

Public comment opened at 6:09 p.m.:

Art Christman, in favor.

John Mandle, in favor.

Norman J. Boyan, in favor.

Bill Spangler, in favor.

Henry Jones, in favor.

Carl G. Mueller, in favor.

Ernest Campbell, in favor.

Robert Staley, concerned with loss of open space.

Steve Gaither, addressed possible loss of open space.

Bob Hull, stated the project makes sense but expressed concerned with neighborhood density.

Ruth Georgi, addressed density issues.

Heike Kilian, addressed traffic concerns.

Arthur Halenbeck, addressed parking concerns, submitted photographs and written testimony.

Tom B. Burgher, addressed placement compatibility with Hidden Oaks PUD.

Judy Orias, addressed grading and traffic issues.

Public comment closed at 6:47 p.m.

Motion:

Continued indefinitely to Full Board with the following comments:

1) The Board finds the proposed expansion of the facility to return to its conditional use permit threshold on the number of units is valid in light of the lack of senior housing and the fact that additional property has been purchased to increase the amount of acreage. 2) The Board supports the infill of the new units and looks for the new infill portion of the project to maintain similar setbacks and open space as original community. 3) The Board is concerned with the proposed unit mix and size of the newly added units. Provide more variety within the proposed unit types. 4) The Board is concerned with negative impacts to the Calle De Los Amigos and Hidden Oaks neighborhoods. a) With respect to Calle De Los Amigos, the Board is concerned that the distance factor of the proposed employee parking is too great from the main hub of the facility. i) Study relocating the employee parking closer to the facility center point. ii) Raising the grade in front of the administration building to perhaps include semi-subsurface parking, and; iii) Locate parking pockets along the drive as opposed to parallel and perpendicular stalls. 5) Provide technical drawings and site sections indicating grading when project returns to the Board. 6) The Board does not support setback modifications at the perimeter of the project, as it abuts the single-family residential and PUD neighborhoods. 7) Study the location of the three northerly duplexes, single units to achieve greater setback.

Possible solutions might be to locate some units adjacent to the oak grove and proposed employee parking. 8) The Board is in support of the proposed architectural style as depicted on the administration building and new residential units. Provide an implementation plan to achieve uniformity. With regard to topography, the Board is concerned with the massing of the proposed new duplex buildings. 9) Restudy traffic and circulation of the Torino Drive cul-de-sac and study moving the intersection away from the cul-de-sac or making it emergency only access. 10) Study ways to minimize driveway approaches to the garages, to prevent cars from parking in the driveway in front of garages. 11) Resolve the creek setback of the proposed art studio.

Action: LeCron/Wienke, 7/0/0.

ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW
MINUTES

Monday, April 9, 2007 **David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street** **3:02 P.M.**

BOARD MEMBERS:

MARK WIENKE, Chair, Present
CHRISTOPHER MANSON-HING, Vice-Chair, Present
CLAY AURELL, Present
JIM BLAKELEY, Present
GARY MOSEL, Present
RANDY MUDGE, Present (left at 5:18 p.m.)
DAWN SHERRY, Present
PAUL ZINK, Present

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:

GRANT HOUSE, Absent

PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:

BRUCE BARTLETT, Present (from 3:12 p.m. until 5:18 p.m.)

STAFF:

JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor, Absent
HEATHER BAKER, Project Planner, Present (from 3:02 p.m. until 3:12 p.m. and from 7:15 until 7:25 p.m.)
IRMA UNZUETA, Project Planner, Present (from 3:12 p.m. until 5:18 p.m.)
TONY BOUGHMAN, Planning Technician, Present
GLORIA SHAFER, Commission Secretary, Present

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM

I. 900 CALLE DE LOS AMIGOS

A-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 049-040-050
Application Number: MST2005-00742
Owner: American Baptist Homes of the West
Applicant: Tynan Group
Agent: Cameron Carey
Architect: Keith Nolan

(Proposal for residential and non-residential additions to the Valle Verde Retirement Community. Proposed is the construction of 35 additional senior housing units across the existing campus, bringing the total to 254 residential units. The non-residential component includes 7,893 net square feet of demolition and 12,775 net sq. ft. of new commercial construction and 10,888 net sq. ft. to be remodeled. The proposal would add 60,860 square feet of structures, bringing the total to 318, 533 net square feet, as well as 98 new parking spaces for a total of 429 spaces. There would be 24,140 cubic yards of cut and 24,860 cubic yards of fill on the 59.75 acre site. The project requires Planning Commission approval for an amendment to the existing Conditional Use Permit and modifications for building separation and yard encroachments.)

