



City of Santa Barbara

Planning Division

ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW MINUTES

Monday, April 2, 2007

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street

3:12 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS:

MARK WIENKE, Chair, Present
 CHRISTOPHER MANSON-HING, Vice-Chair, Absent
 CLAY AURELL, Present
 JIM BLAKELEY, Present
 GARY MOSEL, Present
 RANDY MUDGE, Present
 DAWN SHERRY, Present (arrived at 3:26 p.m.)

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:

GRANT HOUSE, Absent

PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:

BRUCE BARTLETT, Absent

STAFF:

JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor, Absent
 HEATHER BAKER, Project Planner, Present (from 3:12 until 3:56 p.m.)
 TONY BOUGHMAN, Planning Technician, Present
 GLORIA SHAFER, Commission Secretary, Present

ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST (See ABR Guidelines & Design Review Submittal Requirements for Details)		
CONCEPT REVIEW	Required	<p><u>Master Application & 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 & 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</u> plans are required <u>at the time of submittal & each time plans are revised.</u></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 & 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.</p> <p><u>Exterior elevations</u> - showing existing & proposed grading where applicable.</p>
	Suggested	<p><u>Site Sections</u> - showing the relationship of the proposed building & 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 & thorough information is recommended to facilitate an efficient review of the project.</p>
PRELIMINARY REVIEW	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 & grading where applicable.</p> <p><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.</p>
	Suggested	<p><u>Color & Material Samples</u> - to be mounted on a board no larger than 8.5" x 14" & 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 & must be complete & accurate.</p>
FINAL & CONSENT	Required	<p>Same as above with the following additions:</p> <p><u>Color & 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 & irrigation plan.</p> <p><u>Consultant/Engineer Plans</u> - electrical, mechanical, structural, & 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 If you have any questions or wish to review the plans, please contact Tony Boughman, 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 March 29, 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.
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.

Motion: Approval of the minutes of the Architectural Board of Review meeting of March 26, 2007, with corrections.

Action: Mosel/Mudge, 5/0/0. (Manson-Hing, Sherry absent.)

C. Consent Calendar.

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar. The Consent Calendar was reviewed by Dawn Sherry with the exception of Item K, reviewed by Randy Mudge.

Action: Blakeley/Mosel, 5/0/0. (Manson-Hing, Sherry absent.)

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

1. Ms. Baker announced that there will be an annual Advisory Group Workshop on Wednesday, April 4th, from 4:30 t 6:30 p.m. in the Faulkner Gallery of the Central Library.
2. Mr. Boughman announced that Board member Manson-Hing will be absent:
3. Board member Blakeley announced that he will leave during the scheduled recess.

E. Subcommittee Reports.

Chair Wienke reported that the Airport Subcommittee met on Wednesday, March 28th. Due to budget constraints the project has gotten smaller. The majority of the Subcommittee agreed that the building appears more refined and is moving in a better direction.

Report from the Joint Architectural Board of Review/Historic Landmarks Commission Design Award Subcommittee on award nominations.

Chair Wienke reported that the Joint Architectural Board of Review/Historic Landmarks Commission Subcommittee met via telephone. The Subcommittee is moving toward two nominations for City Council approval:

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: MST2007-00134
Contractor: Adolfo Cabello
Applicant: Sunukjian and Associates
Owner: County of Santa Barbara
Business Name: Verizon Wireless

(Courtesy review of wireless communication facility for Verizon Wireless, 6 pole mounted panel antennas and new equipment shelter enclosure 25 feet by 40 feet, minor grading, underground conduits for utilities)

(Courtesy review of County Bowl Wireless Facility.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES FINDINGS OF NO ADVERSE VISUAL IMPACTS.)

(3:26)

Present: Jason Sunukjian, Applicant, representing Verizon wireless; Heather Baker, Project Planner.

Motion: To provide the following courtesy review comments:

- 1) The Board likes the use of stone material for the building, and the high quality wood plank doors.
- 2) The Board appreciates the use of multiple short poles with one antenna on each pole, rather than one taller pole.
- 3) The Board is disappointed to see a large number of utility panels attached to exterior of the stone enclosure. The Board recommends looking for ways to screen the utility boxes.
- 4) Some Board members are concerned with the above-ground conduit as shown on the plans.

