction of a 1,499 square foot, 2-story single family residence with an attached 443 square foot garage, on a 23,885 square foot vacant bluff-top lot. Access to the site would be provided by private easements extending south from the end of the paved public road (El Camino de la Luz).

Case Planner: Victoria Greene, Project Planner  
Email: vgreene@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Victoria Greene, Project Planner, gave the Staff Report and introduced Debra Andaloro, Environmental Analyst, and Steve Rodriguez, Environmental Consultant.

Brent Daniels, L & P Consultants, asked to defer the applicant presentation until after the conclusion of public comment.

Commissioner's comments and questions:

1. Asked if the lot's legal status and access issues have been resolved.
2. Asked for clarification of the "top of bluff".
3. Asked about the annual erosion and how bluff stability is determined.
4. Referenced the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the mitigation measures proposed for the alternative house designs that require a slope stability analysis, but

- noted that the mitigation measures did not call for a slope stability analysis for the originally proposed residence. Asked why a slope stability analysis was not required.
5. Asked if any construction would put more potential weight on the slope than is being excavated.
  6. Suggested a side-on driveway in alternative designs, and asked why no analysis was done on siting a house as far to the West as the property line allows.
  7. Asked Staff if the alternatives analysis provided sufficient environmental detail to allow the Planning Commission to approve an alternative project.
  8. Asked counsel if the Commission is able to choose an alternative, even if the applicant has not proposed one. Recalled that City Council has previously directed an applicant to conform to an option not chosen by the applicant.
  9. Asked if an alternative has similar impacts to a proposed project and the alternative reduces impacts further than the proposed project, then is the Commission required to choose the alternative with the lesser impact.
  10. Asked if the Planning Commission had the ability to request a third alternative and gave an example.
  11. Asked if adding an alternative would require recirculation of the DEIR.

Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney, stated that the responsibility of demonstrating adequate access rests with the applicant. The city is not the arbiter of the claims, nor in a position to tell the applicant that it must settle its interest. The applicant goes through the process and takes the risk. If the applicant's project is approved, and the applicant moves forward, the neighbors can choose to block the applicant's efforts to gain permits. Ms. Hubbell added that the lot is legal, the specific concern was with the legal access to the project. If the project is approved, a condition would be placed that adequate legal access is provided to allow for fire access.

Debra Andaloro, Environmental Analyst, responded that numerous geologic surveys have been done over the years that led to determining the top of the bluff. Many of the studies looked at where the setback line should be drawn, based on defining the top of the bluff. This is not a perfect science, but the bluff top should be stable for approximately 75 years. Ms. Hubbell added that most geologists look at a site with a particular type of geology that is there, looking at soil types, etc. to determine the specific geological erosion rate for an individual site.

Steve Rodriguez, Environmental Consultant, addressed the two slope stability analyses referenced in the EIR; only one applies only to the alternatives. Both alternative designs require excavation to lower the project height of the residence. The slope stability analysis addressed whether you are putting more weight on the slope than you are taking off with the excavation. Mr. Rodriguez affirmed that, based on a slope stability analysis done by Dr. William Anikouchine, Certified Engineering Geologist, any construction would put more weight on the slope than would be removed. The other component applying to the proposed project and the two alternatives is the question of whether there is a bedding plane weakness feature on the site. Geologists have varied opinions on whether this feature exists. The

bedding plane feature is a different issue than overall slopes. Dr. Anikouchine's slope stability report was for the project. Mr. Rodriguez replied that the house could not be moved all the way to the West on the lot because it would not allow for access to the garage.

Ms. Greene responded that the EIR does provide sufficient detail to allow decision-makers to approve a project alternative.

Mr. Vincent explained the purpose of evaluating alternatives. If the Commission cannot approve the originally proposed design, the applicant can be given the option of choosing another alternative. The applicant can be given an option approved by the Commission and is free to disagree with the Commission decision and appeal to City Council.

Mr. Vincent responded that the Commission is not obligated to choose the least impacting alternative. Ms. Hubbell added that, in this project, both alternatives have Class 2 impacts. This is a discretionary decision and the Commission can continue to push to reduce the impacts so that the project chosen is the best and most consistent with policies.

Ms. Hubbell stated that, if a third alternative were added, it could mean potential recirculation of the draft EIR.

Mr. Vincent clarified that the purpose of today's hearing is for evaluating the sufficiency of the environmental document, considering whether it has looked at enough alternatives, and reconciling the difference in opinions. If the findings cannot be made for policy reasons, the applicant can be asked to present another option with suggestions on resolving the policy issues. Ms. Hubbell stated that the reasoning why other alternatives were considered, but not chosen, could be included in the EIR.

