



# City of Santa Barbara

## Planning Division

### HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION MINUTES

Wednesday, May 2, 2007

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street

1:30 P.M.

**COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

WILLIAM LA VOIE, *Chair* – Present  
 ALEX PUJO, *Vice-Chair* – Present  
 ROBERT ADAMS – Present  
 LOUISE BOUCHER – Present  
 STEVE HAUSZ – Absent  
 FERMINA MURRAY – Present  
 SUSETTE NAYLOR – Present  
 DONALD SHARPE – Present

**ADVISORY MEMBER:**

DR. MICHAEL GLASSOW – Absent

**CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:**

ROGER HORTON – Present until 3:19 p.m.

**PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:**

STELLA LARSON – Absent

**STAFF:**

JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor – Present until 3:00 p.m.  
 JAKE JACOBUS, Urban Historian – Present  
 SUSAN GANTZ, Planning Technician II – Absent  
 GABRIELA FELICIANO, Commission Secretary – Present

Website: [www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov](http://www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov)

<b>HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST</b> (See El Pueblo Viejo District Guidelines & Design Review Submittal Requirements for Details)		
<b>CONCEPT REVIEW</b>	Required	<u>Master Application &amp; Submittal Fee</u> - (Location: 630 Garden Street) <u>Photographs</u> - of the existing building (if any), adjacent structures, composite panoramic view of the site, surrounding areas & neighborhood streetscape - mounted or folded to no larger than an 8.5" x 14" photo display board. <u>Plans</u> - three sets of <u>folded plans</u> are required at the time of submittal & each time plans are revised. <u>Vicinity Map and Project Tabulations</u> - (Include on first drawing) <u>Site Plan</u> - drawn to scale showing the property boundaries, existing & proposed structures, building & area square footages, building height, areas to be demolished, parking, site topography, conceptual grading & retaining walls, & existing landscaping. Include footprints of adjacent structures. <u>Exterior elevations</u> - showing existing & proposed grading where applicable.
	Suggested	<u>Site Sections</u> - showing the relationship of the proposed building & grading where applicable. <u>Plans</u> - floor, roof, etc. <u>Rough sketches</u> are encouraged early in the process for initial design review to avoid pursuing incompatible proposals. However, more complete & thorough information is recommended to facilitate an efficient review of the project.
<b>PRELIMINARY REVIEW</b>	Required	Same as above with the following additions: <u>Plans</u> - floor, roof, etc. <u>Site Sections</u> - showing the relationship of the proposed building & grading where applicable. <u>Preliminary Landscape Plans</u> - required for commercial & multi-family; single family projects where grading occurs. Preliminary planting plan with proposed trees & shrubs & plant list with names. Plans to include street parkway strips.
	Suggested	<u>Color &amp; Material Samples</u> - to be mounted on a board no larger than 8.5" x 14" & detailed on all sets of plans. <u>Exterior Details</u> - windows, doors, eaves, railings, chimney caps, flashing, etc. Materials submitted for preliminary approval form the basis for working drawings & must be complete & accurate.
<b>FINAL &amp; CONSENT</b>	Required	Same as above with the following additions: <u>Color &amp; Material Samples</u> - to be mounted on a board no larger than 8.5" x 14" and detailed on all sets of plans. <u>Cut Sheets</u> - exterior light fixtures and accessories where applicable. <u>Exterior Details</u> - windows, doors, eaves, railings, chimney caps, flashing, etc. <u>Final Landscape Plans</u> - landscape construction documents including planting & irrigation plan. <u>Consultant/Engineer Plans</u> - electrical, mechanical, structural, & plumbing where applicable.

**PLEASE BE ADVISED**

- \*\* All approvals made by the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) are based on compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 22.22 and with adopted HLC guidelines. Some agenda items have received a mailed notice and are subject to a public hearing.
- \*\* The approximate time the project will be reviewed is listed to the left of each item. It is suggested that applicants arrive 15 minutes early. The agenda schedule is subject to change as cancellations occur. Staff will notify applicants of time changes.
- \*\* The applicant's presence is required. If an applicant is not present, the item will be postponed indefinitely. If an applicant cancels or postpones an item without providing advance notice, the item will be postponed indefinitely and will not be placed on the following HLC agenda. In order to reschedule the item for review, the applicant must fill out and file a Supplemental Application Form at 630 Garden Street (Community Development Department) and submit appropriate plans.
- \*\* The Commission may grant an approval for any project scheduled on the agenda if sufficient information has been provided and no other discretionary review is required. Substitution of plans is not allowed, if revised plans differing from the submittal sets are brought to the meeting, motions for preliminary or final approval will be contingent upon staff review for code compliance.
- \*\* Preliminary and Final Historic Landmarks Commission approval is valid for one year from the date of the approval unless a time extension or Building Permit has been granted.
- \*\* The Commission may refer items to the Consent Calendar for Preliminary and Final Historic Landmarks Commission approval.
- \*\* **Items before the Commission may be appealed to the City Council. For further information on appeals, contact the Planning Division Staff or the City Clerk's Office. Said appeal must be in writing and must be filed with the City Clerk at City Hall within ten (10) calendar days of the meeting at which the Commission took action or rendered its decision. The scope of this project may be modified under further review.**
- \*\* **AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT:** In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Division at (805) 564-5470. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements.
- \*\* **AGENDAS, MINUTES and REPORTS:** Copies of all documents relating to agenda items are available for review at 630 Garden St. and agendas and minutes are posted online at [www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov](http://www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov). If you have any questions or wish to review the plans, please contact Susan Gantz, at (805) 564-5470 between the hours of 8:30 a.m. to noon and 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

