



# City of Santa Barbara

## Planning Division

### ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW MINUTES

**Monday, June 19, 2006**

**David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street**

**3:08 P.M.**

**BOARD MEMBERS:**

BRUCE BARTLETT, Chair, Present  
 JAMES LECRON, Vice-Chair, Absent  
 CHRISTOPHER MANSON-HING, Present  
 GARY MOSEL, Present  
 RANDY MUDGE, Present  
 LAURIE ROMANO, Present  
 DAWN SHERRY, Present  
 MARK WIENKE, Present

**CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:**

GRANT HOUSE, Present

**PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:**

STELLA LARSON

**STAFF:**

JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor, Present from 3:08 p.m. to 4:10p.m., and 8:27 p.m. to 10:07 p.m.  
 KELLY BRODISON, Planning Technician  
 GLORIA SHAFER, Commission Secretary

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

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

**PLEASE BE ADVISED**

- 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 Architectural Board of Review (ABR) agenda. In order to reschedule the item for review, a rescheduling fee will be paid and the applicant must fill out and file a Supplemental Application Form at 630 Garden Street (Community Development Department) in addition to submitting appropriate plans.
- All approvals made by the ABR are based on compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 22.68 and with adopted ABR guidelines. Some agenda items have received a mailed notice and are subject to a public hearing.
- The ABR 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.
- The Board may refer items to the Consent Calendar for Preliminary and Final Architectural Board of Review approval.
- Preliminary and Final Architectural Board of Review approval is valid for one year from the date of the approval unless a time extension or Building Permit has been granted.
- **Items before the Board 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 Board 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 Kelly Brodison, 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:**

1. That on June 15, 2006 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](http://www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov).
2. This regular meeting of the Architectural Board of Review will be broadcast live and rebroadcast in its entirety on Wednesday at 8:00 a.m. on Channel 18.

**GENERAL BUSINESS:**

## A. Public Comment:

Any member of the public may address the Architectural Board of Review 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 Architectural Board of Review meeting of June 12, 2006.

Motion: Approval of the minutes of the Architectural Board of Review meeting of June 12, 2006, with corrections.

Action: Manson-Hing/Sherry, 6/0/1. Wienke abstained.

## C. Consent Calendar.

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar. The Consent Calendar was reviewed by Bruce Bartlett.

Action: Manson-Hing/Romano, 7/0/0.

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

## 1. Mr. Limón made the following comments:

- a) Mr. Limón clarified that information concerning site visits FAR was not forwarded in error.
- b) Mr. Limón announced that the Appeal of 559 Ricardo Avenue will be presented to Council on July 11, 2006. Mr. Limón requested that a representative of the ABR attend the hearing.

2. Chair Bartlett announced that he will step down from Item # 1.

3. Board Member Romano announced that she will step down from Item # 6.

4. Board Member Mosel announced that he will not attend the ABR meetings on July 3 and July 11, 2006.

## E. Subcommittee Reports.

No subcommittee reports.

## F. Possible Ordinance Violations.

No reported violations

**CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM****1. 1122 N MILPAS ST**

A-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-110-023  
Application Number: MST2006-00334  
Owner: County of Santa Barbara  
Architect: Steve Carter

(This is a courtesy review for a Santa Barbara County project at the Santa Barbara Bowl concert arena. The proposal consists of upgrades to the landscape, revisions to the hardscape and the addition of water features, upgrading site lighting, a new entry gate structure, and a complete new storm drain system.)

**(THIS IS A COURTESY REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR THE "GROVE" FOR THE SANTA BARBARA BOWL CONCERT ARENA.)**

(3:20)

Steve Carter, Architect DesignARC; Susan Van Atta, Van Atta and Associates; Eric Lassen, Santa Barbara Bowl Foundation, and Karen McConaghy, present.