Chair Jacobs opened the public hearing at 1:35 P.M.

The following people expressed concerns with the report:

Ray Franco, speaking for a group of El Camino de la Luz neighbors, expressed concern that visual impacts are not mitigatable even with the alternatives proposed. Mr. Franco added that the topography submitted by the applicant was incorrect for defining top of bluff and shows the wrong contours; discrepancy between the top of bluff shown and top of bluff as defined in the Public Records Code. Challenged methodology and content of Dr. Anikouchine's report; slide analysis not included. Also, would like to see their letter, dated May 19, 2005, included in the EIR. Mr. Franco referenced statements recorded in the Planning Commission Minutes of May 19, 2005, as being incorrect and asked they be corrected: 1) Mr. Franco alleges he did not make the statement on Page 4 discussing a 10' easement, and 2) that the property to the north of Dr. Barthels property is his and is not the location of the portion of an access easement quitclaimed by Dr. Barthels.

Joanna Morgan identified herself as being the recipient of Dr. Barthel's quitclaim deed that narrowed his access to 9' with access to the beach by easement. Ms. Morgan contracted with Penfield and Smith for a topographic survey of her property. The survey shows different topography and bluff top than the applicant's plans. Three geologists interviewed by the neighbors did not agree with Dr. Anikouchine and felt that he was taking the liability of a potential slide. Ms. Morgan also felt the proposed project is too close to the creek.

Peter Miller spoke about the instability of the cliff. Concerned with drilling that could further alter bluff stability and City liability if the project caused instability and loss of homes.

Janice Taylor noted the importance of ocean views from La Mesa Park and the footbridge. The park is used year round. It provides a window to the sea that needs to be preserved.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:54 P.M.

Mr. Daniels gave the applicant presentation and clarified the draft EIR and that the applicant would review the survey data with their architect.

Mr. Daniels noted applicant disagreement with the mitigation measure requiring a flat roof..

Commissioner's comments and questions:

1. Asked Staff about the process for rectifying the difference in surveys now that another survey has been presented.
2. Asked Staff what kind of choices the Planning Commission will have in certifying the final EIR.
3. Asked how Staff will address Mr. Franco's request for corrections of the minutes of May 19, 2005. Requested that Staff review and resolve the request.
4. Noted that the EIR adequately covers the issues.
5. Two Commissioners felt that it is not appropriate to dictate architectural style in the EIR, only a height restriction is appropriate.
6. Concerned with the drainage system requirements that allow surface drainage from the property to flow into the creek.
7. Findings would have to be made to support California Coastal Act Section 30251. Noted that homes have been built in the area that do not comply with this policy. Cannot say that there is no significant impact on view when all options list some view impact.
8. Would like to see a graphic that includes the mitigations.
9. Many Commissioners expressed concern over the conflict in geology and topography information and would like to see a resolution to each, especially defining the top of the bluff.
10. Asked why alternative #1 is 25-30% larger than the proposed project.

11. Asked why a smaller house was not evaluated as part of alternative #2. Would also like to see the reasoning behind alternatives presented.
12. Two Commissioners were concerned with slopes and adequacy of setbacks on the east side of the property and with drainage to the Creek; slope stability issues need to be addressed in the EIR. Setting exact heights for this project does not work, given that it looks different depending on where viewed; three-dimensional envelope needs to be defined. Suggested an alternative #3 that explores other options for the automobile and access onto the property.
13. Some Commissioners expressed a desire to see a public benefit to mitigate the loss of a public view, such as fixing the footbridge at the park over the creek, or stairs to the beach.
14. While the document does address size, bulk, and scale, it does not necessarily provide alternatives
15. Several commissioners felt that there was insufficient information presented in the EIR to make the findings for the CDP and modification.

Ms. Greene stated that the difference in topography numbers can be resolved. The top of bluff definition can be revisited.

Ms. Hubbell stated that a review can be done of the minutes. However, the Commissioners present at the meetings in question are no longer on the Commission. Mr. Vincent suggested that a review be done and any discrepancies can be documented in the EIR response to comments. Also, Mr. Franco can submit a letter about the discrepancies.

