



City of Santa Barbara
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 7, 2017

1:00 P.M.
 City Hall, Council Chambers
 735 Anacapa Street
SantaBarbaraCA.gov

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Jay D. Higgins, *Chair*
 Lesley Wiscomb, *Vice Chair*
 John P. Campanella
 Mike Jordan
 Sheila Lodge
 Deborah L. Schwartz
 Addison Thompson

STAFF:

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
 Beatriz Gularte, Senior Planner
 Kathleen Goo, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Higgins called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Jay D. Higgins (until 5:50 p.m.), Vice Chair Lesley Wiscomb, Commissioners John P. Campanella, Mike Jordan, Sheila Lodge, Deborah L. Schwartz, and Addison Thompson

STAFF PRESENT

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
 Tava Ostrenger, Assistant City Attorney
 Renee Brooke, City Planner
 Susan Reardon, Senior Planner
 Beatriz Gularte, Senior Planner
 Rosie Dyste, Project Planner
 Kathleen Goo, Commission Secretary

II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

- A. Requests for continuances, withdrawals, postponements, or addition of ex-agenda items:
 No requests.
- B. Announcements and appeals:
 No announcements.

C. Review, consideration, and action on the following draft Planning Commission minutes and resolutions:

1. August 24, 2017, Special Meeting Minutes
2. PC Resolution No. 014-17
2609 De La Vina St. (Storefront Collective Dispensary Permit Appeal)

MOTION: Lodge/Thompson

Approve the August 24, 2017 minutes and PC Resolution No. 014-17, as amended.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

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

No public comment.

III. STAFF HEARING OFFICER APPEAL

APPEAL OF THE DECISION OF THE STAFF HEARING OFFICER TO REVOKE THE STOREFRONT COLLECTIVE DISPENSARY PERMIT ISSUED TO SANTA BARBARA PATIENTS COLLECTIVE AND HEALING CENTER, 3617 STATE STREET, APN 051-051-005, C-P/SD-2 RESTRICTED COMMERCIAL/SPECIAL DISTRICT 2 ("UPPER STATE STREET AREA") ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: COMMERCIAL/MEDIUM HIGH RESIDENTIAL (MST2014-00438)

[THIS ITEM WILL BE REVIEWED AND RATIFIED SEPARATELY ON OCTOBER 19, 2017.]

Contact: Tava Ostrenger, Assistant City Attorney
Email: TOstrenger@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 560-7513

RECUSAL: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Commissioner Jordan recused himself from hearing this item.

*** THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 2:26 TO 2:35 P.M. ***

IV. RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND MUNICIPAL CODE

ACTUAL TIME: 2:35 P.M.

For the Planning Commission to consider proposed amendments to the Municipal Code to regulate Accessory Dwelling Units. Effective January 1, 2017, recently adopted state legislation nullified and voided the City's regulations for secondary dwelling units, now referred to as Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). Until the City adopts its own ordinance, a local government is required to ministerially approve ADUs if the unit complies with state standards including certain parking requirements, the maximum allowable size of an ADU, and setback requirements.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission initiate an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to adopt an Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance in accordance with the requirements of Senate Bill 1069 (SB 1069) and Assembly Bill 2299 (AB 2299), and forward a recommendation to the City Council for adoption.

Contact: Rosie Dyste, Project Planner

Email: RDyste@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 4599

Renee Brooke, City Planner and Rosie Dyste, Project Planner gave the Staff presentation. Jerry Hittleman, Consulting Senior Planner and Joe Poire, Fire Prevention Division Chief, were available to answer questions.

Public comment opened at 3:02 p.m.

The following person spoke in support:

1. Catherine McCammon (submitted written letter) spoke in support, but had concerns regarding ADUs in high-fire areas and requested revision of the proposed map to include her home, and issues regarding increased traffic, parking, water supply, and sewage capacities impacts to neighborhoods, including concerns for long term enforcement.
2. Suzanne Elledge (speaking for Holly Garcin) spoke in support of ADUs but raised concerns with the proposed ordinance; questioned prohibition of ADUs in the high fire area as some do not have limited access or safety issues, have sufficient available parking, and are larger size parcels that should not be subject to limits on structure size; questioned the restriction of ADUs to only 600 SF and encouraged consideration of using a sliding scale based on parcel size; strongly advocated for the City to embrace this opportunity and pass a local ordinance that fully effectuates the intent of SB 1069; believes this provides a unique opportunity to put a dent in our housing crisis and that ADUs have the potential to address in a meaningful way the housing needs of our own citizens by creating hundreds of small units over a short period of time; and, stated that this kind of housing creates units for kids home from college who are transitioning to life on their own, middle income workforce, young people who have outgrown their willingness to have multiple roommates and older people who would like to remain on their property in a smaller space and make their larger home available to a family.

