



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

MONTECITO PLANNING COMMISSION MARKED AGENDA

Hearing of November 15, 2017
9:00 a.m.

SUSAN KELLER, CHAIR
J'AMY BROWN, 1ST VICE-CHAIR
CHARLES NEWMAN
DONNA SENAUER
DAN EIDELSON

Santa Barbara County
Planning Commission Hearing Room
123 East Anapamu Street, Room 17
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 568-2000 (Planning & Development)

TV COVERAGE ANNOUNCEMENT: *Montecito Planning Commission Hearings are televised live on County of Santa Barbara Television (CSBTV) Channel 20 at 9:00 A.M. in the South Coast, Lompoc, Santa Ynez Valley, Santa Maria and Orcutt areas. Rebroadcast of Montecito Planning Commission Hearings are on Fridays at 5:00 P.M. on CSBTV Channel 20. This hearing will also be streamed live on CSBTV's website at <https://www.countyofsb.org/ceo/csbtv/livestream.sbc> and digitally archived at <http://www.countyofsb.org/ceo/csbtv/archives.sbc>, and on the County's YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/user/CSBTV20>*

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA:

- I. **HEARING CALLED TO ORDER:** by Chair, Susan Keller.
- II. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- III. **TV COVERAGE ANNOUNCEMENT:** by David Villalobos.
- IV. **ROLL CALL:** All Commissioners were present.
- V. **PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTION TO JACK OVERALL** by First District Supervisor Das Williams.
- VI. **AGENDA STATUS REPORT:** by Dianne M. Black.
- VII. **PROJECTION REPORT:** by Dianne M. Black.
- VIII. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Charlene Nagel introduced the new Montecito Association Executive Director Allison Marcillac.
- IX. **PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S INFORMATIONAL REPORTS:** None.
- X. **MINUTES:** The Minutes of October 18, 2017 were considered as follows:
ACTION: **Approved the Minutes of October 18, 2017.**
Newman/Brown **Vote: 4-0-1 (Senauer abstained)**
- XI. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HEARING SUMMARY:** by Glenn Russell, Director.

XII. STANDARD AGENDA:

1. South Coast HOV Lanes Project Jurisdiction Discussion

The Montecito Planning Commission will discuss the Commission's jurisdiction related to the Highway 101 HOV Lanes project and related potential interchange improvements (Olive Mill and San Ysidro Roads), and will consider a request to the Board of Supervisors regarding permit jurisdiction for the project segment through the Montecito Community Plan Area and/or for interchange improvements at Olive Mill and San Ysidro Road Interchanges.

ACTION: The Montecito Planning Commission discussed the Commission's jurisdiction related to the Highway 101 HOV Lane project and related potential interchange improvements (Olive Mill and San Ysidro Roads). The Commission asked staff to request from the Board of Supervisors that the Montecito Planning Commission be designated permit authority for the ancillary interchange improvements at San Ysidro Road and Olive Mill Roads in coordination with the City of Santa Barbara, and request that the Montecito Planning Commission be a recommending authority to the County Planning Commission on the 101 HOV Lane project, as provided by the County Code.

Brown/Senauer Vote: 5-0
Appeal process not applicable.

2. 1062 Coast Village Road (MST2016-00451)

Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner, City of Santa Barbara (805) 564-5470 x4560

The Montecito Planning Commission will receive a presentation from the City of Santa Barbara for the proposed project, and provide input to the City Planning Commission, City of Santa Barbara staff, and the applicant. The proposed project consists of the demolition of a 14-unit apartment building and the construction of a new 21,167 square foot mixed-used development, including nine three-bedroom condominium units, 989 square feet of commercial space, and an underground garage with 24 parking spaces. The application involves Assessor Parcel No. 009-211-014, located at 1062 Coast Village Road, in the City of Santa Barbara, First Supervisorial District.

At the Montecito Planning Commission hearing of November 15, 2017, the following comments were made by the Commission:

Newman:

- **The project will be an enhancement to the neighborhood.**
- **Commissioner Newman indicated that he had concerns with the privacy of neighbors.**
- **Commissioner Newman stated that further architectural refinements are needed.**
- **Commissioner Newman stated that mature landscape screening would be appreciated as part of the proposed project.**

Brown:

- **Commissioner Brown recommended increased noticing range for the project. Commissioner Brown was particularly concerned with noticing neighbors on Palm Tree Lane and Hermosillo Road.**