**LICENSING ADVISORY:**

The Business and Professions Code of the State of California and the Municipal Code of the City of Santa Barbara restrict preparation of plans for certain project types to licensed professionals. Applicants are encouraged to consult with Building and Safety Staff or Planning Staff to verify requirements for their specific projects.

Unlicensed persons are limited to the preparation of plans for:

- Single or multiple family dwellings not to exceed four (4) units per lot, of wood frame construction, and not more than two stories and basement in height;
- Non-structural changes to storefronts; and,
- Landscaping for single-family dwellings, or projects consisting solely of landscaping of not more than 5,000 square feet.

**NOTICE:**

- A. That on April 27, 2007, at 4:00 P.M., this Agenda was duly posted on the indoor and outdoor bulletin boards at the Community Development Department, 630 Garden Street, and online at [www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov/hlc](http://www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov/hlc).
- B. This regular meeting of the Historic Landmarks Commission will be broadcast live and rebroadcast in its entirety on Friday at 1:00 P.M. on Channel 18.

**GENERAL BUSINESS:**

- A. Public Comment:

Any member of the public may address the Historic Landmarks Commission for up to two minutes on any subject within their jurisdiction that is not scheduled for a public discussion before the Board on that day. The total time for this item is ten minutes. (Public comment for items scheduled on today's agenda will be taken at the time the item is heard.)

No public comment.

- B. Approval of the minutes of the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of April 18, 2007.

**Motion: Approval of the minutes of the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of April 18, 2007, with corrections.**

Action: Adams/Boucher, 6/0/1. (La Voie abstained. Hausz absent.) Motion carried.

- C. Consent Calendar.

**Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar as reviewed by William La Voie; with the exception of the landscape plan for Item A, 922 Laguna Street, and Item F, 1900 Lasuen Road, which were reviewed by Robert Adams.**

Action: Boucher/Sharpe, 7/0/0. (Hausz absent.) Motion carried.

- D. Announcements, requests by applicants for continuances and withdrawals, future agenda items, and appeals.

1. Mr. Jacobus announced that Steve Hausz would not be attending the meeting and that Jan Hubbell wished to speak to the Commission regarding temporary installations at the Granada Theatre tower.
2. Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner, stated construction on the tower portion of the Granada building has begun. The sidewalk area will need to be covered to protect pedestrians. Placing a chute down the front of the building is being proposed to dump materials into a truck while the interior rehabilitation is being done. There will also be a mechanical hoist to lift materials up.

The attachments for both the chute and the mechanical hoist will include additional support from the *inside* of the building so as to not damage the façade of the building. The temporary installations are expected to be up until January 2008. Signs will be placed to say that the Tupelo Junction and East restaurants are still in operation. An addendum historic structure report has been requested by Staff that will be reviewed by the Commission at the next meeting. Chair La Voie requested that a summary be sent to City Council so that they are made aware that the Commission is paying attention to these issues. He also expressed appreciation to Staff for being so diligent in preserving the building.

3. Chair La Voie acknowledged receipt of letters from Paula Westbury regarding five of the items on the agenda. (A copy was given to each of the Commissioners.)
4. Jaime Limón, Design Review Supervisor, announced that a City Council meeting will take place May 8<sup>th</sup> to discuss structures and heights in El Pueblo Viejo District. Chair La Voie requested an e-mail be sent to the Commission members informing them of the exact time of the discussion.
5. Mr. Limón reported that on May 1<sup>st</sup> the *Single Family Design Guidelines (SFDG)/Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance (NPO) Update* was introduced to City Council and will be adopted at the City Council May 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. The SFDG Update will take effect immediately and the NPO Update Ordinance will be effective 30 days from May 8<sup>th</sup>.

E. Subcommittee Reports.

1. Mr. Adams reported that the Awards Subcommittee has moved forward and all the nominees have been evaluated. The calligraphy of the plaques is being funded by the Architectural Foundation of Santa Barbara. The Subcommittee will have one plaque for each award prepared for possible inclusion for next year's awards as well. Mr. Limón requested that Mr. Adams look into a tentative date when the Subcommittee would like to have the awards ceremony at City Council.
2. Mr. La Voie reported that the El Pueblo Viejo (EPV) Guidelines Subcommittee met and is proceeding quite well.

F. Possible Ordinance Violations.

No violations reported.

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

(1:47)

A discussion of the Proposed Two-Year Financial Plan for Fiscal Years 2008 - 2009 and the Recommended Operating and Capital Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, focusing on the Community Development Department and Planning Division, was presented by City Planner Bettie Weiss.

Present: Bettie Weiss, City Planner  
Paul Casey, Community Development Director  
Michele De Cant, Administrative Analyst II

Bettie Weiss stated that the standard cycle of the city is a two year financial plan and she discussed three topics:

1. **Planning Division Programs and Services:** All four planning programs were highlighted.
  - a) Long-Range Planning and Special Studies
  - b) Development and Environmental Review
  - c) Zoning: Ordinance, Information and Enforcement
  - d) Design Review and Historic Preservation
2. **Budget Submittal Highlights:** New items in the planning budget include compensation for design review boards and a new position in the Planning Division.
3. **Proposed New Fee and Increases:** A new fee is proposed as part of the Land Development Team and ongoing fee adjustments.

**The Commission, either individually or collectively, had the following comments, suggestions, and/or questions:**

1. Asked how the public will be informed of increases in building permit fees. Ms. Weiss responded that the increased fees will be for the Planning Commission (PC) land development projects only; therefore, a PC resolution will be given that will include a condition of approval. The recovery fee will be calculated upfront, during the application process, as 30% of the total processing fees. Announcing fee increases in the Land Development Team Bulletin is also being considered.
2. Commented about design reviews by subcommittees. Suggested that the applicant be charged for the benefit of a subcommittee review. Emphasized that it would be a benefit to the applicant, the Commission and Staff.
3. Asked about the cost of appeals and requested that the issue be taken back to City Council for possible fee increase in view of the time City Staff and board members spend to prepare for and attend appeal hearings. Mr. Casey responded that it is a City Council policy issue rather than a cost recovery issue. City Council wants to keep the appeal fee at a reasonable level so that people are not priced-out of the appeal due-process.
4. Asked if there is any funding in the budget for awards and suggested that the Commission create a program that can be presented to the City Council in order to receive funding for such purpose. Mr. Limón responded that funds had been allocated under an awards line item in the budget with the purpose of creating tiles for all City Landmarks, but there is no current commitment by the City to reserve funds for award plaques. Ms. Weiss added that the materials used in the design are quite costly and that a matching program could be considered.
5. Expressed appreciation for the new training position and commented that ongoing training is helpful, especially for new board members.

### **MISCELLANEOUS ACTION ITEM – PUBLIC HEARING**

(2:11)

A Public Hearing was held to update the “City of Santa Barbara Master Environmental Assessment Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historic Structures and Sites.” The Commission accepted recommendations from the Designations Subcommittee for the proposed removal of structures from Appendix C, City of Santa Barbara Potential Historic Structures/Sites List.

Present: Jake Jacobus, Associate Planner/Urban Historian  
Jaime Limón, Design Review Supervisor

Chair La Voie emphasized that the purpose of the Potential Historic Structures/Sites List is to identify properties that are *potentially* significant historic resources in Santa Barbara. The Commission's task was to update the Potential List by: 1) reviewing an existing list in order to remove properties that were placed on the list without a known reason; and 2) determining the properties that should remain on the list. The criteria for selecting a property to stay on the Potential List includes one or more of the following: it should be of a certain age, is a good example of a style of architecture from a particular period, was designed by a renown architect, or is connected to someone important in the history of the City of Santa Barbara. Chair La Voie stated that the restrictions for buildings on the Potential List are minor and determined only through a Historic Structures Report review process. The Potential List is in accordance with the City's Demolition Ordinance which has determined that any building over 50 years old needs to be evaluated before a demolition permit is issued.

Staff comments: Mr. Jacobus stated that some of the buildings were placed on the Potential List twenty five or thirty years ago. Some of the buildings listed have disappeared from the site; others were altered and do not necessarily qualify as historic; and still others simply do not have a reason to be on the list. A Historic Landmarks Commission hearing was held February 7, 2007. The Commission voted to have 35 properties removed from the Potential List at that time.

Mr. Jacobus stated that there were 11 additional properties reviewed by the Designations Subcommittee and one of those properties, 3301 Laurel Canyon Road, was identified as not being worthy to be on the Potential List because: 1) It is not a significant example of the architecture it represents since it had a number of alterations. 2) A historic structures report determined it was not historically significant. The building is unstable and the foundations were constantly being repaired. Mr. Jacobus mentioned that, in anticipation of the building demolition, the applicant had large-format photography taken of the building.

Mr Jacobus stated that there are now 36 properties on the list of recommended buildings to be removed from the Potential List. He also mentioned that two property owners were present to request that their homes be removed from the list. In addition, the owner for the property at 1816 Santa Barbara Street, who was not able to attend the Subcommittee review meeting, was also in attendance to address the Commission.

Public comment opened at 2:18 p.m.

1. **Jeanne Ullom**, 28 E. Valerio Street, requested that her property be removed from the list. Her family purchased the home in December 1979. It is the only single-family home on her block and all other buildings have been turned into businesses, rentals, a halfway house, a day care center, and condominiums. She has considered that it could become a financial hardship for her if the property remains on the Potential List because, being in an R-3 zone, if she decides to sell in the future a potential purchaser may not be allowed to construct condominiums or develop the property.
2. **Addison Cook**, 1816 Santa Barbara Street, commented his family is honored that the City would want their property considered for historic designation, but the owners do not want it to be designated. **Mr. Jacobus commented** that the house was designed by the architectural firm of Soule, Murphy and Hastings. The home has a one-story bedroom addition that was done in 1977. Mr. Jacobus pointed out that the main block of the building is intact the way it was originally designed and it is a nice example of the Monterey Style.

3. **Trevor Martinson**, 1849 Mission Ridge Road, representing Dr. and Mrs. John Clark, stated that he asked Staff to confirm with the City Attorney's Office how CEQA Guidelines Section 15169 was utilized to establish the Potential List. He mentioned that the HLC Ordinance references Section 15169, but that it is for proposed projects that are identifying the environmental character and constraints of an area, and commented that the Potential List has nothing to do with an environmental impact. **Mr. Limón responded** that, under CEQA provisions, the City has sufficient authority to set goals and methods to identify historic resources within its boundaries. The Potential List is used to flag parcels that have potential significance. He emphasized that the Planning Division is not advocating, at this time, that the properties on the Potential List be designated. **Mr. Martinson responded** that the City has exceeded its limits and it should be clarified by the City Attorney's Office. He also mentioned that a similar residence (designed by George Washington Smith and built in 1922) was put on the market and could not be sold for a year. The property was a City Landmark and was sold for less than what it was worth. He considers it would be the same if the property is on the Potential List. He mentioned a contacted insurance group stated the insurance premium would increase two to three times and that, now that the property has been designated, in case of a natural disaster the HLC would impose standards to rebuild. **Chair La Voie responded** that, if destroyed by a natural disaster, a *designated* property would no longer be rebuilt because its landmark status is not extended with the loss of the building. **Mr. Martinson responded** that, if partially destroyed, it would be considerably expensive to repair the damages to its current condition, including wrought ironwork and other artifacts requiring replacement. He agreed that it is perfectly all right to consider whether a property is a historic resource when a demolition is proposed, but insisted that the property not be designated as a landmark.

4. **Kellam De Forest**, local resident, thanked the HLC and the Subcommittee for keeping these properties on the Potential List and commented he considers it important to retain the character of Santa Barbara.

Public comment closed at 2:35 p.m.

**Chair La Voie and Commissioner Murray clarified** that the Potential List is a recognition of a property's age, history and provenance; and again emphasized that it is *not a historic landmark designation* of the 1849 Mission Ridge Road property, but rather identifying it as a *potential* historic resource.

Straw votes: How many commissioners would want the property at 28 E. Valerio Street *removed* from the Potential List? 0/7. (All opposed.)

How many Commissioners would like the property at 1816 Santa Barbara Street to *stay on* the Potential List? 7/0. (All agreed.)

How many Commissioners would support *removal* of the property at 1849 Mission Ridge Road from the Potential List? 0/7. (All opposed.)

**Motion:** 1) To remove the thirty-six properties recommended **\*to be removed** from the Potential Historic Structures/Sites List. 2) The Commission concludes that the ten properties recommended by the HLC Designations Subcommittee **#to remain** on the Potential Historic Structures/Sites List are historically significant by their own aesthetic merit and provenance and shall remain on the list.

Action: Boucher/Naylor, 7/0/0. (Hausz absent.) Motion carried.

**Mr. Jacobus announced the ten day appeal period.**

\*The following properties were recommended **to be removed** from the City of Santa Barbara Potential Historic Structures/Sites List:

<u>Address</u>	<u>APN</u>
222 W. Alamar Avenue	051-213-008
2020-2072 Alameda Padre Serra	019-163-004
720 N. Alisos Street	031-124-024
735 Anacapa Street	037-092-037
2109 Anacapa Street	025-242-010
E. Cabrillo Blvd. at Ball Park	017-311-001
330 E. Canon Perdido Street	031-041-001
333 E. Canon Perdido Street	029-301-015
110 W. Carrillo Street	039-272-023
1208 Castillo Street	039-162-022
1502 Chapala Street	027-231-017
320 E. De La Guerra Street	031-091-008
900 Block of De La Vina Street	Various
710 Garden Street	031-091-008
1218 Indio Muerto Street	017-292-004
705 Laguna Street	031-091-008
3301 Laurel Canyon Road	055-172-003
620 W. Mission Street	043-092-009
1331 Mountain Avenue	041-102-031
107 Nopalitos Way	017-010-001, 017-203-020
2515 Orella Street	025-021-007
1728 Pampas Avenue	043-174-018
300-320 W. Pueblo Street	025-102-001
1115 Punta Gorda Street	017-291-015
1314 Punta Gorda Street	017-341-004
1036 Rinconada Road	029-240-008
423 Rose Avenue	031-281-006
217 S. Salinas Street	015-261-042
513 Santa Barbara Street	031-201-011
521 Santa Barbara Street	031-201-009
712 Spring Street	031-123-014
618 Sutton Avenue	037-061-013
2721 Verde Vista Drive	053-372-011
2860 Verde Vista Drive	053-362-020
214 S. Voluntario Street	017-252-010
326 S. Voluntario Street	017-281-008

#The following properties, reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission Designations Subcommittee at the direction of the full Commission, were recommended by the Subcommittee **to remain** on the City of Santa Barbara Potential Historic Structures/Sites List:

2120 Anacapa Street	025-251-009
1505 Chapala Street	027-222-025
2330 Chapala Street	025-121-014
1812 Garden Street	027-051-017
906 W. Mission Street	043-073-012



1849 Mission Ridge Road	019-090-020 (Representative spoke during the public hearing.)
1816 Santa Barbara Street	027-042-011 (Owner addressed the Commission during the public hearing.)
425 Stanley Drive	051-273-004
2331 State Street	025-122-004
28 E. Valerio Street	027-182-022 (Owner addressed the Commission during the public hearing.)

## **DISCUSSION ITEM**

1. 35 STATE ST HRC-2/SD-3 Zone  
(2:37) Assessor's Parcel Number: 033-102-004

Application Number: MST97-00357  
 Applicant: Santa Barbara Beach Properties, LP  
 Agent: Ken Marshall  
 Architect: Doug Singletary  
 Landscape Architect: Philip Suding  
 Engineer: Patrick Gibson & Bryan Mayeda  
 Engineer: Penfield & Smith Engineers, Inc.  
 Business Name: Ritz-Carlton Club

(Proposal for the Ritz-Carlton Club involving the private redevelopment of portions of three blocks of properties located at 22-120 State Street, 15 East Mason Street, 125 State Street, and the State Street right-of-way between Mission Creek and the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way.)

**(Presentation by Donald J. Bredberg, Managing Director, Stonecreek LLC/Mountain Funding Santa Barbara LLC, to provide an update on the project focused on new ownership, Area A design, and scheduling.)**

Present: Donald Bredberg, Stonecreek LLC  
 Ken Marshall, Agent

Mr. Bredberg gave the applicant presentation and stated the new owner is NF Santa Barbara, LLC (known affiliate of Mountain Funding, LLC). The ownership title was transferred on March 16, 2007. The applicant will be presenting the project to the Historic Landmarks Commission in June 2007.

### **Commission comments:**

1. Suggested that, during the selection of the value engineer, someone be hired who has knowledge of historic structures.
2. Pointed out that the Commission spent much time reviewing the exterior with its architectural detailing and high quality of materials. Stated that the Commission would expect nothing less than the best for the property under the new ownership.

**HISTORIC STRUCTURES REPORT**

2. 102 E PUEBLO ST E-1 Zone

(2:49) Assessor's Parcel Number: 025-201-024  
Application Number: MST2006-00451  
Owner: Melville Sahyun  
Designer: Steve Morando

(Proposal for a two-story addition and remodel of an existing one-story single-family residence located in the Mission Area Special Design District. The proposal includes an 825 square foot first- and second-story addition, a second-story deck, interior and exterior remodeling, and a roof-mounted solar array. The project would result in a 3,156 square foot two-story dwelling with the existing detached garage, greenhouse, and accessory building to remain on the 15,947 square foot lot. Modifications are requested for exterior remodeling in the setbacks.)

**(Review of Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Post/Hazeltine Associates.)**

Present: Pamela Post and Tim Hazeltine  
Steve Morando, Designer and Ownership Representative  
Wayne Ward, General Contractor

Staff comment: Jake Jacobus, Associate Planner/Urban Historian, stated that the house was designed by Robert Ingle Hoyt and that it is a minimal Spanish Style interpretation. Staff has reviewed the report and agrees with its conclusions and recommendations.

Mr. Pujo stated that he did not agree with the statement on page 33, paragraph 1, Standard 9, and that the Pueblo Street massing *does* alter the spatial relationship of the existing house.

Straw vote: How many Commissioners agree with Mr. Pujo's observation? 7/0. (All agreed.)

Public comment opened at 2:59 p.m.

Tony Fischer, neighbor, stated the project was heard by the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) on September 5, 2006, and made similar comments as Mr. Pujo. He also pointed out that the report does not make a reference to the ABR comments. Chair La Voie stated it is the duty of the ABR to review and either approve or disapprove the design. He explained that an acceptance of the report by the HLC is not an acceptance of the design.

Public comment closed at 3:02 p.m.

Chair La Voie read into the record the ABR motion from the September 5, 2006, meeting.

Chair La Voie asked the applicant if solar integration was still being considered and stated that, if so, an evaluation would need to be integrated into the report. Applicant responded it is being considered, but is not currently part of the project.

**Motion:** The Commission accepts the report, but disagrees with the analysis on page 32 and 33 regarding the impact of the second story addition to the structure and considers that the addition does not meet Secretary of the Interior's Standard 9 with respect to the spatial relationships. 1) The following corrections shall be made by the preparer of the report: a) Page 3, second paragraph, line 10, shall be corrected to read: "identifies the house as a *modernist* interpretation." b) Page 33, second paragraph, shall read: "the house *and the detached garage* [...] are eligible for listing as a [...] Structure of Merit. 2) The architecture shall be more responsive to the work of Robert Ingle Hoyt. 3) A courtesy review shall be scheduled for the Commission to make comments about the design that will then be forwarded to the Architectural Board of Review.

Action: Pujo/Sharpe, 6/0/1. (La Voie abstained. Hausz absent.) Motion carried.

### **FINAL REVIEW**

3. 1214 STATE ST C-2 Zone

(3:11) Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-183-019  
 Application Number: MST2004-00005  
 Owner: Santa Barbara Center for Performing Arts  
 Architect: Phillips, Metsch, Sweeney & Moore  
 Business Name: Granada Theatre

(The proposed project involves the partial rehabilitation of and modifications to the Granada Theatre, including an addition of 13,360 square feet. Of the 13,360 square feet proposed, 6,634 square feet would be added to the building's footprint. The existing dressing rooms on the north side of the theater would be rebuilt with a 99 foot long, five foot wide and 60 foot high addition to accommodate stage space, exiting, storage, and equipment, as well as a fully accessible dressing room and toilet. An 80 foot long, 10 foot wide and 78 foot high addition to the east side of the theater would provide more stage space and meet stage rigging needs. The south side addition, which is 100 feet long, eight feet wide and 36 feet high, would accommodate access ramps inside the building. The remaining 6,700 square feet would be for the construction of a basement level to provide dressing rooms for the performers. One of the existing ground floor storefronts adjacent to the theater's entrance would be utilized as the theater's ticketing area. Space in the Granada tower at the second floor would also be utilized for the theater's second floor lobby area.)

**(Final approval of entrance door details is requested.)**

**(PROJECT REQUIRES COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 049-04.)**

Present: Steve Metsch, Architect  
 Monisha Adnani, Project Manager

Straw vote: How many of the Commissioners would like to see the bronze with a true divided light bronze frame and a wood outer frame? 5/0/2. (Adams/Murray abstained.)

**Motion:** Continued two weeks for applicant to return with a more credible expression of a true divided light bronze glazing system.

Action: Adams/Pujo, 7/0/0. (Hausz absent.) Motion carried.

**CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED**

4. 1722 STATE ST C-2/R-1 Zone  
(3:30)

Assessor's Parcel Number: 027-102-021  
Application Number: MST2005-00455  
Owner: 1722 State Street Investors, LLC  
Applicant: Howard Gross, 1722 State Street Investors, LLC  
Architect: Jan Hochhauser

(Proposal for a three-story commercial mixed-use development consisting of twelve residential condominium units with approximately 10,000 s.f. of commercial development. The residential units would consist of four 3-bedroom units, six 2-bedroom units, and two 1-bedroom units. In accordance with the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, one 2-bedroom and one 1-bedroom residential unit would be affordable. Parking to accommodate 50-60 cars will be located in a subterranean parking garage. The existing 7,500 square foot commercial structure on this 28,875 square foot lot will be demolished as part of this proposal.)

**(Second Concept Review.)**

**(PROJECT REQUIRES COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 015-07.)**

Present: Jan Hochhauser and Jay Blatter, Architects  
Phil Suding, Landscape Architect

Public comment opened at 4:14 p.m.

Kellam De Forest, local resident, commented that almost anything on the site would be better than the existing bank building. He also commented that it is wonderful that nothing on this structure will be over 40 feet. Mr. De Forest asked how much of the structure will be up to 40 feet. Chair La Voie responded that the structure is stepped back so that there is no instance of a 40 foot façade on State Street.

Public comment closed at 4:15 p.m.

**Motion:** Continued two weeks for the applicant to simplify some of the elements with the following comments: 1) A simplification of the building is desired. 2) The architecture expression needs to be consistent. The character of the expression and quality of finishes need to be attended to as the design develops. 3) There should be more substantial landscaping, greenscape as opposed to hardscape, on State Street. 4) Following are parts of the project that the Commission supports and would like to see retained: a) The height of the building. b) The underground parking. c) The interior courtyard. d) Permeable landscaping. 5) Applicant should study a redesign of the third story bridge.

Action: Pujo/Naylor, 5/0/2. (Adams/Sharpe abstained. Hausz absent.) Motion carried.

**PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

5. 433 E CABRILLO

HRC-2/SP-1/SD-3 Zone

(4:24) Assessor's Parcel Number: 017-680-009  
 Application Number: MST95-00175  
 Applicant: Parker Family Trust  
 Agent: Richard Fogg, Attorney  
 Architect: Daun St. Amand  
 Architect: Henry Lenny  
 Architect: Gregory Burnett  
 Business Name: Waterfront Hotel

(This is a revised proposal for a 150-room, three-story luxury hotel located on a three-acre development envelope that received a substantial conformance determination on June 1, 2001. The proposal is a 196,715 square foot hotel that includes 128 subterranean level parking spaces, pool cabana, spas, health club, meeting rooms, and restaurant. The project previously received preliminary approval from the Historic Landmarks Commission on August 15, 2001.)

**(Continued from April 18, 2007: Revised preliminary approval is requested of design changes to exterior elevations including doors, windows and balconies. Massing and footprint of the building remains unmodified.)**

**(PROJECT REQUIRES COMPLIANCE WITH CITY ORDINANCE NO. 4920.)**

Present: Henry Lenny, Architect  
 Gregory Burnett, Architect

Public comment opened at 4:45 p.m.

Kellam De Forest, local resident, commented that it seems like the north façade is to function as a sound wall. Mr. De Forest suggested that the north wall be treated as a Spanish bullring with flags on the top and it would not necessary have to completely tie in to the rest of the building. He added that it could also be treated as a castle wall with arrow slits and fenestrations on top so that it would be an actual wall and not part of the entire building.

Public comment closed at 4:46 p.m.

**Motion:** **Continued two weeks with the following comments:** **1)** The stairway on the north courtyard elevation requires more study. **2)** The north elevation sound wall needs more study, but appears to be going in the right direction. **3)** A variety of trees and irregular spacing along the north elevation should be incorporated.

**Action:** Boucher/Adams, 7/0/0. (Hausz absent.) Motion carried.

**CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED**

6. 1900 LASUEN RD R-2/4.0/R-H Zone  
 (4:48) Assessor's Parcel Number: 019-170-022

Application Number: MST2007-00140

Owner: Orient Express Hotels

Applicant: El Encanto, Inc.

Agent: Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services

Architect: Henry Lenny

Business Name: El Encanto Hotel

(Phase 1 of the project (MST99-00305) is complete; portions of Phase 2 of the project (previously reviewed under MST2005-00490) including Groups E, L, and N, require Planning Commission approval and are being reviewed with this Phase 3 of the project with Group M, which requires Planning Commission approval as well.)

**(Third Concept Review.)**

**(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL, AND HISTORIC RESOURCE FINDINGS.)**

Present: Henry Lenny, Architect  
 Minh Pham, Representing Ownership

**Motion: Continued four weeks.**

Action: Adams/Sharpe, 7/0/0. (Hausz absent.) Motion carried.

**Commission comments:**

1. Emphasized the importance of the landscape in the character of the campus.
2. There is concern with regard to: **a)** The concentration of two-story buildings in this part of the campus. **b)** The possibility of insufficient space between two-story buildings. **c)** The size of the building.

**CONSENT CALENDAR****CONTINUED ITEM**

A. 922 LAGUNA ST C-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-302-016

Application Number: MST2007-00160

Owner: Herbert Reff

Architect: William Cooper

(Proposal to remove an existing screen wall and trellis, remodel the existing interior space, remove two existing windows facing Laguna Street and replace with windows to match existing, replace entry door, add one new window, and remove a window.)

**(Final approval of the project is requested.)**

**1) Final approval of architecture with the following conditions:** a) Remove the vertical mullion bar at door; b) simplify the light fixture; and c) staff is to verify changes. **2) Final approval of Landscape Plan.**

### **REVIEW AFTER FINAL**

- B. 421 E FIGUEROA ST R-3 Zone  
 Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-173-017  
 Application Number: MST2006-00050  
 Owner: J. Allen Zimmer  
 Applicant: Allen Zimmer  
 (Proposal to remodel an existing adobe residence, and construct two new detached single family residences and convert to condominiums.)

**(Review after final of removal of proposed second floor window of Unit "A".)**

**Final approval of Review After Final as submitted.**

### **NEW ITEM**

- C. 906 W MISSION ST R-1 Zone  
 Assessor's Parcel Number: 043-073-012  
 Application Number: MST2007-00196  
 Owner: Pini Dario  
 Architect: Bryan Murphy  
 (This structure is on the City's Potential Historic Resources List. Proposal to paint the exterior of an existing Victorian duplex and detached duplex to the rear of the parcel, which is outside of El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District.)

**Continued two weeks.**

### **NEW ITEM**

- D. 925 DE LA VINA ST C-2 Zone  
 Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-312-003  
 Application Number: MST2007-00206  
 Owner: Amita Limited, LLC  
 Architect: Lenvik and Minor Architects  
 (This is a City Landmark: "Former Knights of Columbus Hall (and former Saint Vincent's School building)" and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Proposal to remove existing shingle roof and replace with GAF asphalt Grand Slate, Essex Green.)

**(PROJECT REQUIRES HISTORIC RESOURCE FINDINGS AND FINDINGS FOR ALTERATIONS TO A CITY LANDMARK.)**

**Final approval as submitted and the following findings are made: 1) Historic Resource Findings:** The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. **2) Alterations to a City Landmark Findings:** The exterior alterations are being made primarily for the purposes of restoring the landmark to its original appearance or in order to substantially aid in the preservation or enhancement of the Landmark.

### **REVIEW AFTER FINAL**

E. 1900 LASUEN RD R-2/4.0/R-H Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 019-170-022  
 Application Number: MST2005-00490  
 Owner: Orient Express Hotels  
 Applicant: El Encanto, Inc.  
 Agent: Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services  
 Architect: Henry Lenny  
 Business Name: El Encanto Hotel

(This is a Structure of Merit. Proposal to review the Master Plan for the El Encanto Hotel. The planned revisions to the site include relocating cottages, adding new cottages, new landscaping, parking additions and improvements and expansion of the main hotel structure. This portion of the work is Phase II and includes the main building, relocation of the swimming pool, the west parking lot, the historic arbor, and units 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29. Review of additional phases will follow. Phase I of the project (MST99-00305) is complete.)

**(Review after final of the following items: added patio enclosure and new door on the north elevation of Cottage 13 of Group I; and, addition of handrails along the pathway ramp at the Main Building of Group B.)**

**(PROJECT REQUIRES HISTORIC RESOURCE FINDINGS AND COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 057-04.)**

**1) *Patio enclosure and new door addition:* Final approval of Review After Final with minor changes and the following Historic Resource Findings are made:** The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. **2) *Handrail addition:* Revised handrail design as noted on plans.** Staff shall verify change.



**REVIEW AFTER FINAL**

F. 1900 LASUEN RD R-2/4.0/R-H Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 019-170-022  
Application Number: MST2005-00490  
Owner: Orient Express Hotels  
Applicant: El Encanto, Inc.  
Agent: Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services  
Architect: Henry Lenny  
Business Name: El Encanto Hotel

(This is a Structure of Merit. Proposal to review the Master Plan for the El Encanto Hotel. The planned revisions to the site include relocating cottages, adding new cottages, new landscaping, parking additions and improvements and expansion of the main hotel structure. This portion of the work is Phase II and includes the main building, relocation of the swimming pool, the west parking lot, the historic arbor, and units 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29. Review of additional phases will follow. Phase I of the project (MST99-00305) is complete.)

**(Review after final of various tree relocations for Groups C, H, and I to comply with High Fire Landscape Guidelines.)**

**(PROJECT REQUIRES HISTORIC RESOURCE FINDINGS AND COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 057-04.)**

**Final approval of Review After Final and the following Historic Resource Findings are made:** The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.

**\*\* MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:03 P.M. \*\***