The following people spoke in opposition or with concerns or recommendations:

1. Jarrett Gorin (speaking for April Palencia, Michael Ober, Katie McDowell) spoke of concerns regarding the proposed ADU Ordinance amendments in violation of State law, which supports the building of ADUs in single-family and multi-family zones within the City. He opposes the proposal to build within areas of inaccessibility, imposing discretionary reviews into the application process, limits to size of accessory dwelling units within the existing structure, and recommends further study on the proposed ADU amendments by staff.
2. Art Ludwig (speaking for Aaron Musicant, Robert Rainwater, Terence Carfner, Skye) spoke of concerns regarding the need to include owner inspections in the covenant, that bike parking incentives should be the same as car incentives for square footage and setbacks, that 2-foot below grade exemptions already excluded in FAR calculations should also be excluded from maximum square foot size of an ADU, and proposed proportional kitchens fixtures, and ultra high-efficiency submeters fixtures and locations should be recommended instead of separate water meters.
3. Vicki Allbrett spoke of concerns regarding proposed 600 square feet size limits imposed and impacts on her own proposed ADU structure.

4. Paul Zink, local architect and former ABR/SFDB member, spoke of concerns regarding prior difficulty of ADU design reviews, and recommended continuation and more study for ADU recommendations, including support for including Junior ADUs.
5. David Kim (speaking for Bob Hart and Reyne Stapelmann) urged simplifying design review for owners; allowing ADUs in R3, R4, and commercial zones; increasing the maximum unit size allowed to 800 square feet; no minimum lot size requirement; and including Junior ADUs.
6. Everett Woody spoke of parts of the ADU Ordinance in violation of State law, including limits in high-fire areas, prohibited parking in front setbacks, architectural review, recording easements, and sub-meter issues. He clarified ADUs are not separate residences.
7. Andreas Blomst spoke of issues regarding limiting ADUs to 600 square feet, administrative design and covenant, and short-term rental limits and not being able to keep ownership without rental fees.
8. Richard Box spoke of concerns regarding \$12,000 water meter cost, and recommended the proposed ADU Ordinance be sent back to staff for more review.
9. Paul Poirier spoke of the following revisions to the ADU Ordinance: allow ADUs in multi-family zones to add diversity; 600 square feet is too small, 750-800 square feet is better; allow planters greater than 3 feet wide and parking in existing driveways; and allow under-counter refrigerators and smaller appliances. He appreciated the allowance for the installation of individual water meters and sewer connections.
10. Mark Sapp spoke of concerns that he would not be allowed to build his proposed home according to the current ADU recommended amendments.
11. Nancy Mulholland spoke of concerns that the current ADU amendments violates State Law and regarding issues of excluding from R3 and R4 zones and on lots less than 5,000 square feet.
12. Natalie Cope-Phillips, local architect, spoke of concerns of that multi-family zones should be included in the Ordinance, and recommended further revisions to the ADU Ordinance.
13. Kevin Dumain, AIA, spoke against restrictions and requirements for owner occupancy of AUDs and ADUs, and the need to allow homeowners to build to suit their needs and budgets.
14. Cassandra Ensberg spoke against the restrictions of ADUs against parking locations in front yards, which should be allowed if needed, and recommended further review of changes to the ADU Ordinance.
15. Mark Edwards, local builder, spoke of concerns of proposed ADU Ordinance limits to available housing, and recommended further review of the ADU Ordinance.
16. Eve Sanford spoke of concern about limited available amenities if ADUs are limited to outer inaccessible areas and about honoring the City's multi-modal transportation goals of the Bicycle Master Plan with a reasonable parking plan.
17. Rex Ruskauff spoke of concerns regarding revisions to Ordinance should be of the date of adoption and not retroactive, and recommended further review of the ADU Ordinance.
18. Anna Marie Gott reminded the Commission that the ADU Ordinance goal is to supply lower cost housing, spoke of concerns regarding limits to short-term rentals and the need for longer-term leases, and potential night-time resident parking issues in ADU neighborhoods near event areas like the Santa Barbara Bowl.
19. Adam Grosshans, AIA, spoke of concerns regarding size limits of the proposed ADU Ordinance amendments on larger lots and spoke against lot minimum sizes, which limits families who cannot afford larger lots and homes to living in smaller units.
20. Clay Aurell, local architect, spoke of concerns that ADU amendments are not in compliance with State Law, which only restricts development.