Motion: The Board made the following comments: 1) The overall concept is supported by the Board. 2) The use of water element and pathway elements are assets to project. 3) Restudy the entry area as its size relates to the number of pedestrian entering and exiting the area. Consider widen of the sidewalk stairs leading into the center area as a gesture to use center area as the cueing indoor focus and then splitting off. 4) Install gates that have a quality designed in keeping with the Bowl. 5) Designs of the pathway and edges, retaining walls, fountain, seating area and retaining walls should be as natural and rustic as possible. To prevent safety hazards, the gate openings are to be adequately tucked into the wall system. 6) To prevent an overdeveloped look, emphasize the landscape and reduce emphasis on hardscape. 8) Built elements are to be understated. 9) Minimize retaining wall heights.

Action: Manson-Hing/Sherry 6/0/0. Bartlett stepped down.

**CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM****2. 1115 QUINIENTOS ST**

R-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 017-141-014  
Application Number: MST2005-00609  
Owner: Jaime and Robin Melgoza  
Agent: Justin Van Mullem  
Architect: Keith Nolan

(Proposal to construct three detached two-story condominium units totaling 5,823 square feet with three attached two-car garages totaling 1,377 square feet on an 11,275 square foot vacant lot. Two additional uncovered parking spaces are proposed.)

**(Third Concept Review.)**

**(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL OF A TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP FOR CONDOMINIUMS.)**

(4:10)

Justin Van Mullem, Agent; Keith Nolan, Architect, present.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Staff Hearing Officer, and return to the Full Board with the following comments: 1) The site plan for the infill is appropriately scaled for the neighborhood, presenting a narrow building frontage to streets, and provides a full-width single-story covered porch. 2) The Craftsman style of Buildings A and B are successful. Provide similar Craftsman style on the Building C. 3) Restudy the detailing of the porch railing of Building. A. 4) The west facing gable roof on Building A appears to be more massive and out of style with the Dutch-gabled roof. Restudy to lower the roof and chimney height. Restudy the gable end vent on the south street elevation of Unit A. 5) Use carriage doors throughout the project. 6) The proposed driveway entry elements are good identifiers for the project. 7) Provide a landscape plan.

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

**CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING**

**3. 565 YANKEE FARM RD**

A-1/SD-3 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 047-030-005  
Application Number: MST2005-00759  
Applicant: Nils Hammerbeck  
Owner: Honuakai LLC

(Proposal for a new 6,304 three-story single-family residence, a 1,300 square foot attached garage, and a 500 square foot detached accessory structure. The existing 2,773 square foot single-family residence on the 3.51 acre lot will be demolished. Cut and fill grading will be balanced on-site. This project requires approval of a Coastal Development Permit. A Modification is requested for the garage to exceed 750 square feet.)

**(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL OF NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FINDINGS.)**

(4:38)

Nils Hammerbeck, Agent and Designer; and Andreas Von Blotnitz, Client, present.

Public comment opened at 5:01 p.m.

Ms. Brodison, Planning Technician, summarized letters or emails submitted by the residents expressing their concern of the proposed project's non-conformance with NPO, neighborhood size, bulk, character incompatibility, scale, driveway, motor court grading, visibility, accessibility, design issues, location on ridge, drainage, erosion, and hillside stabilization problems. The residents request installation of third-story poles. Letters were submitted by following residents: Bill Cooper, agent for Tony and Mary Sences; Jana Young; Lori Rafferty; Robert and Margaret Nichaus; Jean Schuyler; Patricia Foley; Mark Fell; Norma Young; Patricia Marquart.

Mr. Bill Cooper, Agent for Tony and Mary Sences. Mr. Cooper relayed comments and concerns to the Board. Concern regarding the loss of privacy, the amount of paving at the motor court, hazardous access to property, a request for story poles installation, and the house should be located in the middle of the site to minimize grading quantities and to shield it from neighboring properties.

Ms. Patricia Foley, neighbor, expressed concern regarding the mass, bulk, size and scale of the proposed project's effect on the existing rural neighborhood.