Action: Mosel/Blakeley, 5/0/0. Motion carried. (Manson-Hing absent; Mudge stepped down.)

**** THE BOARD RECESSED FROM 3:53 P.M. UNTIL 3:56 P.M. ****

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM**2. 521 SANTA BARBARA ST**

C-M Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-201-009
Application Number: MST2007-00008
Owner: David Willows
Architect: Ron Sorgman

(Proposal to demolish and re-build an existing 1,411 square foot two-story single-family residence on a 2,408 square foot lot. The building is proposed to be centered on the site, which results in modification requests for encroachments into the interior yard setbacks. The existing residence was legal non-conforming with no on-site parking and one garage parking space is proposed.)

(Second Concept Review.)

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

(3:56)

Present: Ron Sorgman, Architect.

Public comment opened at 4:03 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Staff Hearing Officer and continued to the Full Board with the following comments:

- 1) The Board finds that the modifications requested for the interior yard setbacks will have no negative aesthetic impacts.
- 2) The Board finds that the modification for the one-car parking garage with one tandem parking space in front of the garage door to be an aesthetic improvement to the previous proposal.
- 3) The applicant is to study eliminating the hip roofs on the two side elevations.
- 4) The applicant is to reduce the pitch of the dormer roofs on the third level so they are below the ridgeline of the roof.
- 5) Coordinate with the Parks & Recreation Department regarding the use of vines on the rear fence.
- 6) Study the columns on the front elevation to provide further articulation.
- 7) The Board is happy with the choice of materials as presented, including the wood windows.
- 8) Provide a color board.
- 9) Coordinate the landscape plan with the site plan and restudy the tree at mid-lot, north property line.
- 10) Consider the front accessibility to the storage area at the north elevation.

Action: Mudge/Aurell, 5/0/0. Motion carried. (Manson-Hing absent. Sherry stepped down.)

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM**3. 40 PINE DR**

E-3/PUD Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 049-100-019
Application Number: MST2004-00676
Owner: Justin and Michelle Pawl
Agent: L and P Consultants
Applicant: Michael Stroh

(Proposal to construct a 412 square foot detached two-car garage for an existing 1,686 square foot single-family residence on a 11,216 square foot parcel. This proposal was part of an earlier project approved at Planning Commission on July 20, 2006: Proposal to merge and resubdivide two existing parcels. One parcel is presently 15' wide & 129.7' long (1,942 SF) and provides access to the second parcel (20,839 SF). Resubdivision would result in 2 parcels, one 11,216 SF and the other 11,565 SF.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES CONFORMANCE TO PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 032-06.)

(4:18)

Present: Michael Stroh, Architect.

Public comment opened at 4:25 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

Motion: Preliminary Approval and continued indefinitely to Consent Calendar with the following comments:

- 1) Show the neighboring oak tree to the west and provide oak protection measures on the landscape plans.
- 2) Show all utilities to be underground, per the Santa Barbara Municipal Code and Planning Commission Resolution No. 032-06.
- 3) Show the trash, recycling, and yard waste to be outside of the setback area.
- 4) The applicant is to enlarge the roof eaves overhang to at least two feet to be more in keeping with the architectural style of the existing house.
- 5) The applicant is to show the existing and proposed driveway on the plans. Minimize the amount of paving and maximize the landscaping on either side of driveway.
- 6) Provide a color board.
- 7) Windows and doors are to match the existing house.
- 8) Provide a landscape plan documenting removal of significant trees from both parcels and mitigation measures for tree removals.

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

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM**4. 1335 MISSION RIDGE RD**

E-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 019-210-005
Application Number: MST2006-00285
Owner: Dario L. Pini
Architect: Bryan Murphy

(Proposal to reinstate approvals and legalize "as-built" additions and sitework for an existing three-story residence. Additions previously approved under expired building permits include 171 square feet on the first floor and 517 square feet on the second floor. Proposed as abatement of other building and zoning violations for "as-built" additions are 94 square feet on the first-floor and 314 square feet of basement additions. The proposed project would result in a 5,490 square foot residence. The existing house is situated almost entirely within the required front yard and a modification is required for the improvements to the structure. Two additions to the front of the house encroach into the public right-of-way, requiring an encroachment permit. The project is located on a 17,043 net square foot lot in the Hillside Design District.)