21. Barbara Batastion spoke of concern regarding parking requirements of high-fire zones, and restrictions on short-term rentals and on additions to existing homes.
22. Denise Adams requested fire evacuation routes in the Alameda Padre Serra area, specifically from Alston Road to Milpas Street, and requested requirements for street width for high-fire areas for public health and traffic safety, and discussed the potential that unpermitted housing may become a problem with related water meters and sewer connection issues.
23. Maria Friedmann mentioned that State Law excludes ADUs in high-fire areas due to traffic and public safety considerations and that safe street width with appropriate bicycle path width should be a legitimate factor of consideration. She also addressed amnesty and incentive development issues, and water meter connection issues.
24. Nick Koonce spoke against ADU restrictions, including kitchen requirements for ADA and assisted housing, whose needs are not considered in the ADU Ordinance.
25. Jason Yarrd spoke against placing retroactive limits to ADU units already built.

The following people provided written public comment and were acknowledged:

1. Helen Couclelis
2. Nancy Mulholland
3. Fred Sweeney
4. Paul Zink
5. Thomas McNair
6. Jim Heaton
7. Dennis Thompson
8. Tom Jacobs
9. Patricia Kohlen
10. Bob Hart

Public comment closed at 4:36 p.m.

Ms. Brooke clarified for the Commission that the proposed amendments to the Municipal Code to regulate ADUs would be coming back to the Planning Commission in November.

Mr. Vincent clarified for the Commission and the public that the proposed ADU Ordinance does not allow short term rentals under the 30-day limit, which will not change.

Commissioner comments:

Commissioner Schwartz recommended first sending the current Draft ADU Ordinance to the State Housing Community Development (HCD) department as a reliable screening resource for staff and the Commission. She also commented that Senate Bill 229 and other housing bills will be reviewed by the Governor that will severely impact local municipalities' ability to regulate and enforce amendments. She recommended a more cost- and time-efficient method of waiting for further State Law changes before making recommendations to accommodate current laws in the light of impending legislation that will impact local regulatory control.

Mr. Vincent clarified for Commissioner Lodge that he would not recommend changes to the ADU Ordinance that violated State Law, but there are allowances within the law to amend the ADU Ordinance, which staff has recommended in this ADU Ordinance.

Commissioners Wiscomb and Jordan identified general issues for consensus:

- Maximize size of units
- Lot restrictions to 5000 square feet
- Allowing ADUs in some high-fire zones of less impact
- Allowing ADUs in zones of higher density for more available housing

Mr. Poire clarified for Commissioner Lodge, who is in favor of high-fire zone identification and limits, that the proposed high-fire hazard zones identified by the proposed Ordinance are acceptable and promote public health and safety, acknowledged reliance on Planning staff to accurately identify these zones, recognized that there are very strong public feelings and opinions on restrictions within these identified zones, and stressed the importance of safe emergency access to these areas. Commissioner Schwartz suggested comparisons and contrasts between state fire and local needs and invited comment from the Fire Chief Patrick McElroy.

Mr. Poire clarified for Chair Higgins specific information from the submitted Wildland Fire Plan and identified high-fire zones. Mr. Poire explained the origin of the document, based on year 2000 EIR and CEQA documents, will contain updates and revisions from various departments in the City through traffic assessments, studies, and model updates for inclusion in a future revision, but are currently only contained in a supplement with various side studies completed. He added that zones vary dramatically between coastal, interior, and foothill zones.

Commissioner Campanella suggested that some analysis of the type of projects submitted may be useful, given the various state standards, so that some flexibility or possible trends might be observed.

