



# City of Santa Barbara

## Planning Division

### ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW *REVISED (for Item 2 only)* MINUTES

**Monday, September 28, 2015**      **David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street**      **3:00 P.M.**  
**BOARD MEMBERS:**

KIRK GRADIN – CHAIR (Consent Agenda Representative)  
SCOTT HOPKINS – VICE-CHAIR  
THIEP CUNG  
COURTNEY JANE MILLER (Consent Agenda Landscape Representative)  
STEPHANIE POOLE (Consent Agenda Representative)  
AMY FITZGERALD TRIPP  
WM. HOWARD WITTAUSCH

**CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:**      DALE FRANCISCO  
**PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:**      JOHN CAMPANELLA  
**PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON (Alternate):**      SHEILA LODGE

**STAFF:**      JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor  
                 SUSAN GANTZ, Planning Technician  
                 KATHLEEN GOO, Commission Secretary

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

An archived video copy of this regular meeting of the Architectural Board of Review is viewable on computers with high speed internet access on the City website at [www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov/ABRVideos](http://www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov/ABRVideos).

#### **CALL TO ORDER:**

The Full Board meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Gradin.

#### **ATTENDANCE:**

Members present:      Gradin, Hopkins, Miller, Poole, Tripp, Wittausch, and Cung (present at 3:18 until 6:08 p.m.).  
Members absent:      None.  
Staff present:      Gantz, Limón (present until 4:00 p.m.), and Goo.

#### **GENERAL BUSINESS:**

##### **A.      Public Comment:**

Christopher Manson-Hing reminded the Board about the upcoming annual American Institute of Architects—Santa Barbara Chapter (ArchitecTours) held this Saturday, October 3, 2015, presenting the examples of the “Architecture with a Story” theme featuring nine projects with intriguing personal stories of the design obstacles encountered during the processing and building phases, which can be viewed on the ArchitecTours website, [www.aiasb.com](http://www.aiasb.com), where tickets are also available to interested parties.

##### **B.      Approval of Minutes:**

Motion:      Approval of the minutes of the Architectural Board of Review meeting of **September 14, 2015**, as amended.  
Action:      Poole/Miller, 5/0/1. Motion carried. (Tripp abstained, Cung absent).

##### **C.      Consent Calendars:**

Motion:      Ratify the Consent Calendar of **September 21, 2015**. The Consent Calendar was reviewed by **Poole and Miller**.  
Action:      Poole/Miller, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Cung absent).

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **September 28, 2015**. The Consent Calendar was reviewed by **Poole and Miller**.

Action: Poole/Hopkins, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Cung absent).

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

1) Ms. Gantz made the following announcements:

- a) Board Member Miller announced that she will be stepping down on Item #2, 6100 Hollister Ave.
- b) The Project Design Approval of the project at 806 Alberta Avenue has been appealed to the City Council. That appeal will be heard on Tuesday, November 17<sup>th</sup>. Staff will need someone to represent the ABR at that hearing. The maker of the motion was Board Member Wittausch and the seconder of the motion was Board Member Poole, with Chair Gradin and Board Member Tripp absent. The approval was unanimous. Board Member Wittausch will represent the Board at the November 17<sup>th</sup> City Council appeal hearing.
- c) The Project Design Approval of the project at 521 Chiquita Road has been appealed to the City Council. The date for that appeal has not yet been set. Staff will need someone to represent the ABR at that hearing. The maker of the motion was Board Member Hopkins and the seconder of the motion was Board Member Wittausch, with Board Members Cung and Tripp absent. The approval was unanimous. Board Member Hopkins will represent the Board at City Council appeal hearing when it is eventually scheduled. Staff will remind the Board when that appeal hearing is scheduled.
- d) Staff requested an ABR attend the Planning Commission hearing this Thursday, October 1<sup>st</sup> for the project at 15 S. Hope Avenue. The Board member representing the ABR would summarize the action taken in today's hearing for this project. The Planning Commission meeting begins at 1:00 p.m., and this item will be second on the agenda. Board Member Wittausch will represent the Board at Thursday's October 1<sup>st</sup> Planning Commission appeal hearing.