Mr. Gill Barry, neighbor, expressed concern regarding the amount of opposition to the proposed project's non-conformance with the General Plan, NPO, and Hillside Design Guidelines.

Public comment closed at 5:17 p.m.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Full Board with the following comments:  
1) The Board will conduct an organized site visit with the applicant. The applicant shall stake major corners of structure with one and two-story poles. 2) The majority of the Board is comfortable with relocation of the building pad to the proposed location. 3) The majority of the Board is concerned with the amount and location of the proposed fill after excavation has occurred. The grade as depicted is not in keeping with the natural topography. Work toward concept grading plans to accompany the submittal. 4) The radial design is creative and inspired; however, soften some of the projecting wings. 5) The roof slopes run against the natural topography which is not in keeping with good hillside design. 6) Eliminate the third story wall plane that faces south by manipulating the top floor. There is concern about the amount of hardscape and impacts that the large motor court is having on the proposed location of the residence. 7) The Board is looking for permeable paving and natural materials to ground the house. 8) The landscape should appear natural, and should create a buffer between the proposed residence and neighboring properties. 9) Refine the Fire Department access to minimize the amount of hardscape required. 10) Provide natural tones in color and materials so that the project does not stand out on the natural hillside. 11) Provide more complete documentation with elevations roof plan and 3-D modeling. 12) Provide context photo documentation of neighboring properties.

Action: Mosel/Mudge, 7/0/0.

\*\*\*\*\* **THE BOARD RECESSED FROM 6:13 P.M. UNTIL 6:36 P.M.** \*\*\*\*\*

**CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING****4. 832 ORANGE AVE**

R-3 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 037-024-002  
Application Number: MST2005-00657  
Owner: Lorenzo & Maria Martinez  
Applicant: Manuel Contreras

(Proposal to demolish a 789 square foot residence and existing garage on a lot where two units currently exist. A new unit is proposed to be attached to the remaining 933 square foot unit to create a two-story, 3,344 square foot duplex, with a 406 square foot attached two-car garage. Two covered and two uncovered parking spaces are proposed. A Modification is requested to allow one uncovered parking space to encroach into the required interior yard setback.)

**(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND STAFF HEARING OFFICER APPROVAL FOR A MODIFICATION.)**

(6:35)

Caesar Cruz, Designer; and Manuel Contreras, Contractor, present.

Kelly Brodison, Planning Technician, provided the Board with the Historic Landmark Commission's motion and comments regarding this project.

Ms. Brodison informed the Board that, as part of the Environmental Assessment in order to mitigate potential freeway noise, staff is requiring a fence or wall along the property line and along the front.

Public comment opened/closed at 6:43 p.m.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Full Board with the following comments: 1) The program of the two-story second unit dwarfs the single-family residence. 2) The Board finds that the proposed parking modification for the uncovered parking is not supportable. The Board would be in favor of a modification for a side yard encroachment with the garage structure to provide pedestrian access from the alley to the second unit. 3) The Board is concerned with the long side elevations which are in plane with the existing residence. Offset the 6-foot side setback to distinguish the new constructed unit from the existing residence. Study more modulation, especially on the long facades. 4) The Board does not support the cantilever on the northwest side. 5) Restudy the modified garage configuration. 6) The Board finds that the second unit entry needs to be more apparent. 7) Provide accurate drawings to reflect existing conditions. 8) The new unit is to match in materials the exposure of the lap siding of the existing residence. 9) Roof treatment should be in keeping with the original style. 10) Board seeks resolution of pedestrian circulation especially through the open yard space of the rear unit. 11) Locate trash and recycling outside of interior setback.

Action: Mosel/Wienke 7/0/0.

**CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING****5. 1420 ALAMEDA PADRE SERRA**

E-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 019-193-011  
Application Number: MST2006-00292  
Owner: Jo Ann Sutton  
Owner: Larry Smith  
Architect: Kurt Magness

(Proposal to construct an attached 470 square foot garage and convert the existing attached 283 square foot garage into living space. The one-story 3,314 square foot single-family residence is located on a 21,814 square foot lot in the Hillside Design District. A Modification is requested to allow the new garage to encroach into the interior yard setback.)

**(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FINDINGS AND STAFF HEARING OFFICER APPROVAL FOR A MODIFICATION.)**

(7:08)

Kirk Magness, Architect, present.

Public comment opened at 7:17 p.m.

Chair Bartlett member read a letter submitted from Ms. Collier, neighbor, which expressed concern regarding large size, aesthetics, incompatibility, privacy, encroachment, and design issues of the proposed project.

Public comment closed at 7:18 p.m.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Staff Hearing Officer, then return to Consent Calendar for Modification. 1) The proposed structure supportable as it will sit below natural grade and be tucked into the land occupying an area that is currently being used as parking. 2) Install high quality garage doors facing the street. 3) Add landscape pocket(s) to the area southeast edge of the garage and along the driveway edge to soften the hardscape area. 4) Restudy the roof plan so red tile roof is used as much as possible and integrated into existing roof.

Action: Manson-Hing/Romano, 7/0/0.



**CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING****6. 2550 TREASURE DR**

E-3/SD-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 051-330-003  
Application Number: MST2003-00707  
Owner: Samarkand of Santa Barbara Inc.  
Architect: Todd Kilburn  
Applicant: Isaac Romero

(Proposal for a Samarkand Master Plan for future development. The changes consist of the demolition of nine existing multi-residential buildings containing 45 units along the eastern property line and replacing them with five new residential buildings containing 64 new units. The project includes a new 91 space underground parking structure, alterations to existing access road, and a new driveway from Tallant Road. The resulting project will gain 19 new units, and 100 new parking spaces.)

**(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT.)**

(7:25)

Issac Romero, Applicant; Ken M, Administrator; Tod Kilburn Architect; Ted Kilburn, Architect; Bob Cunningham, present.

Public comment opened 7:51 p.m.

Chair Bartlet read a letter from Francis Green, resident. Ms. Green approves of the project with the condition that Tallant Road be widened.

Public comment closed 7:52.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to Development Application Review Team (DART), overall review by the Planning Commission, and return to Full Board. 1) Board finds the overall site planning to be in harmony with the existing Samarkand facility. 2) The Board is concerned about the location of the East View building particularly as it abuts the southerly single-family zoned properties. Applicant shall provide additional setback or sections and site photo documentation to clarify that area. 3) The Board is concerned with vehicular circulation, especially at the proposed Oak View garage and the new driveway curb cut near the sharp curve on Tallant Road. 4) The Board is concerned with structures that might be proposed on slopes that are in excess of 30 percent. Applicant shall provide site sections. 5) There are serious safety and aesthetic concerns with the proposed entry to the garage in its current figuration. 6) Provide site sections cut through the Oak View building, across Tallant Road, to the neighbors beyond to enable the board to better understand the relationships of the topography, and the nature of the existing landscapes that are to remain. 7) Restudy the steepness of the proposed roof-pitch in the hope of reducing building mass (as some buildings appear to be nearing the 30-foot height limit).

Action: Manson-Hing/Wienke 6/0/0. Romano stepped down.

**DISCUSSION ITEM****7. SINGLE FAMILY DESIGN GUIDELINES/NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE (SFDG/NPO) DRAFT UPDATE**

Staff: Heather Baker, Project Planner, and Jaime Limón, Senior Planner.

(This is second review with comments and request for final adoption recommendation to City Council of the Single Family Design Guidelines/Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance (SFDG/NPO) Draft Update Package.)