### III. NEW ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 2:34 P.M.

APPLICATION OF JUSTIN VAN MULLEM, ON DESIGN, LLC, AGENT FOR JAMES AND PAMELA HALDEMAN, 1533 W. VALERIO STREET, APN: 041-071-031, A-2/R-1 ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: MAJOR HILLSIDE (MST2003-00338)

The proposed project consists of the subdivision of an existing 3.45 acre site into two lots of approximately 1.725 acres each. The lots would take access from West Valerio Street via a shared private driveway that also serves two existing single-family residences. Proposed Parcel 1 would be 75,140 square feet with an average slope of 29%. A new residence is proposed on this parcel and would be approximately 5,843 square feet, including basement and garages. Proposed Parcel 2 would be 75,142 square feet with an average slope of 31%. This parcel contains the existing residence, which is approximately 5,948 square feet.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Modifications to allow the two newly created lots to have less than the required 100 feet of frontage on a public street (SBMC §28.15.080);

2. A Modification to permit garage space in excess of 750 square feet in the A-2 zone (SBMC §28.87.160.4);
3. A Tentative Subdivision Map (TSM) to allow the division of one parcel into two lots (SBMC §27.07).
4. A Public Street Frontage Waiver to create a lot that does not front on a public street (SBMC, §22.60.300).
5. Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Findings to allow grading in excess of 500 cubic yards on a project site located within the Hillside Design District (SBMC §22.68.070).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15332, Infill Development.

Case Planner: Allison De Busk, Associate Planner

Email: adebusk@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Allison De Busk, Associate Planner, gave the Staff Report.

Justin Van Mullen and Tom Ochsner, On Design Architects, gave the applicant presentation.

Commissioner's comments and questions:

1. After noting that two thirds of the building envelope is in slopes that are over 30%, commissioners asked the applicant for clarification of the slope contours, absence of existing contours on the slope density map, and surveying of topography lines.
2. Expressed concern over the existing fire hydrant on West Valerio and whether it is within an appropriate distance to the existing house, has adequate road access, and provides adequate turnaround for Fire Department vehicles.
3. Many commissioners asked for clarification on issues related to the proposed accessory building envelope, including intended use, Fire Department accessibility, view obstruction, and existing contours
4. Asked City Counsel clarification of the Conservation Element language regarding slopes and the Commission's latitude associated with 'should' as opposed to 'shall' in view of the policy's statement that the Commission 'should' avoid building on slopes over 30%.
5. Some Commissioners inquired about the Architectural Board of Review's comments on the freestanding chimney and freestanding garage and asked if consideration was given to eliminating the freestanding garage as opposed to requesting a modification. Also asked if a modification would be needed for any additional accessory structure, if a detached accessory garage structure already exists.

Jim Austin, Fire Inspector, affirmed the location of the fire hydrant on Valerio is not within an appropriate distance to the existing house. The proposed house is making the access to

the existing house better than what exists and the access to the new development meets fire department standards. A fire hydrant on the private property that would have to be maintained by the owners. Construction materials for the potential accessory structure building could be mitigated and access and contour issues would be acceptable to the Fire Department.

Mr. Ochsner stated that building envelope in question is for potential development of a non-habitable accessory structure. Mr. Ochsner affirmed that the topography maps were surveyed and not speculative. Many shapes were considered on the building envelope site before and all were below 30%.

Mr. Vincent stated that 'should' is permissive, as apposed to 'shall' that is mandatory. Mr. Vincent interpreted the Conservation Element policy as developing a parcel in the least steep areas, but other constraints should also be considered. Ms. Hubbell read the specific 30% slope language in the Conservation Element for clarification and added that it is an implementation strategy and not a policy. The policy is focused more on visual resources and not a seismic safety or safety policy.

Mr. Ochsner clarified the ABR's comments regarding the freestanding garage's 10' plates that allowed for extra storage. Ms. Hubbell illuminated the square footage totals for the proposed accessory building and garage as related to City policy.

Chair Jacobs opened the public hearing at 3:13 P.M.

Mary Fiske opposed the project and submitted a written letter and petition signed by 30 neighbors. Major concerns were with size, bulk, and scale of the project and incompatibility with the neighborhood. She also stated the existing oak tree should be saved.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 3:18 P.M.

Commissioner's Comments:

1. Two Commissioners commented that the project is not an inappropriate size or scale for the neighborhood, with one Commissioner finding the house not in character with what exists on Valerio.
2. One Commissioner would like to see the original house incorporated in any future proposal.
3. Other Commissioners felt that the square footage of the proposed project is not an issue since most of the square footage is subterranean.
4. Many Commissioners expressed concern with the location of the house being built on the steepest area of the lot. Referenced another project that was built on a slope of greater than 20% and the problems that occurred with a heavy rain and

the impacts on health and safety. One Commissioner suggested development below the 250' contour line.