E. Subcommittee Reports.

Member Hopkins reported on today's prior 2:00 p.m., Southern California Gas Advanced Meter Subcommittee meeting concerning proposed remote-location meters on poles at four sites where two sites were approved and two others proposed in sensitive site locations. Other Board members were welcome to join a site visit scheduled for September 29, 2015, at 10:00 a.m., to review the two proposed sensitive site locations.

## DISCUSSION ITEM

### 1. **ABR MEETING AND DISCUSSION PROTOCOL**

(3:15) Staff: Jaime Limón, Senior Planner.

Actual time: 3:21 p.m.

Mr. Limón addressed concerns regarding how Design Review staff create agendas and set the length of review times for each agenda item for more efficient use of the Board's time. Topics covered included staff's advice and recommendations on the basic protocol of board meetings, analysis of agenda items, time management rules, time allocations of agenda items, time management goals, concept comments, and options and findings for project denials. Some considerations that staff factor in when allocating time to a proposed project include size and type of projects, and anticipated amount of public interest and public speaker comment, which can be difficult to predict. The Board's initial Concept Review of projects should concern the "broad issues" of site planning and the relationship to the site and neighborhood using the Compatibility Analysis and Guideline Consistency Check. The Board's Conceptual Analysis of projects should cover issues such as: project size, bulk and scale, height and number of stories, compatibility, site design, building footprints, circulation and parking locations (using Guideline consistency), architectural style and compatibility, and project impacts derived from public comments. The Board should take sufficient review time, ask for either visual or context studies or modeling, and request more information

if needed. Concerning project denials, at the first level the Board should indicate why a project is deemed unacceptable or unsupportable and provide direction on how to revise the project. Staff prefers this step so the applicant is allowed to continue the review process by following the Board's direction. Applicants may request a project denial to pursue their appeal rights of the Board's decision. If a project is denied, the Board must make findings explaining the basis for why a project is being denied. The applicant cannot re-file an application for the same project for one full calendar year. "Denials without prejudice" is a legal term that allows the applicant to continue the review process and revise the project and/or find other or slightly different alternative solutions.

Staff recommends that the Board provide concise and clear direction to applicants, recognize public comments, provide a brief basis for comments, respect different perspectives, be fair, consistent, and helpful, and ultimately make good motions based on findings and rational decisions.

#### Board Comments:

- 1) Chair Gradin requested that a statement be included on the posted agenda that states the maximum presentation time for applicants is limited to one-third of the constraint time set for each project.
- 2) Chair Gradin and some Board members requested that Power Point presentations be severely limited since they take up an inordinate amount of the Board's time and are a distraction to the Board from the actual submitted plans and drawings available to the public; requested 3-D modeling being the exception. Staff has made efforts to request advance scans of plans and drawings from applicants, but are hampered by architectural firms' proprietary claims of plans and drawings.
- 3) Board Member Miller suggested the applicant be simply made aware that the Board will concentrate on the submitted plan sets, drawings, and/or photo documentation, and any other time factor such as Power Point presentations shall be up to the applicant to fit within the allotted one-third constraint time set for each project.
- 4) Chair Gradin commented that the standard presentation time of the actual submitted plans often take up most, if not all, the one-third presentation time, and any other visual aids would only detract from that time.
- 5) Board Member Poole, as a possible applicant herself, commented that she understood the need for time limits as part of a Board member's obligation to serve the public as Board representatives.
- 6) Board Member Cung commented that he is frustrated with the length of agenda items and meetings.
- 7) Chair Gradin suggested that he could be available to review agendas to help determine the correct length of agenda items if given the deadlines for agenda posting. Mr. Limón stated that this was previously attempted, but ultimately proved unsuccessful. Staff will increase efforts to accurately set and adhere to set agenda item time constraints.
- 8) Mr. Limón clarified for Board Member Wittausch that review comments from the Board using the language terms such as "some board members," "study" or "restudy" may not provide strong enough direction to the applicant. He advised the Board to be clear regarding unacceptable designs, and/or take straw votes on key decisions when the Board has conflicting opinions in order to develop a clear consensus on a proposed motion. He also clarified that "Concept Reviews" for projects are more fluid and when there is a difference of opinion during review, it is acceptable for the Board and/or staff to bring any issues to the Board's attention prior to the project receiving Project Design Approval.

**CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM****2. 6100 HOLLISTER AV (also 6100 Wallace Becknell Road) A-I-1/SP-6 Zone****(3:30)**

Assessor's Parcel Number: 073-080-065  
Application Number: MST2014-00619  
Owner: City of Santa Barbara - Airport  
Agent: Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services  
Applicant: Direct Relief  
Architect: DMHA

(Proposal to construct a new facility for Direct Relief, a nonprofit organization, including a new 127,706 square foot warehouse with an attached two-story 27,294 square foot administrative office building, a secure truck yard loading area, and 152 parking spaces on a 7.99 acre parcel to be purchased from the City of Santa Barbara Airport. The existing six main buildings and five outbuildings totaling 12,937 square feet would be demolished. A new public road is proposed to be constructed immediately south of the project site, which is located in Sub-area 3 of the Airport Specific Plan (SP-6). The project received a designation as a Community Benefit project and an allocation of 80,000 square feet (and reservation of 30,000 square feet) of non-residential floor area from the Community Benefit category by the City Council. Development Plan approval by the Planning Commission is required.)

**(Second Concept Review. Comments only; requires Environmental Assessment and Planning Commission review. Project was last reviewed on August 3, 2015.)**

Actual time: 4:00 p.m.

Chair Gradin read a statement regarding sole proprietorships exceptions, and Board member presentations: The State Fair Political Practices Act (FPPC) regulation 18704.4(b)(5) states that an official may appear before a design or architectural review committee of which he or she is member to present, explain architectural or engineering drawings which the official has prepared for a client. Ms. Courtney Miller is a sole practitioner and is using this exception understanding certain limits regarding advocating on behalf of her client.

Present: Suzanne Elledge, SEPPS Agent; Judy Partch, Director of Human Resources, Administration and Compliance for Direct Relief; Michael Holliday, Architect for DMHA; Courtney Jane Miller, Landscape Architect; and Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner.

Public comment opened at 4:17 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

**Motion: Continued indefinitely to Planning Commission for return to Full Board with comments:**

- 1) A majority of the Board finds the mass, bulk, and scale acceptable and finds the building to be an acceptable size for the project location.
- 2) A majority of the Board finds the architectural style is compatible with the neighborhood.
- 3) Restudy the proposed concrete surface treatments and the further refinement of some of the architectural elements on the tilt-ups.
- 4) Provide taller mature trees to help screen the building.
- 5) The Board finds the proposed appliqué plaster solution unacceptable.
- 6) The Board prefers a more abstract design rather than a more literal breaking up of the massing with doors and windows.
- 7) The Board supports the architecture on the front elevation.

- 8) **The Board has reviewed the proposed project and the Compatibility Analysis criteria (SBMC 22.22.145.B. and 22.68.045.B.) were generally met as follows:**
- a. **Compliance with City Charter and Municipal Code; General Consistency with Design Guidelines:** The Board made the finding that the proposed development project's design complies with all City Regulations and is consistent with ABR Design Guidelines.
  - b. **Compatible with Architectural Character of City and Neighborhood.** The proposed design of the proposed development is compatible with the distinctive architectural character of the Santa Barbara and of the particular neighborhood surrounding the project.
  - c. **Appropriate size, mass, bulk, height, and scale.** The proposed development's size, mass, bulk, height, and scale are appropriate for its neighborhood.
  - d. **Sensitive to Adjacent Landmarks and Historic Resources.** (This criterion is not applicable to this site.)
  - e. **Public View of the Ocean and Mountains.** The design of the proposed project responds appropriately to established scenic public vistas.
  - f. **Appropriate Amount of Open Space and Landscaping.** The project's design provides an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping.