**(Second Review)**

Heather Baker, Project Planner, provided a recap of the May 22, 2006, Architectural Board of Review, the May 31, 2006, Historic landmarks Commission (HLC), and the June 1<sup>st</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 15<sup>th</sup>, 2006, Planning Commission (PC) meetings. Ms. Baker stated that the next step is for the NPO Update to be presented to City Council. Jaime Limón, Senior Planner, was also available to answer questions and provide clarification to the Board.

The HLC suggests the 20 closest homes analysis include photographs. The PC posed a new Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) standard for second stories of .1 to .15 for consideration.

Public comment opened at 8:40 p.m.

Mr. John Devore, resident, spoke in favor of FARs as regulations.

Ms. Kathy Camman, League of Women Voters, spoke in support of FARs limiting the size of single-family home additions.

Mr. Paul Dernati, resident and representative of the Citizen's South Coast Land Use Committee, expressed support of FARs in providing direction to applicants and architects.

Public comment closed at 8:52 p.m.

**(RECOMMENDATIONS TO CITY COUNCIL FOR REVIEW.)**

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

1. (Q) Is the idea for second story FARs an overlay in addition to the FARs? (R) The Planning Commission indicated that there appeared to be a concentration of problems associated with large second stories and this would be one way to limit those second stories. Rather than focus on the entire lot, the focus could be on the second stories. This could be either a standard or as a guideline, and would make the most sense combined with whole lot FARs.
2. (Q) Which projects would come to ABR? (R) All two-story homes would come to ABR. Currently there are some projects that do not come to the ABR due to the NPO question #13 which allow exemption of the house if it were designed in certain ways. The proposal is to eliminate those exceptions. A recommendation has made to allow other types of projects to follow design standards that staff could administratively approve. One of the concepts is to have second story additions under 500 sq. ft. potentially eligible for zoning required administrative approval with specific design standards.

3. (Q) Is the 1,250 sq. ft. zoning required minimum outdoor open space still going to be in the NPO? (R) That is a zoning standard that will not change. Also, a concept is included whereby going over 4,000 sq. ft. on a one story structure will trigger Design Review and some Green Building design standards.
4. (Q) If part of a house was originally built over the setback line does that trigger coming to ABR for a modification to the addition? (R) No, modifications do not automatically trigger Design Review.
5. (Q) Your idea is that we consider a limit for the second story FAR and guidelines for the total FAR as being more of a middle road position, with the limit focused where it is needed on the upper level? (R) Yes, that is a possible recommendation that ABR can make.
6. (C) A situation is likely to occur where in order to avoid coming to ABR, people are going to begin keeping one-stories and moving parking garages to the front. We will begin seeing a large number of front loaded drives similar to the 218 El Monte example shown. Another concern is that once there is an established maximum home size, people are going to feel entitled to that maximum. There is a tendency for photos provided to the Board to be taken with cameras with wide angle lens causing everything to look smaller and farther back. (R) Avoiding all disputes is not possible, but improving the system to avoid them is possible.
7. (Q) Does staff really feel that a specific FAR number will reduce the number of disputes? (R) Staff believes that there could be a new tool implemented that gives the neighborhoods an expectation of what the ABR's range of approvability is. The neighborhoods will be aware that there are standards in place. This also helps in the pre-design to advise the applicant on what size of home they are initially proposing. It gives the applicant the ability to invest in a design that is closer to what you are looking for in size.
8. (C) Having an FAR number does not mean that the design and result will be satisfactory. (R) There will always be good and bad design, but the neighborhoods seem to be more concerned with large design mistakes. It is important to remember that the NPO findings still have to be made. If it is poorly designed the ABR does not have to give approval. The idea is that the ABR is not having initially to review so many very large projects that are obviously not compatible. The neighbors will still have a say in design issues.
9. (Q) At the last presentation, staff recommended 10,000 sq. ft. lot, now the number is 15,000 sq. ft. (R) The published draft states 10,000; however, it was mentioned that staff had revised their opinion and recommends up to 15,000.
10. (C) Proposals over the maximum are still allowed; requiring site visits, a super majority vote, and a twenty closest homes analysis. That seems like a lot more work for the ABR. (R) The concept as discussed by the NPO Steering Committee was to attempt to make the exceptions to the 100% maximum FAR rare.
11. (C) Would it be possible to have the site visits on a delay so that the ABR could visit them together by bus every other month? (R) One of the difficult challenges is to predict how many of these will come in; the submittal standards are not very easy. It would be necessary to check with the City Attorney to determine whether there would be any potential problems with grouping the site visits into a monthly or bi-monthly meeting.
12. (Q) How does restricting single-family homes while allowing condos to be maximized help neighborhood preservation? (R) In the R3 and R4 zones that is an important concept to think about. As proposed, the FAR standard would apply if the project has 2 single-family homes adjacent. In this case, the neighborhood is still "in transition" and it would be important for the size to be respectful of the existing homes.
13. (Q) How long will it take staff to create the data base that will be relied on? (R) The data base will grow over time.