(Second Concept Review.)

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

(4:34)

Present: Bryan Murphy, Architect; Dario Pini, Owner.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Staff Hearing Officer and return to the Full Board with the following comments:

- 1) The Board finds that the modifications required for the proposed improvements to the existing house, within the front yard setback, are aesthetically acceptable as presented.
- 2) The Board would prefer to see the entire house designed in a cohesive style, possibly including reductions in window sizes, the potential removal of the stained glass windows, potential grounding of fireplaces, and relocation of columns, on the rear elevation, to align with the structural supports above.
- 3) The Board understands and appreciates the "quirkiness" of the design of the house and looks for a design to be played out in the Spanish Mediterranean style.
- 4) The Board is concerned with the parking in the front and looks to staff to advise the applicant, as the parking is an existing condition.
- 5) Document the rear driveway and retaining wall areas on the plans. Some of the walls appear to be deteriorated.

Action: Sherry/Mudge, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Manson-Hing absent.)

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING**5. 133 W MOUNTAIN DR**

A-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 021-061-024
Application Number: MST2007-00070
Owner: James E. Moore
Architect: Jim Armstrong

(Proposal to construct a two-level 4,004 square foot single family residence with a detached 499 square foot accessory art studio building, 440 square foot attached carport, two swimming pools, 170 cubic yards of grading and associated site improvements on a vacant 3 acre lot in the Hillside Design District.)

(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FINDINGS, AND COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 036-01.)

(5:10)

Present: Jim Moore, Owner; Tae Kim, Project Manager.

Public comment opened at 5:24 p.m.

Gary Jenson: in support of the project; however, expressed concern with use of utility road that connects to Coyote Road, and stated that the Planning Commission previously ruled that the access road is not to be used for construction.

Shereef Moharram: expressed concern that it is difficult to determine from the plans the massing of the north elevation. Otherwise is in support of the project.

Public comment closed at 5:31 p.m.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Full Board with the following comments:

- 1) The Board is pleased with the overall size, bulk, and scale of the proposal.
- 2) The Board is happy with the height, being less than 16 foot high, and the overall design style and choice of materials.
- 3) The Board has some concerns with the lack of a front entry, and with the guest parking on the steep driveway. The applicant is to confer with Transportation Planning for an appropriate solution.
- 4) Overall, the Board is happy with the use of sandstone as a base material.
- 5) The Board would prefer to see the sandstone retaining walls at a maximum of 6 feet high and, when needed, to have a stepped retaining walls separated by 5 feet.
- 6) Provide a landscape plan.
- 7) The Board suggests the applicant study a different railing style which is more compatible with the architecture.
- 8) The Board suggests studying the fenestration of the doors and windows, and the placement and proportion of the grid muntins to better accommodate the style of the design.
- 9) Study the carport design. Eliminate the garage door and articulate the side and rear openings with columns or other devices to reduce the scale of the opening.

- 10) The Board finds the proposed accessory building at the south end of the property to be acceptable as presented.
- 11) The Board finds that the terraced wall at the right of the entry, between the master bedroom and pool, needs further study or removal.
- 12) Planning Commission Resolutions pertaining to the architecture and landscape should be reproduced on the plans.
- 13) Study the southern end of the pool for ways to reduce the grading.
- 14) The applicant is encouraged to restudy the Hillside Design Guidelines section of the City's Single Family Residence Design Guidelines.

Action: Mosel/Blakeley, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Manson-Hing absent.)

****** THE BOARD RECESSED FROM 6:05 P.M. UNTIL 6:34 P.M. ******

6. DISCUSSION ITEM

(5:30) UPPER STATE STREET STUDY

Staff: Beatriz Ramirez

(Planning Staff will present the Upper State Street Study and request comments from the ABR on the recommendations of the study.)

(COMMENTS ONLY)

(6:34)

Present: Beatriz Ramirez, Project Planner; John Ledbetter, Principal Planner.