Chair Higgins suggested the following 12 general issues for Commission consensus:

1. Allowable Zones
2. High-Fire Zones
3. Lot Size
4. Allowable Floor Area of Units
5. Development Standards (height, setbacks, fees, etc.)
6. Parking Requirements and Exceptions
7. Process of Design Reviews and Analysis of Historic Structures or Districts
8. Location on the Lot (structures in front, rear, etc.)
9. Junior ADUs
10. Owner Occupancy in the Covenant Requirement
11. Timing
12. Utility Connections and Fees (water, sewer, etc.)

1. Allowable Zones:

Commissioner Thompson asked why staff determined to eliminate the RM-Zone and RMH-Zones when the State Law states “any family residential zone.” Commissioners Jordan, Wiscomb, Lodge, and Campanella concurred with Commissioner Thompson in asking staff why RM Zones and RMH Zones are excluded, and why not allow ADUs in the downtown core areas closer to transit and work areas.

Commissioner Jordan stated he would like confirmation of the same section of the State Law that mentions under “*Primary Intent ... is containing one single residential unit in*

zones that allow residential development” and he requested clarification of what the law interprets this to mean, and not just what the subjective intent of the law might determine this to mean.

Commissioner Campanella concurred with the inclusion of multi-family zones, and asked to also include commercial zones to provide housing. City Council discussions and Housing Task Force meetings indicate that existing units are providing affordable housing and the ability to retain these kind of structures in any zone that allows housing is a benefit, unless impact is created on the neighborhood and other uses on the property by providing one additional unit. A number of potential Structures of Merit are located in multi-family areas, and this inclusion would be a method of being less imposing on them by allowing a detached additional unit at the rear rather than allowing the additional density of an apartment building complex. Without undermining other policies, there is room to provide housing with ADUs, and less expensive rentals, in any lot in the City that allows housing with a house on it.

Commissioner Lodge concurred that it is reasonable to consider ADUs in multiple zones where they are developed with a single-family house per the state law.

To provide the right kind of housing, Commissioner Schwartz questioned not including other zones where residential use is allowed, the limitation to certain zones, and suggested other zones for consideration, such as commercial and office zones, manufacture zones, and coastal-oriented zones.

Chair Higgins also requested more input from the Coastal Commission regarding ADUs in coastal zones.

2. High-Fire Zones:

For an updated Wildland Fire Plan, Chair Higgins asked Mr. Poire if he would recommend the Commission consider more refined tools or factors more specific to response times and road widths rather than high-fire zones. Mr. Poire clarified that the zones are partly state-mandated or state-driven, and that road widths and response times are factors among others within high-fire areas. He also stated that another approach would be to use evacuation blocks that are driven by a new “reverse 9-11” system, which factors in geographic blocks including geographic and density constraints within certain areas and allows for more orderly evacuations by zone or multiple zones.

Commissioner Schwartz also concurred that more refined tools are needed, and requested feedback from the Fire Department on whether it would be feasible to analyze the more generalized high-fire mapped areas and refine them with a more strategic or surgical approach to include micro-neighborhoods or differentiated street-to-street areas to determine areas of greater to lesser concern.

3. Lot Size and Allowable Floor Area:

Commissioner Wiscomb suggested exploring a more sliding scale concept of lot size versus unit size or just lot size, which might be a more appropriate approach to determine areas of greater to lesser concern and would provide the opportunity to include smaller lots.

Commissioner Thompson commented that he did not understand the rationale for minimum lot size limits, and that a legal single-family residence on a single lot should be included regardless of the smaller size. He suggested a sliding scale limit percentage of the existing building or percentage of the lot size up to 1200 square feet as stated in the State Law, and Chair Higgins concurred.

Commissioner Jordan suggested a sliding scale either above or below a 5,000 square foot lot size limit with criteria checklist items demonstrating resident ADU building envelope measured to a certain percentage of the lot square footage for a more reasonable relationship of lot size versus development on the lot. He observed that small-sized lots going for modifications review or with limited square footage for larger-sized lots may seem a barrier for applicants. He also observed that 600 square foot limit is too small for a lot size relationship to the primary residence, requiring a modification review may be a barrier and not within the intent of the law, a middle ground may be lot size relationship to the primary residence, and suggested a 750-900 square foot maximum as a starting point before reviewing other criteria.

Commissioner Wiscomb also concurred that the use of a sliding scale is very appropriate, but should also be included in the floor-to-lot area ratio (FAR) calculations with some flexibility of use in the sliding scale limits.