14. (Q) Isn't there some discrepancy with the County records? (R) The County records are not 100% accurate. There can be some differences in totals if the figure is a gross or a net figure. The figures provide a general range of historic development patterns.
15. (Q) Benefits below 85%? (R) There are not as many submittal requirements below 85%. The fees go up significantly for over 100% maximum FAR proposals.
16. (Q) Why is there a requirement for 3-D drawings over the 85% of maximum mark? (R) We want the Architectural Board of Review and neighbors to have additional information for projects which can have significant effects on neighborhoods.
17. (Q) If the Board can be trusted with design decisions and design tools, why can't we be trusted with a size tool before it has to become an ordinance? (R) The question that staff will pose to Council is whether they prefer to give boards some ability to make decisions with guidelines or should we enact strict ordinance standards and see whether they work or not.
18. (Q) The Board is interested in having the same organized site visits that Planning Commission had. (R) It would seem that a site visits is not necessary. The Board was previously supportive of the Steering Committees work on the FAR numbers. The ABR is more familiar with the projects than the PC was. A site visit to evaluate the new second floor .1 to .15 FAR limit proposed by PC would be appropriate.

Motion: To support the FAR chart as guideline in lieu of ordinance standard.

Action: Sherry/Manson-Hing, 5/2/0. Mosel/Mudge opposed.

Motion: The Board will not consider a second-story FAR.

Action: Mudge/Manson-Hing, 6/1/0. Mosel opposed.

Motion: For projects in excess of 100% of the maximum FAR a super majority (66%) vote of those appointed to the Board is required, as well as a site visit.

Action: Mudge/Sherry, 7/0/0.

Motion: Recommend to City Council that the ABR consider conducting consolidated site visits, and Board compensation for site visits to projects over 100% of the maximum FAR.

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

Motion: Recommend City Council adopt SFDG/NPO Update Package with ABR's comments.

Action: Mudge/Sherry, 7/0/0.

**CONSENT CALENDAR****FINAL REVIEW****A. CITYWIDE**

Assessor's Parcel Number: 099-MSC-0PW  
 Application Number: MST2004-00691  
 Owner: City of Santa Barbara

(Caltrans Highway 101 Milpas to Hot Springs/Cabrillo Operational Improvements Project. Project components include: a third southbound land; northbound auxiliary lanes at Cabrillo to Salinas, and Salinas to Milpas; bridge replacement at Sycamore Creek; new undercrossing at Cacique Street between Milpas and Alisos; various interchange and ramp modifications, retaining and soundwall improvements; and landscape improvements. Additional improvements on adjacent surface street connections at Los Patos intersection, Butterfly Lane, Indio Muerto, and Old Coast Highway would also be provided.)

**(Final Approval is requested.)**

Final as noted on plans, with the condition that the applicant is to return to for an in-progress inspection of the sound wall land retaining wall color for Architectural Board of Review approval.

