

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY BOARD AGENDA LETTER



Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 568-2240

Agenda Number:

Prepared on: April 27, 2006
Department Name: Planning & Development
Department No.: 053
Agenda Date: May 9, 2006
Placement: Administrative
Estimate Time: 1 hour
Continued Item: Hearing set on April 11, 2006
If Yes, date from:
Document File Name: G:\Group\Permitting\Case Files\TRM\05 Cases\05TRM-00000-00002 Board ltr for GPA hearing.doc

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Dianne Meester, Assistant Director
Planning & Development

STAFF CONTACT: Zoraida Abresch, Deputy Director (934-6585)
North County Development Review Division

SUBJECT: Hearing to Consider Request for Acceptance and Initiation of the
Proposed Mission Oaks General Plan Amendment

Recommendation: That the Board of Supervisors decline to initiate the formal review process for the Mission Oaks General Plan Amendment (Case No. 05GPA-00000-00004), and corresponding cases (05TRM -00000-00002 and 05RZN-00000-00006), until it can be considered in the context of a comprehensive community plan for the Mission Hills area. The subject site is located on the south side of Burton Mesa Boulevard, between Rucker Road and Calle Quarta (APN 097-111-002), Fourth Supervisorial district.

Alternatively, the Board could accept the proposed General Plan Amendment request and direct staff to initiate the formal review process. Correspondingly, the companion Zone Change and Tentative Tract Map applications would also be accepted for processing.

Alignment with Board Strategic Plan:

The recommendations are primarily aligned with actions required by law or by routine business necessity.

Executive Summary: The Mission Hills community contains approximately 1,200 residential units and 6.26 acres of commercial property. The applicant proposes to reclassify 3.65 acres of that commercial property to residential in order to develop housing.

The proposal raises concerns about creating a potential residential-to-commercial imbalance, and raises the question as to whether such a proposal would be better viewed in the context of a community plan for the area.

Discussion:

Existing Comprehensive Plan designations in the Vandenberg/Mission Hills area have been in place for more than 20 years, and there has never been a community plan for the area. At their February 8, 2006 hearing, the Planning Commission voted 3-1-1 (Boysen no; Brown abstained) on a motion to refer the General Plan Amendment initiation request to the Board with a recommendation that the Board give consideration to a community plan for the Mission Hills/Vandenberg area. Please refer to the Planning Commission staff report for more information about the site and what the applicant is proposing (Attachment A).

Prior to taking action, the Planning Commission made the following comments:

- This is a policy issue that should go to the Board;
- A lot of new housing has been approved and is being planned in the greater Vandenberg/Mission Hills area, and not everyone wants to drive 2 ½ miles for a quart of milk;
- The property is too small for a major shopping center but too large to be left vacant;
- The property is an ideal candidate for higher density housing;
- Mission Hills will never be a regional shopping draw and likely will never support much more than a nice convenience store, which the community would benefit from greatly;
- The current request highlights the need to reconsider zoning in the area;
- Previous requests for a community plan for the Mission Hills/Vandenberg area have fallen on deaf ears;
- Zoning in the area is out of date and it is time that we begin really planning for our neighborhoods;

Commissioner Boysen voted 'no' on the motion because he felt that the General Plan Amendment should be accepted by the Planning Commission, and not passed on to the Board of Supervisors. He clarified that he was not in a position to comment on the site plan or the density that is being proposed but agreed that the existing shopping center is under-utilized and will not likely be built out in our lifetime. Boysen stated that the whole area needs help and we should encourage developers willing to invest in improving the area.

Commissioner Valencia voiced concerns about reducing the percentage of commercial zoning in the area because of all the new, recently approved and proposed housing in the area. Other Commissioners were less concerned about the eventual re-designation of the subject property to allow for residential development, and more concerned about the lack of a community plan for the area. The Board must rule as to whether the possible re-designation of the subject property

should be accepted and processed on an individual piecemeal basis, or whether it should be considered as part of a future community plan. Staff would recommend the latter.

Mandates and Service Levels:

No changes in programs or service levels are anticipated.

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:

All costs of permit processing are reimbursed by the project applicant. Costs to process this application are fully reimbursed by the applicant per the department's adopted fee schedule. Permit revenues are budgeted in the Permitting and Compliance Division of the Development Review North Division, on page D-296 of the adopted 2005-06 fiscal year budget. There are no facilities impacts.

Special Instructions:

The Clerk of the Board shall complete noticing for the project in a newspaper of general circulation in the County of Santa Barbara ten (10) days prior to the hearing (mailing labels are attached).

The Clerk of the Board shall forward a copy of the Minute Order to Planning & Development, Attention: Cintia Mendoza, Hearing Support.

Planning & Development will prepare all final action letters and notify all interested parties of the Board of Supervisors final action.

Concurrence:

N/A

Prepared by: Gary Kaiser, Planner III, Development Review North

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A -- February 8, 2006 Planning Commission Staff Report