(Second Concept Review.)

(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE EXISTING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND FOR MODIFICATIONS FOR BUILDING SEPARATION AND YARD ENCROACHMENTS.)

(3:12)

Present: Kieth Nolan, ON Design Architects; Cameron Carey, Agent; Justin Van Mullen, ON Design Architects; Ron Schaefer, Executive Director Valle Verde Retirement Community; Kirsten Ayars, Community Outreach Liaison, Edward Steinfeldt, Project Manager; Bruce Bartlett, Planning Commission Liaison; Irma Unzueta, Project Planner, City of Santa Barbara.

Staff Comments: Ms. Unzueta stated that the DART review for this project is expected to be complete at the end of the month, and requested that the Board focus on whether the applicant has adequately addressed comments and concerns identified by the ABR at the previous conceptual review of the project. Ms. Unzueta provided a summary of the Planning Commission's review of the project on July 2006, and delineated concerns expressed by the Planning Commission regarding:

Public comment opened at 3:42 p.m.

The following individuals spoke in favor:

Harry Jones, Robert J. Buegler, Norman Boyan, Bob Miller, Judith Greer, Donald Carey, Louise Carey,
Dennis Allen, Donald O'Dowd.

The following individuals expressed concerns about the project:

Ruth Georgi: suggested elimination or relocation of units 3, 4, and 5.

Jermaine Chastain: suggested eliminating units 3, 4, and 5.

Art Halenbeck: parking, threatened ambience, and the need to refurbish the health center.

Hieke Kilian: traffic flow, density, potential loss of oak trees; suggested eliminating units 3, 4, and 5.

Chair Wienke acknowledged receipt of a large number of letters either in support or opposed to the project.

Public comment closed at 4:32 p.m.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Planning Commission and return to the Full Board with the following comments:

1. The Board is generally pleased with the applicant's response to the Board's previous comments.
2. The Board feels the relocated employee parking area is an improvement over the previous proposal, and appreciates the adjacent building being tucked into hillside.
3. The proposed parking for Zone 5 housing is better than previously proposed. Some Board members feel the backup distance from the garage is too great. Restudy for better maneuverability.
4. The Board feels the proposed units in Zone 5 are too close to the hillside.
5. The housing in Zone 6 is improved over the previous proposal. The Board appreciates the 40 foot setbacks to the neighboring property line. Some Board members feel the proposal is still too dense and causing numerous retaining walls on the north side of the units. One suggestion is to relocate Unit 6.
6. The Board appreciates the preliminary landscape plan with landscaping and a wildlife path to the north of the Zone 6 housing. A majority of the Board members would prefer adding more green space between the clustered units, and are concerned with the amount of grading.
7. Although a majority of the Board is concerned with the close spacing of Zone 6 units, the Board is not concerned that the units do not match the setbacks of the existing campus. It is felt that because of their hillside location, additional landscape area is needed between the units and for the retaining walls.
8. The architecture as presented is going in the right direction but the Board reserves comment on architectural details until a later presentation.
9. The Board appreciates the use of parking pockets throughout the site.
10. Some Board members are concerned with the grade of the parking in front of the Administration Center. The Board would prefer a minimal retaining wall, or no retaining wall, in this area.
11. The Board appreciates the sustainable built-green design, and the use of photovoltaics.

Action:
opposed.)

Manson-Hing/Zink, 6/2/0. Motion carried. (Mudge and Blakeley



City of Santa Barbara

Planning Division

ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW MINUTES

Monday, January 26, 2009 **David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street** **3:02 P.M.**

BOARD MEMBERS:
 CHRISTOPHER MANSON-HING, Chair - PRESENT
 DAWN SHERRY, Vice-Chair - PRESENT
 CLAY AURELL - PRESENT
 JIM BLAKELEY - PRESENT
 CAROL GROSS - PRESENT
 GARY MOSEL - PRESENT
 PAUL ZINK - PRESENT
 CHRISTOPHER GILLILAND - PRESENT
 KEITH RIVERA - PRESENT

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON: DALE FRANCISCO - PRESENT GRANT HOUSE (ALTERNATE) - ABSENT
PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON: BRUCE BARTLETT - PRESENT