**REVIEW AFTER FINAL****B. 661 LAS ALTURAS RD**

E-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 019-281-005  
 Application Number: MST2004-00812  
 Owner: Richard & Joan Hecht  
 Architect: Dennis Thompson

(Proposal to add 182 square feet to the main level, a new 468 square foot upper level addition to an existing 2,573 square foot single-family residence with an attached 420 square foot garage on a 10,361 square foot lot located in the Hillside Design District. The project will result in a multi-level 3,223 square foot single-family residence with an attached 420 square foot garage. A Zoning Modification is requested for the new addition to encroach into the required front yard setback.)

**(Review After Final for revision to deck from solid roof extension to a wood trellis.)**

Final Approval as submitted for the Review After Final.

**REVIEW APPROVAL AFTER FINAL****C. 602 W ANAPAMU**

P-R Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-151-014  
 Application Number: MST2005-00459  
 Owner: City of Santa Barbara  
 Architect: Doug Reeves

(Remodel for new entry Boys & Girls Club building located in public park. This will result in a net reduction of 48 square feet to the building.)

**(Review After Final for revisions to mechanical plan, addition of trash enclosure and ADA/Van parking space.)**

Final Approval as submitted of Review After Final

**REVIEW AFTER FINAL****D. 324 N ALISOS ST**

R-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-372-029  
Application Number: MST2005-00081  
Owner: Elconin Family Trust 4/15/03  
Agent: Isaac Romero

(Proposal to convert four (4) existing one-story single-family residences to condominium units. 120 square feet in addition to the existing 4,268 square feet is proposed.)

**(PROJECT REQUIRES COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 069-05.)**

**(Review After Final for changes to windows and doors.)**

Administrative Approval of the Review After Final.

**REVIEW AFTER FINAL****E. 130 HARBOR WAY**

HC/SD-3 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 045-250-011  
Application Number: MST2006-00072  
Owner: City of Santa Barbara  
Architect: RJC

(Proposal to install covered trellis at pedestrian entrance from parking lot and to replace approximately 150 square feet of paving.)

**(Review After Final for change to details.)**

Final Approval as Submitted of the Review After Final

**FINAL REVIEW****F. 415 E DE LA GUERRA ST**

C-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-022-008  
Application Number: MST2004-00243  
Owner: Valentino & Edith Ziliotto, Trustees  
Designer: Gina Giannetto

(Proposal to construct a 1,657 square foot residential unit and a 258 square foot garage on a mixed-use site. There is an existing 4,350 square foot mixed-use building consisting of 4,350 square feet of commercial space, two existing residential units totaling 2,755 square feet, and a 400 square foot garage on the site, which are proposed to remain. There are currently 15 uncovered parking spaces on the lot. Modifications are required for parking and setback encroachments along two property lines.)

**(Modification approved on November 30, 2005. Final Approval is requested.)**

Final Approved as Submitted

**CONTINUED ITEM****G. 1242 BEL AIR DR** E-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 049-231-014  
Application Number: MST2005-00834  
Architect: Hugh Twibell  
Owner: Peter Parish

(Proposal for a 362 square foot first -floor addition to an existing 1,944 square foot, one story, single-family residence with an attached 448 square foot 2-car garage. Lot size is 12,775 square feet located in the Hillside Design District. No grading is proposed. A modification is requested for encroachment into the interior setback.)

**(PROJECT REQUIRES NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FINDINGS.)**

**(Modification Approved on March 15, 2006. Final Approval is requested.)**

Final Approval as submitted with the finding that the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance criteria have been met as stated in Subsection 22.68.060 of the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code.

**NEW ITEM****H. 117 A HARBOR WAY** HC/SD-3 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 045-250-011  
Application Number: MST2006-00332  
Owner: City of Santa Barbara  
Applicant: Brian Colgate  
Architect: Pacific Architects  
Contractor: Channel Islands Construction, Inc.