5. Some Commissioners expressed a desire to see landscaping and drainage plans that addressed preservation of the Oak Woodland. One Commissioner would like to see a trade-off in benefit if the avocado trees were lost.
6. The consensus of Commissioners did not support the accessory building envelope because of accessibility issues, distant location to the residence, and impact on the skyline from various vantage points.
7. Some Commissioners note the absence of the chimneys on the scale model presented and expressed a desire to see the chimneys brought under control and suggested they be better integrated into the structure.
8. Some Commissioners also felt that the accessory garage was not necessary given that the house has an almost subterranean level that could fulfill the functions of a garage
9. Many Commissioners felt that this project is an opportunity to upgrade the existing house and also provide improvements to the private street that are an enhancement to the neighborhood. Commissioners would like to see a fire hydrant added that meets City Standards.
10. Other public benefits noted were the additional sidewalk. One Commissioner would like to see the applicant increase the proposed sidewalk to link to neighboring sidewalk.
11. One Commissioner felt the driveway access is appropriate and that the restoration of the lower grade will be an aesthetic benefit. Moving the house down on the parcel would impact the adjacent neighbors more.
12. One Commissioner felt that some of the conditions of approval on the lot split should also apply to the original lot, specifically the fire hydrant and oak tree restoration.
13. Commissioners noted the solar panels on the scale model and would like to add a condition that the applicant shall follow the City's published guidelines for solar panels.

**MOTION: Larson/White**

Continue the proposal to February 8, 2007 to allow the applicant to respond to issues surfacing from today's hearing, including: 1) oak tree preservation, 2) project siting, 3) building envelope, 4) accessory building envelope, 5) additional garage, 6) chimneys, 7) solar panels 8) and drainage issues, and that conditions be applied to both lots.

Mr. Van Mullen stated that the applicant is receptive to a continuance and has a letter from an arborist that addresses oak tree issues.

**STRAW VOTE:**

Whether or not a free standing garage is appropriate.

2 (Barlett, Thompson) Commissioners felt the free standing garage is appropriate, while 4 (Jostes, White, Jacobs, Larson) Commissioners do not feel the free standing garage is appropriate.

Consensus was for the elimination of the free standing garage in favor of using the under-story of the house for parking cars.

Discussion:

1. Would like to see applicant provide written assurances on erosion control, solar panel placement, etc., so that a clearer vision could be seen by the Commission.
2. Would like to make sure that the applicant is receiving clear direction on the garage.
3. Reduce the impact of the project.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Jacobs announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

Chair Jacobs called for a break at 3:53 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 4:10 P.M.

**IV. CONTINUED ITEMS:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 4:10 P.M.**

**APPLICATION OF LISA PLOWMAN, AGENT FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA-NEVADA CONFERENCE – UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, 230 LIGHTHOUSE ROAD, APN: 045-021-021, E-3/S-D-3 ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL/COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, 5 UNITS PER ACRE (MST2006-00455) Continued from December 7, 2006**

The proposed project involves the rezone of the property from one-family residential (E-3) to two-family residential (R-2), and development of the site with 22 three-bedroom condominium units under the Garden Apartment Zoning designation (SBMC, Chapter 28.30). Four of the units would be affordable to middle-income homebuyers, and two of the units would be affordable to upper-middle-income homebuyers. The development includes 58 parking spaces. The subject parcel is currently developed with a church, which is proposed to be demolished as part of the project. .

The purpose of the concept review is to allow the Planning Commission an opportunity to review the proposed project design at a conceptual level and provide the Applicant and Staff

with feedback and direction regarding the proposed land use and design. No formal action on the development proposal will be taken at the concept review, nor will any determination be made regarding environmental review of the proposed project. Upon review and formal action on the application for the development proposal, the proposed project will require the following discretionary applications:

1. Initiation of a Rezone from E-3/S-D-3 to R-2/S-D-3 by the Planning Commission (SBMC, §28.92.020);
2. General Plan Map amendment to amend the General Plan Land Use Map for the subject parcel from Residential 5 dwelling units per acre to Residential, 12 units per acre;
3. Local Coastal Plan Amendment to amend the General Plan Land Use Map in the Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.45.009.7);

*The following decisions will be contingent upon City Council approval of the rezone and General Plan Amendment and Coastal Commission approval of the Local Coastal Plan Amendment:*