STAFF:
 JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor - PRESENT UNTIL 8:27 P.M.
 MICHELLE BEDARD, Planning Technician - PRESENT
 KATHLEEN GOO, Commission Secretary - PRESENT

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM

3. 900 CALLE DE LOS AMIGOS **A-1 Zone**

Assessor's Parcel Number: 049-040-050
 Application Number: MST2005-00742
 Owner: American Baptist Homes of the West
 Applicant: Tynan Group
 Agent: Cameron Carey
 Architect: Keith Nolan

(This is a revised proposal for residential and non-residential additions to the Valle Verde Retirement Community. The proposal includes the construction of 40 new senior independent living units across the existing campus, for a total of 251 residential units. The non-residential component includes 13,945 square feet of demolition, 14,902 square feet of new construction, resulting in a 957 net square feet addition, and 10,461 square feet to be remodeled. The proposal would result in the addition of 58,436 square feet of structures, bringing the total on site development to 317,741 square feet. 83 new parking spaces are proposed for a total of 414 parking spaces. 11,520 cubic yards of cut, 13,300 cubic yards of fill, and 1,780 cubic yards of imported soils is proposed on the 59.75 acre site. The project requires Planning Commission approval for an amendment to the existing Conditional Use Permit, Lot Line Adjustment and Modifications for building separation and yard encroachments.)

(Third Concept Review. Comments only; Project requires Environmental Assessment and Planning Commission review for an amendment to the existing Conditional Use Permit, Lot Line Adjustment and Modifications for building separation and setback encroachments.)

(4:45)

Present: Ron Schaffer, Executive Director, Valle Verde Retirement Community; Justin Van Mullem, Architect; Keith Nolan, Architect; Cameron Carey, Agent; and Peter Lawson,

Associate Planner.

Public comment opened at 5:14 p.m.

The Board acknowledged staff's announcement that approximately 56 letters, emails, and petitions of support and two opposition letters or emails were received.

The following members of the public spoke *in support* of the proposed project:

Karin & Bob Hughes, Dan George, Larry Wilson, Susan Richards, Susan Johnson, Charlie Johnson, Ragner Thorensen, Louise Carey, Ernie Campbell, Rita Templer, Robert Buegler, Henry Jones, Alice Scott, Art Christman, Art Montgomery, Dr. George Scott, Bill Spangler, Jane Rieffel, Steve Cushman (President of SB Chamber of Commerce), and Rev./Dr. Michelle Woodhouse and Jane Zonke.

The following members of the public spoke *in opposition* to the proposed project regarding lighting and parking issues, safe entrance and egress, the requested no access on Torino Road, modifications within 15 feet of the sidewalk, parking density, emergency access, private views, wild life trail, and landscaping height and pinch-point concerns for vehicular safety of Unit #6 and #7:

Heike Killian (Hidden Oaks Association), Ruth Georgi, and Jermaine Chastain.

Public comment closed at 5:55 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Board members are in favor of the modification for front yard encroachment of Unit 6? 7/0 (unanimous). The Chair clarified that the Board would like to closely look at this area in terms of landscaping, etc.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Planning Commission and return to Full Board with comments:

- 1) The Board supports the site plan.
- 2) The Board finds no negative aesthetic impacts to the requested modifications for building separation, and the setback encroachment for unit #6 and adds that it provides benefits for wild life habitat.
- 3) The Board is not in favor of the current layout of the administrative parking due to insufficient landscaping between the parking and the street. Applicant is to comply with the parking standards requirements (SBMC §28.90.050) regarding the ratio of parking stalls per landscape planting finger.

ARCHITECTURE:

- 1) The architecture of the units is moving in the right direction.
- 2) The Board looks for further refinement of columns and massing of the proposed units.
- 3) The Board reserves the right to review the architecture more completely when the proposed project returns.
- 4) Return with plans and elevations of the carports.

LANDSCAPING:

- 1) The Board appreciates the use of native species. The applicant is encouraged to further study the landscaping to reduce the plant variety and to group similar water-use plants.
- 2) Return with proposed plants to help visually screen the parking.
- 3) The Board appreciates the increased amount of setback between the Hidden Oak neighborhood to Rutherford property units, and looks forward to proposed landscaping solutions on the plans to screen the new units in that area.

Action: Gross/Aurell, 7/0/0. Motion carried. (Blakeley/Sherry absent).