Ms. Ramirez summarized the findings and recommendations of the Draft Upper State Street Study. The study area comprises the areas from Calle Real and Highway 101, East along the State Street corridor to De La Vina and Calle Laureles. Ms. Ramirez stated that due to the large number of proposals for two and three-story buildings, mixed-use buildings, and traffic concerns, Staff was directed by City Council to conduct a focused study using existing policies to determine what could be done to improve both urban and traffic issues. The Board was provided a copy of the draft study and a detailed presentation on the study and recommendations. The Board was requested to provide comments for inclusion in the presentation to Planning Commission on April 12, 2007 and City Council on May 8, 2007. It was also requested that an ABR representative attend the above meeting dates.

Public comment opened at 6:52 p.m.

Peter Hunt, Architect, representing the Santa Barbara chapter of the American Institute of Architecture (AIA). Mr. Hunt summarized comments contained in a letter from the AIA in which City Staff is requested to implement strategies that facilitate Urban rather than Suburban design. Mr. Hunt stated that a small setback for well designed buildings from the right of way would encourage pedestrian traffic and emphasize the urban experience.

Public comment closed at 6:57 p.m.

Board members' comments and questions:

1. Did Staff find any particular sub-area that they felt was perfect in its current condition?

2. When addressing views it is important to consider from where it will be viewed. In good design, it may be that you consider one good design area for a courtyard, plaza, or outdoor seating area from where the view can be seen.
3. The ABR recently reviewed several projects, such as the La Sumida mixed-use project, and the Whole Foods project, located adjacent to two creek fronts. Will it be a problem in the future when the projects have already developed so close to the creek? Is some of this planning too late?
4. When projects come before the ABR, will we be made aware that there are certain elements in the Upper State Street Design Guidelines that should be enforced?
5. Do you anticipate a park being planned for La Cumbre Plaza?
6. Where are the bicycle easement path issues located? Are they located in residential areas?
7. Is it realistic that someone would use a bike path other than State Street.
8. Will there be requirements for modifications spelled out somewhere? Will they be quantifiable? One Board member expressed concern that applicants will attempt to provide a token view in order to receive a modification.
9. Are activity nodes a good idea, won't that create more traffic?
10. There are public gathering spaces in the downtown area, but there are also large parking garages to accommodate them. What has been the discussion to provide parking in the Upper State Street corridor?
11. Please clarify the statement about parking lots creating more congestion.
12. Downtown has four or five streets running parallel to State that are used for circulation. Upper State Street has one. That is a huge contributor to the Upper State Street traffic problem.
13. The Upper State Street Study does not offer much as far as a traffic solution. The study suggests there are four and six lane highways in the Upper State Street area. You would not have cars driving 45 miles per hour down the middle of lower State Street.
14. Has the creation of a second road been studied?
15. From an architectural standpoint, providing a 20 foot setback as opposed to the 10 foot setback provides a sense of place. The loss of larger setbacks might hurt by not allowing for more attractive buildings.
16. Historically the automobile has been prominent. The idea of installing dedicated parking structures is important.
17. There needs to be a vision and guidelines for style of architecture that is going to be supported in the development of Upper State Street. Are the sub-areas to have their distinct styles or should it be one continuous style?

18. Architecture needs to be addressed in addition to view corridors in the Upper State Street. There should be a study of the design in the area and consideration of whether a particular architectural style should be chosen for the area.

Ms. Ramirez responded that one example is the A. G. Edwards. It has a nice entrance that is slanted with the creek at one side. Mr. Ledbetter added that, given the three distinct subareas, there is no one example that fits all. At the far end of the eastern sub-area the parcels are narrow with classic store fronts, located at the back of very wide sidewalks with on-street parking. The Central sub-area is the biggest challenge due to strip-malls, and the western end is characterized by large, deep lots and “campus-like” developments.

Ms. Ramirez responded that there are view opportunities throughout the whole corridor. The corners have magnificent views, and should be considered in an attempt to preserve views. Ms. Ramirez added that applicants of pending projects are aware of the study. For example, the Circuit City project includes balconies that face the creek.

Mr. Ledbetter responded that when projects are presented to the Planning Commission they will have the benefit of the draft study, the recommendations made by the ABR and other Boards. When the projects return for additional ABR review, the projects should have specific conditions spelled out.

Ms. Ramirez stated that staff has met with representatives from La Cumbre Plaza, and they are open to having a public component on the site when their specific plan comes forward. Mr. Ledbetter added that activity nodes will be used to create more pedestrian gathering spaces and will require infrastructure, such as plazas and paseos. This is a longer-range plan, and as areas are redeveloped public spaces would be created where they do not currently exist.