Commissioner Campanella concurred that sample lot sizes and a sliding scale either above or below a 5,000 square foot lot size limit would be an improvement when reviewing multi-family zones, which may have smaller lot sizes than single-family lots. He concurred that flexibility of use in the sliding scale limits percentage of the existing building or percentage of the lot size for a broader reach and is preferable rather than having restrictions to smaller one-bedroom or studio units. A flexible sliding scale to the State Law, and a 50% factor to unit size are supportable scales of measurement rather than using lot sizes that will eventually take of itself.

Commissioner Schwartz suggested referring to and including input from the Santa Barbara Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (SBAIA) on the proposed amendments to the Ordinance.

5. Development Standards (height, setbacks, fees, etc.):

Commissioner Jordan stated he would like clarification on the related State Law and staff's process of determining "subordinate" smaller buildings as opposed to larger same-height buildings on the same lot. Commissioner Campanella concurred.

Commissioner Schwartz stated that further analysis and comparison with the State law is needed for defining the term "subordinate" in reference to page 4 of the proposed ADU Ordinance, under the subject title "*Proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance*" "...further, the proposed standards are designed to ensure that detached and attached ADUs would be subordinate to the primary dwelling in terms of size, location on the lot, and appearance." In her assessment, State Law cannot be interpreted for detached units subordinate to the primary structure in terms of some of the development standards, and thus merits further analysis and comparison with State law.

6. Parking Requirements and Exceptions:

Commissioner Wiscomb suggested staff consider the opportunity of having the screening component for tandem parking be covered by a waiver from the Community Development Director.

Chair Higgins would like staff to consider more flexibility with regard to allowing parking in setbacks as replacement parking, if not located near a transit stop.

Commissioner Campanella suggested staff also consider allowing parking in a tandem position in existing driveways within setbacks as allowed by State Law.

Commissioner Schwartz concurred for staff to consider allowing parking in a tandem position in existing driveways within setbacks, but had some reservations on how to provide screening for such parking in compliance with Ordinance hedge or fence requirements, yet still be able to allow smaller lots to have landscaping, access to garages, etc.

7.a. Process of Design Reviews:

Commissioner Jordan had some concerns regarding the ministerial process of guidelines and their application, and requested more information on the process of merging ADU analysis into the design review process, either by checklist (preferably) or by other methods.

As no discretionary review is allowed, Commissioner Thompson questioned the role and application of guidelines in any ministerial review, especially since the Single Family Design Board has expressed its concerns and confusion on its responsibilities regarding ADU projects, and concerns regarding ADU applications of larger square footage for primary residences, so further study and resolution is required.

Commissioner Schwartz concurs that a checklist for the process of merging ADU analysis into the design review process would be helpful as long as it is not a discretionary review, which is not allowed under State Law, and as long as it is a ministerial review. She also recommended that staff study the process of allowing a solitary person, such as the chair of a design review entity, to review the architectural and design aspects of ADU projects for recommendations, similar to the Chair of the Montecito Board of Architectural Review.

Chair Higgins interpreted discretionary review to involve public noticing and public hearings, and recommended staff push forward with the design review checklist or design related review without involving discretionary review and without sacrificing existing high standards for improvements to properties.

Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Campanella suggested staff utilize the recommended 19-item checklist provided by Fred Sweeney as a guidance for ministerial review, which might not affect the ability to produce supportable units. [For the record, it should be noted that a checklist was submitted by Mr. Sweeney as an individual and not as an SFDB Board Member.]

7.b. Analysis of Historic Structures or Districts:

Commissioner Campanella requested clarification on the language distinguishing between a second ADU unit and the main unit with regards to exterior secondary unit regulations on the main building for determining adverse change and significance of an historic resource. He concurred that clarification is required for “shall not” language in the determination the nature of what is historic, and whether it might be possible to accelerate the determination by the Historic Consultant from potential Structures of Merit units to the category of Structures of Merit as part of the application.

Ms. Brooke clarified for Commissioner Campanella that determining adverse change and significance of a historic resource for ADUs pertains to anything that is a significant historic resource. Regardless of whether it is the primary unit that has already been designated a significant historic resource and the ADU is being proposed in addition to, within, or behind, or whether it is an existing structure on the lot that is being converted to an ADU that is an significant historic resource, the same criteria would apply. Chair Higgins requested general information on historic districts for ADUs.