Action: Hopkins/Wittausch, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Miller stepped down).

### IN-PROGRESS REVIEW

#### 3. 3714 STATE ST

C-P/SD-2 Zone

(4:00)

Assessor's Parcel Number: 053-300-023  
 Application Number: MST2012-00443  
 Owner: KW Fund V-Sandman, LLC  
 Applicant: Kenneth Marshall  
 Architect: Brian Cearnal  
 Agent: John Schuck

(Revision to the previously approved mixed-use development at the former Sandman Inn site [MST2007-00591; City Council Resolution No. 10-020]. The revised project involves the demolition of the existing 52,815 square foot, 113-room hotel and restaurant, and construction of 5,110 square feet of office space and 72 residential condominiums.)

**(In-Progress review of changes to tree relocation and removal plan. Project requires compliance with Planning Commission Resolution No. 008-14. Project was last reviewed on September 14, 2015.)**

Actual time: 4:37 p.m.

Present: Chris Kallstrand, Arborist for Dudek; John Schuck, Agent; Michael Ugan, Vice-President of Construction for Franciscan; Bob Cunningham, Landscape Architect; and Allison DeBusk, Project Planner.

Public comment opened at 4:48 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

**Motion: Continued indefinitely to Full Board with conceptual approval of the tree location and removal plan with the following comments:**

- 1) The Board finds the proposed changes to the project as presented are acceptable.
- 2) Provide an updated landscape plan for review.
- 3) Address/review the adjacent palm trees at corner of Hitchcock Way and State Street in relation to the plaza design.

Action: Miller/Wittausch, 7/0/0. Motion carried.

**CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM****4. 15 S HOPE AVE****C-2/SD-2 Zone**

**(4:30)** Assessor's Parcel Number: 051-040-058  
Application Number: MST2015-00010  
Owner: Johnman Holding, LLC  
Architect: R & A Architecture + Design, Inc.  
Agent: Dudek

**(This is a revised project description:** Proposal to demolish an existing 8,368 square foot commercial building and construct a four-story mixed-use development with an underground parking garage. New development would consist of 780 square feet of commercial space on the ground level and 48 residential units totaling approximately 39,015 square feet. There would be six commercial parking spaces and 48 residential spaces. This project is being reviewed under the Priority Housing Overlay of the Average Unit Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program. Planning Commission Concept Review is required.)

**(Third Concept Review. Comments only; requires Environmental Assessment, Compatibility Criteria Analysis, and Planning Commission review. Project was last reviewed on August 31, 2015.)**

Actual time: 5:08 p.m.

Present: Benjamin Anderson, and Michael Contento, R & A Architecture & Design, Inc., John Cuykendall for Dudek; Lane Goodkind, Landscape Architect; and Allison DeBusk, Project Planner.

Public comment opened at 5:33 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

Straw vote: How many Board members are opposed to units on the panhandles? 3/4 (failed)

Straw vote: How many Board members can support the 15-foot rear overhang facing the creek? 5/2 (passed)

Straw vote: How many Board members can support the proposed terracotta tile materials as appropriate for the project? 5/2 (passed)

**Motion: Continued indefinitely to Planning Commission for return to Full Board with comments:**

- 1) Study the ground floor entry facing the creek. A side yard entrance was suggested.
- 2) The one ground floor unit entry facing the creek should be accessible from the side yard rather than from inside the garage.
- 3) The ground floor units facing Hope Avenue need a landscape buffer.
- 4) Study increasing the opening length of the garage by making the retail space extend further to the south.
- 5) Study ways of enhancing the appearance of the entry in terms of wayfinding, etc.
- 6) In general, the Board finds the massing appropriate and acceptable at this location.
- 7) The Board appreciates the setback of the fourth floor element.
- 8) The Board finds the trash enclosure requires further study.
- 9) The Board finds the re-interpretation of traditional Santa Barbara materials with the proposed terracotta wall tile material and smooth plaster finish appropriate.
- 10) The Board finds the railings overly elaborate, given the proposed architectural style.
- 11) Study ways to modulate the monolithic appearance of the north elevation.
- 12) A majority of the Board voted in favor of the units in the panhandle at a 4-to-3 vote.
- 13) Given the size of the proposed project, very high quality materials and details are required.