Ms. Ramirez responded that one area that would require an easement is the Monterey Pines Development. There would be easements required for bicyclists to cross through that area. Mr. Ledbetter added that the proposed path is an alternative bike route and is also a walking path.

Ms. Ramirez responded that special findings for modifications would be incorporated into the SD-2 zone Ordinance. The requirements would more likely be general; as it would be difficult to quantify them.

Mr. Ledbetter responded that when the La Cumbre Plaza redevelops there will likely be a below-grade parking structure, and this might also be the case at Loreto Plaza. Transportation Planners have stated that more parking creates more vehicular congestion. The creation of more convenient parking is a policy decision. One of the long term recommendations is to create a parking district allowing centralized parking in that area. Other strategies include encouraging more shared parking within the existing lots and reducing the number of driveways. Mr. Ledbetter added that while the Circulation Element recognizes that the automobile is an important part of our community, we also want to make alternative choices easy and convenient. The only new roads proposed as long term solutions are through La Cumbre Plaza. The other alternatives are bicycle and pedestrian paths, which will not offer relief for the automobile. The direction staff received from City Council was to find primarily short-term solutions that could be accomplished under existing policies. The General Plan update process will provide the opportunity to discuss the larger land use, density, and other city-wide issues.

Mr. Ledbetter responded that there is a mixture of styles along Upper State Street, and further development is needed in the guidelines to identify the specific characteristics in each of the sub-areas. Ms. Ramirez concluded by stating that guidelines for the architecture, colors, etc, will be included in the amendments to the Upper State Street Area Urban Design Guidelines amendment, which is the next phase.

No action required.

CONSENT CALENDAR

CONTINUED ITEM

A. 112 W MICHELTORENA ST R-O Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 027-222-011
Application Number: MST2007-00013
Owner: Caron Miller
Architect: Doug Beard

(Proposal for a 518 square foot remodel and a 27 square foot addition to the unit at the rear of the property and to demolish and replace the existing 400 square foot garage in the same footprint all on a 5,950 square foot lot developed with three residential units. New stairs and a patio at the rear of the property are included in the proposal.)

(Preliminary Approval is requested.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FINDINGS.)

Continued one week to Consent Calendar, with the following comments: 1) Clarify trim and beam details. 2) Provide a water heater enclosure. 3) Explore mitigation measures for removal of the oak tree, consider replacement of an oak tree on a neighboring property.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

B. 1416 DOVER RD E-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 019-103-012
Application Number: MST2005-00821
Owner: Craig and Sharon Madsen
Architect: Tai Yeh

(Proposal to construct a 720 square foot, one-story addition and 340 square feet of new deck to an existing 1,497 square foot, one-story, single family residence with a 440 square foot attached garage. Lot size is 19,166 square feet and is located in the Hillside Design District. No grading is proposed.)

(Review After Final for a smaller addition than originally proposed.)

Final Approval as noted of the Review After Final.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL**C. 27 E COTA ST**

C-M Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 037-132-033
Application Number: MST2003-00777
Owner: The Lyon Building
Architect: Kirk Gradin

(The proposal is separated into two phases. Phase A includes a new stair tower, elevator shaft, facade changes along the west elevation of the one-story loading dock (walls and doors are to be constructed within the existing loading bays), and new windows.)

(Review After Final for new rooftop equipment.)

Final Approval as submitted.

FINAL REVIEW**D. 1011 SAN ROQUE RD**

A-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 055-171-010
Application Number: MST2006-00676
Owner: David and Louise Borgatello Trustees
Architect: Jim Zimmerman

(Proposal for a 1,048 square foot second-story addition for an existing 4,530 square foot one-story single-family residence on a 2.1 acre lot in the Hillside Design District. The proposal includes an addition above the existing attached garage, a stair tower, a 257 square foot covered patio at the second-story, and a trellis over an existing patio.)

Final Approval as noted on the plans, with the comment that the applicant is to provide a "south" elevation drawing.

FINAL REVIEW**E. 710 N MILPAS ST**

C-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-122-034
Application Number: MST2006-00766
Owner: Mateo and Lupe Gastelum Trustees
Architect: Victor Schumacher
Business Name: Cesar's Place

(Proposal for 150 square foot commercial addition to the rear of an existing restaurant on a 7,094 square foot lot. There is also an "as-built" exterior color change.)