Commissioner Schwartz requested clarification from staff on how the information relates to, supports, or is different from some of the language in the State Law, which simply references any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historic Places. This is not the same and does not equate to a historic resource; therefore, we should tighten up some definitions and determine what is allowed under State Law and what makes sense for Santa Barbara.

8. [(Skipped category) Location on the Lot (structures in front, rear, etc.)]

9. Junior ADUs:

The Commission generally concurred that a closer look for including Junior ADU applications for permitting is warranted.

10. Owner Occupancy in the Covenant Requirement:

Commissioner Thompson requested information on how the Ordinance requirement for owner occupancy in the covenant can be enforced.

Commissioner Campanella commented that enforcement may be possible for (secondary) accessory dwelling units applications that must be a rental without precluding the requirement for the owner to also live in the unit, which he didn't agree should still be required. Chair Higgins concurred and requested information on how many of the parcels are not owner-occupied that will be allowed in these various zone districts so that an assessment can be made.

Commissioner Schwartz is also interested in this data, mentioned that next Tuesday the County Board of Supervisors will be reviewing homeowner exemptions separate from covenants, and suggested review of such tools to weigh against the collected data.

Commissioner Jordan concurred, observing that requirements for owners to live in the unit is more of a fearful reaction than a pro-active reaction, and commented on lost

opportunities for lots that can absorb the impacts to add another housing unit against others that cannot.

11. Timing:

Chair Higgins commented on the need for a better understanding of ADU applications in the pipeline, and how long ADUs will take through design review before a determination can be made on the effective date of the ADU Ordinance, including application delays, the reality of the 120-day duration, and requested plan check corrections. He requested staff ask HCD on how often they can be available to the Commission to answer questions during this ADU Ordinance review process.

Commissioner Jordan recommended sending the draft recommendations to HCD for input before the next hearing, and requested a presentation from staff on pending legislation that may contradict or affect current information so that the Commission may pose pertinent questions and comments prior to legislation taking place and City Ordinance Committee review. He also requested clarification of Ordinance 3185-040, Section S regarding benefits or burdens for ADU applications to meeting open yard requirements; and of Section K, 3) regarding the requirement for ADUs to conform to residential standards and the lack of flexibility in these requirements for residential accessory building sections (i.e., living room, dining room, bathroom, kitchen, refrigerator dimensions, etc. requirements) as opposed to allowing the owner to build to suit the intended use.

12. Utility Connections and Fees (water, sewer, etc.):

Commissioner Campanella requested a better understanding and the ramifications of meter fees, connection fees, and property tax assessments.

Commissioner Campanella requested more information regarding FAR calculations for primary and secondary units and the State Law distinctions between single-family zones that require FARs and multi-family zones and commercial, which may not require FARs.

Commissioner Thompson requested more discussion, documentation, and factors driving covenants that property owners are being required to execute in order to get the privilege of ADUs.

Commissioner Schwartz requested staff to return with explanation of fee structures in light of the State Law, and the concern that HCD continues to have regarding high fee structures (for connections to utilities and fees) that in essence make ADU permitting prohibitively costly, and how can we streamline the regulatory process to truly promote needed housing.

Commissioner Wiscomb expressed appreciation to staff and interested parties toward the goal of an improved ADU Ordinance.

MOTION: Thompson/Jordan

Continued indefinitely the discussion of recommended amended changes to the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) Ordinance.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

ACTUAL TIME: 6:03 P.M.

A. Committee and Liaison Reports:**1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report**

No report.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

- a. Commissioner Campanella reported on the Architectural Board of Review meeting of August 28, 2017, specifically regarding the continued Average Unit Density Incentive (AUD) Program project at 835 E. Canon Perdido St.
- b. Commissioner Lodge reported on the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of September 6, 2017, specifically regarding the joint City and Santa Barbara County Assoc. of Governments (SBCAG) project at the intersection of the 1700 Block East Cabrillo Blvd. and Los Patos Way.
- c. Commissioner Thompson also reported on the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of September 6, 2017, specifically regarding the design of the AUD Program project at 214 E. De La Guerra St.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Higgins adjourned the meeting at 6:06 p.m.

Submitted by,

Kathleen Goo, Commission Secretary