- **The project should be reviewed by MBAR and be placed on the MBAR agenda after story poles have been placed on the site.**
- **Commissioner Brown indicated that the ingress/egress off of Coast Village Road is inadequate. Concerns about the trash pickup from site were indicated.**
- **A parking plan should be developed for the project as the proposed parking is inadequate.**
- **Construction traffic should not be allowed to park on the streets. Commissioner Brown stated concerns with any overflow parking of visitors to the site that could result in parking in adjacent neighborhoods.**
- **Commissioner Brown indicated that construction should not occur at the same time as that for Highway 101 improvements.**
- **Loss of the trees on the property would be a significant impact. Commissioner Brown stated that an effort should be made to save some of the trees. For example, the three trees located at the rear of the property should be saved.**
- **The existing trees should be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission for any historic value.**
- **Commissioner Brown indicated concerns with landscaping. She stated that the proposed honeysuckle vine is unimpressive. In addition, she is not supportive of the choice of Magnolia trees, as they are slow growers. She also indicated that tall hedges may cause solar issues.**
- **Commissioner Brown provided comments on the architectural design and stated that there was too much happening, i.e. the balconies, decks, and sun dials, etc. She stated that she would like to see less architectural designs.**
- **Commissioner Brown shared her concern on impact to privacy that the project may have to adjoining properties.**
- **Commissioner Brown recommended that the roof top decks be eliminated.**
- **Concerns with potential noise and lighting issues were indicated by the use of the rooftop decks.**
- **She recommended that the roof top utilities should be camouflaged from Coast Village Road.**
- **Commissioner Brown supported the removal of the telephone pole. Further separation between buildings was recommended by Commissioner Brown.**
- **Potential parking issues with the location being four blocks from the beach and conflicts with parking for the project as well as public parking for beach goers could develop.**
- **Commissioner Brown recommended that frosted glass on skylights and on windows be used for privacy.**
- **Commissioner Brown indicated that the project should be story poled.**

- **Commissioner Brown also encouraged that the project proponents consider one bedroom unit development.**

Senauer:

- **Commissioner Senauer recommended that the noticing of the project be increased.**
- **She indicated that story poles should be required for the project.**
- **Commissioner Senauer expressed concerns with privacy issues with the project and adjoining properties.**
- **She indicated that the project should be reviewed by MBAR.**
- **Commissioner Senauer stated she had concerns with construction parking.**
- **Commissioner Senauer also expressed concerns with the landscaping.**

Keller:

- **Commissioner Keller indicated that she had concerns with the overbuilding of the site and with maximizing construction or development on the site. Concerns with maximizing construction on the site.**
- **She encouraged the developer to review scale of development. Commissioner Keller felt that the size of the development will affect the quality of life and property values for neighbors.**
- **She indicated that the project should be reviewed by MBAR. .**
- **Commissioner Keller indicated that the project should be story poled.**
- **She expressed concerning regarding parking.**
- **Commissioner Keller indicated concerns with the use of the rooftops for outdoor living, the type of entertainment that could occur, and the size of the desk space.**
- **She also indicated that the project would result in a loss of affordable housing.**
- **Commissioner Keller supported the removal of the telephone poles.**
- **Commissioner Keller indicated a concern with the loss of trees on the project site.**
- **Commissioner Keller recommended that the Juliette windows be removed from the project design.**
- **She supported that the stairway windows being frosted.**
- **Commissioner Keller stated that the proposed project is an improvement to the existing buildings.**

3. 17APL-00000-00008 Saville Appeal of the Zissler Cable Gate/Gate Posts 584 Stone Meadow Lane

Exempt, CEQA Guidelines Section 15378 Anne Almy, Supervising Planner (805) 568-2053
Mark Friedlander, Planner (805) 568-2046

Hearing on the request of Graham Lyons, agent for the appellant, Patrick Saville, to consider Case No. 17APL-00000-00008 [application filed on June 27, 2016] to appeal the Director's determination of exemption (Case No. 17EXE-00000-00032), in compliance with Chapter 35.420.040 of the Montecito Land Use and Development Code, on a property located in the 2-E-1 zone district. The application involves Assessor Parcel No. 011-180-024, located at 584 Stone Meadow Lane, in the Montecito Community Plan area, First Supervisorial District.

ACTION: Accepted late submittals from Patrick Saville and neighbors of Dr. and Mrs. Zissler into the record.

Newman/Eidelson Vote: 4-0 (Eidelson recused)
Appeal process not applicable.

ACTION: Denied the appeal, Case No. 17APL-00000-00008; made the required findings for affirmation of the Director's determination, including CEQA findings; determined that denial of the appeal and affirmance of the Director's determination is exempt from CEQA; and affirmed *de novo* the Director's determination of the exemption, Case No. 17EXE-00000-00032.

Senauer/Newman Vote: 4-0 (Eidelson recused)
10 day appeal period; fee required.

4. Short-Term Rental Coastal Historic Overlay District Report

Jessica Metzger, Planner (805) 568-3532

The Montecito Planning Commission will receive a report on the short-term rental coastal historic overlay district.

ACTION: The Montecito Planning Commission received a report on the short-term rental coastal historic overlay district from Planning and Development staff. No action was taken.

5. Cannabis Land Use Ordinance Amendments and Licensing Program Update Countywide

Dan Klemann, Deputy Director, Planner (805) 5682-2072

The Montecito Planning Commission will receive an update on the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance Amendments and Licensing Program, which would amend the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code, Santa Barbara County Montecito Land Use and Development Code, and Santa Barbara County Coastal Zoning Ordinance to allow certain types of cannabis activities by zone district. The Project also involves other amendments to the County Code, in order to establish a County licensing program for cannabis-related activities. (Continued from 8/16/17 and 10/18/17)

ACTION: The Montecito Planning Commission received an update on the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance Amendments and Licensing Program from Planning and Development staff. No action was taken.

**The Montecito Planning Commission Agenda, Marked Agenda and Staff Reports are available on the
Planning and Development Web Site at
www.sbcountyplanning.org**

Dianne M. Black
Secretary to the Montecito Planning Commission

G:\GROUP\PC_STAFF\WP\MONTECITO\PLANNING COMMISSION\Agendas\2017\11-15-17mkd.docx