(Proposal to convert the existing building from a bait & tackle shop to a fish market, add a screened platform for refrigeration equipment on the roof and add a water line from the existing stub and remove existing line.)

**(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND COASTAL REVIEW.)**

Preliminary Approved with a one week continuance to the Consent Calendar.

**NEW ITEM****I. 326 S SALINAS ST** C-P Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 017-300-012  
Application Number: MST2006-00356  
Owner: Carlos Alberto Ayala  
Designer: Robert Stamps

(Reinstate prior approval (see MST2004-00057) that expired. Proposal to construct a new 2,200 square foot two-story duplex with an attached 480 square foot two-car garage and a new detached 441 square foot two car garage.)

**(Proposal to reinstate the expired ABR approval.)**

Final Approval as noted on plans.

**FINAL REVIEW****J. 620 W GUTIERREZ ST**

R-4 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 037-180-037  
Application Number: MST2006-00272  
Owner: SB Core Associates, LP  
Applicant: Tectonica Design  
Architect: Wolcott Architecture

(This is a revised proposal. The proposal includes exterior changes to existing apartment building including new exterior paint and light fixtures, new guard rail to existing balconies and staircase (facing street), new roof and 8,010 square feet of new balconies on the second -story facing the interior of the property, new floor finish to the existing balconies. Also, included are new doors and windows to access the proposed balcony.)

**(Final Approval is requested.)**

Continued Indefinitely to the Full Board with the following comments: Indefinite continuance and referred to the Full Board with the comments that the applicant is to provide a site plan that shows the new privacy patio walls, provide a landscape plan showing all changes to the existing landscape plan caused by the new patios and privacy walls, a complete roof plan depicting all proposed skylights, all elevations for all buildings showing all the proposed work including elevations for the buildings where no new work is proposed, show all egress windows, specify sizes of posts and columns for the new balconies, re-study the balcony railing to lessen the number of posts and provide all window and door details.

**CONTINUED ITEM****K. 1130 N MILPAS ST**

E-1/R-3 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-201-004  
Application Number: MST2005-00376  
Owner: Santa Barbara Bowl Foundation  
Agent: Fermina Murray  
Architect: Lori Kari

(Proposed change of use. The project requires Planning Commission approval of a Conditional Use Permit. Proposed future uses (Phase 1) include temporary storage and staging for Santa Barbara Bowl functions. Phase 2 may include relocation of the box office and construction of a grand pedestrian walkway. The existing house, two greenhouses, and one lath house have been demolished. The stone walls and stone steps will remain. This project includes placement of two portable 160 square foot metal storage containers, gravel-surface parking for 5 cars, installation of a fence and landscape screening. The project is located on a 29,644 square foot lot in the Hillside Design District.)

**(Final Approval of the Landscape Plan and proposed fencing is requested.)****(PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT.)**

Final Approval as noted for landscaping and fencing only.



**NEW ITEM****L. 1140 BEL AIR DR** E-1/R-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 043-280-035  
Application Number: MST2006-00358  
Owner: Dolores M. Cheek Trustee

(Proposal for a new 6 foot high, 128 foot long new chain link fence along the property line.)

**(PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FINDINGS.)**

Final Approval as submitted with the finding that the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance criteria have been met as stated in Subsection 22.68.060 of the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code.

**NEW ITEM****M. 934 FELLOWSHIP RD** E-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 041-157-018  
Application Number: MST2006-00359  
Owner: Freeman Trust

(Proposal to abate violations listed in ENF2005-01052 for as-built fence and the relocation of an existing above ground spa outside of the setback. The proposal also includes the addition of a new 8 foot wood privacy fence behind spa, a 8 foot max height chain link fence along the rear property line and the northerly property line and new deck covering.)

**(PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FINDINGS.)**

Final Approval as noted with the finding that the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance criteria have been met as stated in Subsection 22.68.060 of the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code.

\*\*\*\*\* MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:07 P.M. \*\*\*\*\*