Final Approval as noted on the plans, with the comment that the new exterior light fixture is to match the existing fixture on the south side of the building.

FINAL REVIEW**F. 3825 STATE ST E-149**

C-2/SD-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 051-010-014
Application Number: MST2006-00691
Owner: Macerich La Cumbre, LLC
Designer: The Conceptual Motion Company
Business Name: Red Robin Restaurant
Designer: Susan Ciufo

(Proposal for the interior demolition of an existing restaurant and for exterior alterations to include a new awning, new wall fountain, facade remodel, new arcade patio with outdoor restaurant seating and associated rooftop equipment at the existing Red Robin Restaurant at the La Cumbre Plaza. The new tenant will be the Marmalade Cafe.)

Final Approval as submitted.

CONTINUED ITEM**G. 124 W ALAMAR AVE COMMON**

R-4/SD-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 051-430-020
Application Number: MST2007-00101
Owner: Meche Family Trust
Applicant: Vernon Meche

(Proposal to replace wood siding portions of buildings with stucco for a multi-residential property.)

(ACTION MAY BE TAKEN IF SUFFICIENT INFORMATION IS PROVIDED.)

Final Approval as noted on the plans, with the comment that the applicant is to revise the roof fascia detail to eliminate the overhang.

CONTINUED ITEM**H. 1340 CLIFTON ST**

R-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 017-154-018
Application Number: MST2005-00500
Designer: Eric Swenumson
Owner: Richard Golden

(This is a revised project. Proposal to construct a 1,895 square foot three-story single-family residence to include a 610 square foot two-car garage and 94 square feet of covered deck area. The project is on the same 6,067 square foot lot as the existing 1,004 square foot two-story single-family residence with a first floor 440 square foot garage. Modifications are required to allow less than 1,250 square feet of open yard space and for encroachments into the front yard setback.)

(Preliminary Review Hearing.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FINDINGS.)

Continued one week to the Consent Calendar with the following comments: The applicant is to provide details of corbels, a railing detail showing 2"x2" verticals, a detail of new redwood fence, and show a mortared sandstone veneer, tone down the "lemon verbena" color slightly.

NEW ITEM**I. 1832 LOMA ST**

R-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 027-071-013
Application Number: MST2006-00693
Owner: Merrill Reynolds Trust 6/9/04
Applicant: Syndi Souter

(Proposal to construct a new 288 square foot trellis over an existing "as-built" second-story 288 square foot deck and get approval for the as-built deck. The project is attached to an existing 886 square foot two-story single-family residence. Approval is requested for a modification to allow the trellis and deck to encroach into the required front yard.)

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

Continued indefinitely to the Staff Hearing Officer, with the following comments: 1) The applicant is to study additional screening at the column supports; 2) Study incorporation of knee bracing at the new deck-posts to match proposed knee bracing at the upper level trellis; 3) Modification is acceptable because the porch replacement is an aesthetic improvement to the existing residence.

NEW ITEM**J. 680 MIRAMONTE DR**

E-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 035-251-005
Application Number: MST2007-00141
Owner: Michael Richardson
Applicant: Michael Richardson
Architect: Hugh Twibell

(Proposal to replace an existing retaining wall and patio for a single-family residence in the Hillside Design District.)

(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.)

Continued indefinitely to the Staff Hearing Officer, with the following comments: 1) Provide a cross section drawing through the slope illustrating the proposed height of the new retaining wall; 2) Provide a landscape plan that shows the existing vegetation and trees to remain and any proposed supplemental planting that would screen the apparent height of the wall as seen from Miramonte Drive; 3) The proposal appears to be an appropriate solution to the slope stabilization.

NEW ITEM

K. 120 S HOPE E-144

C-2/SD-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 051-010-014
Application Number: MST2007-00130
Owner: Patricia Nettleship Trustee
Owner: Macerich Company
Agent: Rhea North

(Proposal to re-landscape the State Street and Hope Avenue frontages at La Cumbre Plaza.)

(ACTION MAY BE TAKEN IF SUFFICIENT INFORMATION IS PROVIDED.)

Final Approval as submitted of the Landscape Plan.

**** MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:32 P.M. ****