Action: Hopkins/Wittausch, 7/0/0. Motion carried.

**CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM****5. 121 E MASON ST****OC/SD-3 Zone**

**(5:00)** Assessor's Parcel Number: 033-084-005  
Application Number: MST2014-00115  
Architect: Dan Weber  
Owner: Somo Sb, LLC

(Proposal for a four-story, mixed-use development with a tentative subdivision map for apartments and commercial condominiums. The residential portion of the project consists of 125 apartments with an average unit size of 617 square feet, including 10 units of affordable to low-income households. The proposed density is 166% greater than the base density of 47 studios provided by the Variable Density Program. The non-residential portion of the project consists of 13,580 square feet of retail and restaurant uses and 9,144 square feet of light industrial/manufacturing arts-related uses. Proposed public improvements include conversion of Gray Avenue/Mason Street and Santa Barbara Street to one-way circulation, new on-street parking, and valet service on Gray Avenue. A Parking Modification is requested to provide 179 parking spaces rather than the parking required by code. The project includes requests for two concessions/incentives per State Density Bonus Law: (1) to provide 61 additional apartments beyond the 17 required under State Density Bonus Law and (2) to allow for additional bedrooms. The project also requests the following Development Standard Reductions per State Density Bonus Law: (1) to allow a four-story development, (2) to increase the maximum height limit from 45 feet to 56 feet, and (3) to allow the required common outdoor living space to be located above grade. Planning Commission review is required.)

**(Third Concept Review. Requires Compatibility Criteria Analysis, Environmental Assessment, and Planning Commission review. Project was last reviewed September 14, 2015.)**

Actual time: 6:08 p.m.

Present: Dan Weber, Architect; Tony Tomasello, Representing Ownership, Mesa Lane Partners; and Dan Gullett, Project Planner.

Public comment opened at 6:30 p.m.

1) Jeff Theimer expressed support for the proposed project.

Emails of concerns from Brad Nack and June O'Rourke were acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 6:32 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Board members could support the proposed steel building as presented? 2/4 (failed-needs restudy)

Straw vote: How many Board members can support the predominantly rectangular warehouse architectural style? 5/1 (passed)

Straw vote: How many Board members find the mix of architectural styles acceptable as presented? 5/1 (passed)

Straw vote: How many Board members find the rooftop boat acceptable as presented? 5/1 (passed)

**Motion: Continued indefinitely to Planning Commission for return to Full Board with positive comments:**

- 1) The Board found the project's mass, bulk, and scale acceptable.
- 2) A majority of the Board found acceptable the proposed varied architectural styles.
- 3) Restudy the proposed steel building and the size of the cantilevers to more closely match the size of the columns.

- 4) A majority of the Board found the rooftop boats acceptable as presented.
- 5) Provide a detailed landscape plan.
- 6) **The Board has reviewed the proposed project and the Compatibility Analysis criteria (SBMC 22.22.145.B. and 22.68.045.B.) were generally met as follows:**
  - a. **Compliance with City Charter and Municipal Code; General Consistency with Design Guidelines:** The Board acknowledged that the project is proposed under State Density Bonus Law, which supercedes Municipal Code regulations. The Board stated that the proposed development project's design is generally consistent with City Design Guidelines.
  - b. **Compatible with Architectural Character of City and Neighborhood.** The proposed design of the proposed development is compatible with the distinctive architectural character of the Santa Barbara and of the particular neighborhood surrounding the project.
  - c. **Appropriate size, mass, bulk, height, and scale.** The proposed development's size, mass, bulk, height, and scale are appropriate for its neighborhood.
  - d. **Sensitive to Adjacent Landmarks and Historic Resources.** (This criterion is not applicable to this site.)
  - e. **Public View of the Ocean and Mountains.** The design of the proposed project responds appropriately to established scenic public vistas.
  - f. **Appropriate Amount of Open Space.** The project's design provides an appropriate amount of open space. A landscape plan will be reviewed when the project returns for further ABR review.

Action: Wittausch/Poole, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Cung absent).

### CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING

#### 6. 1221 COAST VILLAGE RD

C-1/SD-3 Zone

(5:30) Assessor's Parcel Number: 009-291-013  
 Application Number: MST2015-00412  
 Owner: CVC Group, LP  
 Applicant: Verizon Wireless  
 Architect: SAC Wireless, LLC  
 Engineer: Tahzay Ramirez, PE

(Proposal for a new Verizon Wireless telecommunications facility comprising nine 6'-0" tall antennas and associated equipment to be co-located with existing wireless equipment. The antennas will be screened behind new 7'-0" tall fiberglass screen walls proposed to match the color and texture of the existing building. The address of this parcel is 1221 Coast Village Road, but the area of work fronts Coast Village Circle.)

**(Requires No Visual Impact Findings. Action may be taken if sufficient information is received.)**

Actual time: 6:57 p.m.

Present: Vivion Crawford, Applicant for Verizon Wireless.

Public comment opened at 7:10 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

**Motion: Project Design Approval and Final Approval without conditions to the existing parapet, and with the following conditions for the proposed antennas:**

- 1) The Board finds acceptable the three proposed antennas at the project site, which protrude up beyond the height of the existing parapet.
- 2) The antennas in all three sectors shall be painted a dark color.



- 3) Regarding Wireless Antennas (SBMC 22.87): The project has been reviewed by the Architectural Board of Review in consideration of the proposed antennas and requirement installation with nearby buildings, appropriate screening, site location, and antenna color and size, and made the finding that there are no adverse visual impacts, since the existing large tree canopy provides appropriate screening from public view from the street.

Action: Hopkins/Poole, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Cung absent).

### **CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM**

#### **7. 1200 BLK CLIFF DR**

**(5:50)** Assessor's Parcel Number: ROW-003-156  
Application Number: MST2015-00334  
Applicant: Verizon Wireless

(Proposal for a new wireless communications facility. The project includes a new antenna to be mounted on top of an existing utility pole located within the City right-of-way on the south side of Cliff Drive near Vista Pacifica. The antenna will increase the height of the utility pole from 28'-6" to 31'-0". Also proposed is a new equipment cabinet to be mounted on a concrete pad, new remote radio units and GPS mounted on a new H-frame, new hand hole, and co-axial cable. The area of work will be 3'-6" x 13'-0" and the ground equipment will be screened by a chain-link fence with green slats. A Public Works encroachment permit is being tracked separately under PBW2015-00514.)

**(Second Concept Review. Requires No Visual Impact Findings. Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Project was last reviewed on August 17, 2015.)**

Actual time: 7:13 p.m.

Present: Vivion Crawford, Applicant for Verizon Wireless.

Public comment opened at 7:20 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

#### **Motion: Project Design Approval and Final Approval with conditions:**

- 1) The proposed chain link fence to screen the ground equipment shall be galvanized steel with vinyl-coating in a Malaga green color or similar color to match. The inserts into the chain link fence shall be of wood fiber material or equivalent, and not of reflective or shiny metal.
- 2) Provide additional generous and full-height (taller) landscaping all around each side of the structure to the poles, with the exception of maintenance access to equipment. Any existing landscaping removed due to construction should be replaced with equivalent or similar plantings.
- 3) Regarding Wireless Antennas (SBMC 22.87): The project has been reviewed by the Architectural Board of Review in consideration of the proposed antennas and requirement installation with nearby buildings, appropriate screening, site location, and antenna color and size, and made the finding that there are no adverse visual impacts.

Action: Wittausch/Poole, 5/1/0. Motion carried. (Hopkins opposed, Cung absent).

**\*\* MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:48 P.M. \*\***