4. Tentative Subdivision Map (TSM) for a one lot subdivision with 22 residential condominiums (SBMC Chapters 27.07 and 27.13);
5. Lot Area Modification to allow two over-density units (bonus density) on a lot in the R-2 Zone (assuming zone change) (SBMC §28.92110, A, 2);
6. Front Setback Modification to reduce the required 30-foot front yard setback (based on Garden Apartment Development standards in SBMC Chapter 28.30) (SBMC §28.92110, A, 2);
7. Interior Yard Setback Modifications (3) to reduce the required 30-foot interior yard setbacks (based on Garden Apartment Development standards in SBMC Chapter 28.30) (SBMC §28.92110, A, 2);
8. Conditional Use Permit to allow Garden Apartments in the R-2 Zone SBMC §28.94.030, K);
9. Coastal Development Permit to allow development in the non-appealable jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.45.009.6);
10. Recommendation by Planning Commission and final approval by the City Council of Rezone, General Plan Map Amendment and Local Coastal Plan Amendment (SBMC, §28.92.080 (B)); and
11. Design Review Approval by the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) (SBMC, Chapter 22.68).

Case Planner: Allison De Busk, Associate Planner  
Email: adebusk@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Allison De Busk, Associate Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Ms. Hubbell reminded the Commission that the basic policy for any increase in zoning is to make all of the additional units allowed affordable, with the minimum being 50%.

Commissioner's comments and questions:

Would like to look at the Mesa in a larger context. Asked Staff if there are other projects coming down the pipeline in this area.

Ms. Hubbell reviewed recent projects approved on the Mesa, as well as future projects that could come forward. There is some room for redevelopment, but not much.

Lisa Plowman, Piekert Group Architects, introduced Gary Roberts, representative for the Southern California Nevada Conference of the United Church of Christ. Mr. Roberts provided the Commission with the Church's intentions to find the best use for the property and the City. Ms. Plowman gave the remainder of the applicant presentation.

Commissioner's comments and questions:

1. Asked the applicant what compelled consideration of the Garden Apartment approach.
2. Asked if subterranean parking has been considered for this project.
3. Asked for clarification on the square footage of the proposed units.

Ms. Plowman responded that the Garden Apartment may not be the best approach and that subterranean parking was cost prohibitive. Ms. Plowman stated that the plans are very conceptual at this time and did not go to specific square footage detail; but it would total 42,000 square feet.

Chair Jacobs opened the public hearing at 4:44 P.M.

The following people spoke with concerns on the project:

1. Ed Gamble: project too dense for neighborhood
2. David Hetynk, Director of Facilities and Operations, Santa Barbara School District: appreciates buffer and need to address construction issues and long-term incompatibilities.
3. Mike Jordon, La Mesa Neighborhood Association: traffic increase/water runoff and retention and effective solar system.
4. Mark Ingalls: review development criteria near schools.
5. Tom Ochsner, Washington School PTO: lack of public benefit.
6. Rev. Gwendolyn Hampton, Peace of Wisdom Ministries: against housing replacing church.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 5:04 P.M.

Commissioners Comments:

1. Many Commissioners could not make the findings for this project finding it too dense for the site. Additionally, it is not in compliance with the Garden Apartment intent. The front and interior setbacks are not appropriate.
2. Most Commissioners could not see any benefit in rezoning the property. One Commissioner looked at Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance options for consideration. Wondered why we would subject the neighborhood to such a problematic situation without any public benefit.
3. The majority of Commissioners felt that the current E-3 zoning is appropriate for this property.
4. Commissioners expressed a desire to see a minimum of 50% of the increased density as affordable housing, with some comments asking for more variety in bedroom count, and consideration of a single-family residential development.
5. Some Commissioners expressed concern with any increase in traffic brought on by increased density and do not want to see any increase in peak flows. The area does not provide sufficient ingress and egress.
6. Suggested reaching out to neighbors on other side and adjacent streets. Would like to see a greater sense of neighborhood.
7. Would like to see a public benefit added, such as a community room. Supports a green building approach.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Commissioner Larson reported on the Historic Landmarks Commission and informed the Commissioners that the appropriate reference to De la Guerra Plaza is 'Plaza de la Guerra'.
2. Commissioner Jacobs reported that the Architectural Board of Review has four openings. The deadline for applications has been extended to the end of January.

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

None were requested.

C. Review and consideration of the following Planning Commission Resolutions and Minutes:

- a. Draft Minutes of October 19, 2006
- b. Resolution 042-06  
1 Adams Road

- c. Resolution 043-06  
113-117 W. De la Guerra Street
- d. Draft Minutes of November 2, 2006
- e. Resolution 044-06  
625 Flora Vista
- f. Resolution 045-06  
3408-3412 State Street

**MOTION: Jostes/White**

Approve the minutes and resolutions with corrections.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 2 (Bartlett, Larson) Absent: 1 (Myers)

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Jacobs adjourned the meeting at 5: 28M.

Submitted by,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary