



City of Santa Barbara California

STAFF HEARING OFFICER STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: August 18, 2010
AGENDA DATE: August 25, 2010
PROJECT ADDRESS: 224 W. Micheltorena Street (MST10-00194)
TO: Susan Reardon, Senior Planner, Staff Hearing Officer
FROM: Planning Division, (805) 564-5470
 Renee Brooke, AICP, Senior Planner
 Roxanne Milazzo, Associate Planner

RUB
RM

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 7,000 square foot project site is currently developed with two single family residences. The proposed project involves a 366 square foot second story addition to one of the units. The discretionary application required for the project is a Modification of the required separation between buildings (SBMC §28.21.070).

Date Application Accepted: July 27, 2010

Date Action Required: October 27, 2010

II. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Staff Hearing Officer approve the project, subject to conditions.

III. SITE INFORMATION AND PROJECT STATISTICS

A. SITE INFORMATION

Applicant: Alex Pujo	Property Owner: Kostruba Survivors Trust
Parcel Number: 027-221-017	Lot Area: 7,000 sf
General Plan: 12 Units Per Acre	Zoning: R-4
Existing Use: 2 One-Family Residences	Topography: 5% Slope

Adjacent Land Uses:

North – Multiple Family Residential
 South – Micheltorena Street

East - Multiple Family Residential
 West – Multiple Family Residential

B. PROJECT STATISTICS

	Existing	Proposed
Living Area	Unit A = 1,097 sf Unit B = 894 sf	Unit A = 1,097 sf Unit B + 366 sf = 1,260 sf
Accessory Space	287 sf	287 sf

C. PROPOSED LOT AREA COVERAGE

Building: 2,535 sf 36% Hardscape: 940 sf 14% Landscape: 3,525 sf 50%

IV. DISCUSSION

The project site is currently developed with two single family residences. The units are located within four feet of one another which is non-conforming to the current building separation requirement of 10 feet. Once a second story is added, the required distance between buildings is increased to fifteen feet. In order to meet the purpose and intent of the ordinance, the applicant has designed the proposed second story addition for Unit B (228 W. Micheltorena Street) fifteen feet away from all portions of Unit A (224 W. Micheltorena Street). The design has been reviewed and given favorable comments by the Architectural Board of Review (ABR). It is Staff's position that the placement of the proposed addition provides the separation of the new floor area from the adjacent unit as intended by the Ordinance.

V. FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS

The Staff Hearing Officer finds that the Modification is consistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance and is necessary to secure an appropriate improvement on the lot. The proposed Modification of building separation requirements allows for expansion of Unit B within the existing building footprint. Although the fifteen-foot building separation would not be provided on all floors, the proposed second-story portion would observe the required distance from the adjacent single story residence.

Said approval is subject to conditions that the hedge along the front lot line be reduced to the maximum allowable height of 3 ½', the trampoline and other miscellaneous items be removed from required setbacks, the "as-built" pond and patio cover either be removed or permits be obtained, and that the fence, paving, and portion of the storage room located on the neighboring property to the West, be removed. All conditions must be met prior to issuance of a building permit for this project.

Exhibits:

- A. Site Plan (under separate cover)
- B. Applicant's letter dated July 22, 2010
- C. ABR Minutes

Contact/Case Planner: Roxanne Milazzo, Associate Planner - (rmilazzo@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101 - Phone: (805) 564-5470



PUJO & ASSOCIATES
ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING

735 State Street, Suite 207 • Santa Barbara, CA 93101 • (805) 962-3578 • alex@pujo.net
FAX: (805) 965-1371

July 22, 2010

Susan Reardon, Staff Hearing Officer
Community Development Department
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101

Re: 224 W. Micheltorena, APN 027-221-017, MST 2010-00194
Modification request for encroachment into required building separation.

Dear Ms. Reardon,

We are seeking a modification for a small, 2nd story addition encroaching into the required 15' separation between buildings. This modification is needed to improve this property because of the existing conditions described below.

The property is zoned R-4 and it is located on West Micheltorena Street near the intersection with Bath Street. The parcel is 7,000 sq. ft. and it contains two single-story residences built in the early 1920's. The Kostruba family has owned and lived on this property for over 50 years; the older generation currently lives on one house, the younger generation on the other.

The property appears in City records as "224 W. Micheltorena", although it has two mail addresses (224 and 228) that have been used for almost 80 years. An application for a second address has been filed to clarify that the proposed improvements pertain to the home historically identified as "228 W. Micheltorena".

Existing conditions:

- 224: 3-bedroom, 2-bath residence, 1,146 sf (gross), 1,097 sf (net).
- 228: 2-bedroom, 2-bath residence, 890 sf (gross), 849 sf (net).
- Storage building: 317 sf (gross), 287 sf (net), attached to 228, permitted in 1982 to replace an existing structure.

The neighborhood consists of one- and two-story buildings used as multi-family residences, with few exceptions: a single family residence directly to the west; La Bamba corner market across Micheltorena; and a senior housing complex two parcels to the east. The site has a gentle slope towards the street; at the rear of the lot along the north property line there is a 5' high retaining wall –the neighbor's grade is higher.

Most of the properties in this neighborhood were developed in the 1920's or earlier, and it appears that every one of them contain structures that do not conform to the current zoning ordinance because they lack the required minimum lot area, street frontage, front yard setback, interior yard setbacks, rear yard setback, open yard, off-street parking, or distance between main buildings. Some of these properties do not conform to any one of these requirements. The subject property is non-conforming regarding minimum lot area, interior yard setbacks (east and west), rear yard setback, distance between buildings, and required off-street parking.

The proposed improvement that generates this modification request is a modest, second story addition to the 228 residence: 396 sf (gross), 366 sf (net). Because the parcel does not meet current parking requirements (four spaces) -and it cannot possibly meet that requirement with the existing structures in place- we limited the scope of the addition to less than 50% of the area of the existing residence. The purpose of the project is to provide separate bedrooms for the Kostruba children and two small work areas for their parents –both teachers that spend evenings grading papers. To satisfy these needs in a most efficient manner we are proposing to use a circular staircase for access, and an accordion folding door between bedrooms to create a single, larger space when needed. A small balcony in the north wall will allow furniture delivery to the upper floor.

The required separation between main buildings in the R-4 zone is 10' for one-story and 15' for two-story structures. The current single-story buildings are less than 10' apart (4' at the closest point) and any proposal to add a second story –regardless of where it may be located- increases the requirement to 15'. It should also be noted that the existing structures retain a certain measure of historical significance due to their age and street presence. Their main character-defining elements are the unusual windows projecting in a “V” configuration and the roof dormers facing the street. In consultation with Jake Jacobus, the City Historian, it was agreed that a 2nd story addition should be located in the back in order to retain these features and minimize its visual impact on the streetscape.

In a previous design we proposed an addition squarely over the west, north and east walls of the original house and we met with Modification Officer Roxanne Milazzo to discuss its feasibility. In this scheme, the east wall of the 2nd story was 10' from the west wall of 228. Ms. Milazzo expressed concerns about the 2nd story being too close to the 224 residence. She felt that this proximity could create privacy issues with 224 and the common open yard, and she advised us to pursue a design more in keeping with the requirements of the current ordinance.

Following that advice, we moved the addition 5' to the west in order to maintain the prescribed 15' distance between the addition and the existing structure (224). However, a modification is still required for this project because *the existing first floor of 228 is too close to 224*. This proposal was reviewed by ABR on July 12. ABR was fully supportive of the modification but requested changes to window design and siding material that are now included in the attached plans.

Our proposal consists of a very small expansion to a small house to accommodate the very reasonable needs of a family that lives there. The modification required for this development is internal to the site and it does not affect its neighbors; it is pursued in response to existing site constraints; it retains the Architectural character of the existing structures, and it preserves the existing street ambiance. As far as we know, there is no neighborhood concern generated by this modification request.

Thank you for your assistance in processing this application. Please feel free to call me directly at 962-3578 if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "H. Alexander Pujo". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "H. Alexander" and the last name "Pujo" clearly distinguishable.

H. Alexander Pujo, Architect

c.: Leo & Daniela Kostruba

224 W. MICHELTORENA STREET – ABR MINUTES

July 12, 2010

An opposition letter from Paula Westbury and an email of concerns from Linda Jones were acknowledged by the Board.

Motion: Continued two weeks to Full Board with comments:

- 1) The requested modification has no aesthetic impact on the project.
- 2) Study the window proportion and detailing to be consistent with the original windows of the existing house.
- 3) Study the materiality and use of siding of the upper floor addition to be more consistent with the existing house.
- 4) Compatibility findings could not be made at this time.

Action:Aurell/Gilliland, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Manson-Hing absent).

July 26, 2010

A letter of concern from Paula Westbury was acknowledged by the Board.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to Staff Hearing Officer to return to Consent with comments:

- 1) The Compatibility Analysis is as follows:
 - a. The proposed project complies with the Design Guidelines and is consistent with the City Charter and applicable Municipal Code requirements.
 - b. The project's design is compatible with the City and the architectural character of the neighborhood.
 - c. The project's mass, size, bulk, height, and scale are appropriate for the neighborhood, given compliance with the comments provided here.
 - d. There are no impacts to adjacent City Landmarks, adjacent historic resources or established public views of mountains or ocean.
 - e. The project's design does not block established public views of mountains or ocean.
 - f. The project's design provides an acceptable amount of open space and landscaping.
- 2) The proposed modification poses no aesthetic impact to the proposed project.

Action:Aurell/Zink, 4/0/0. Motion carried. (Mosel/Sherry/Rivera absent).

