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.

**CALL TO ORDER:**

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

**ATTENDANCE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members present</th>
<th>Gradin, Miller, Moore, Tripp, and Wittausch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members absent</td>
<td>Cung and Hopkins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff present</td>
<td>Hernandez (present until 4:30 p.m.), Limón, and Goo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL BUSINESS:**

A. **Public Comment:**

Ms. Sarah York Rubin, the new Executive Director for the Santa Barbara County Arts Commission introduced herself to the Board, reminded the Board that Nina Johnson, Assistant to the City Administrator was the Commission’s Liaison for information.

B. **Approval of Minutes:**

Motion: Approval of the minutes of the Architectural Board of Review meeting of April 25, 2016, was tabled due to further review of Board comments regarding the last Draft Minute Item #7, 3891 State Street.
C. Consent Calendars:

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **May 2, 2016**. The Consent Calendar was reviewed by Howard Wittausch and Courtney Jane Miller.
Action: Miller/Moore, 5/0/0. Motion carried. (Cung/Hopkins absent).

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **May 9, 2016**. The Consent Calendar was reviewed by Howard Wittausch.
Action: Tripp/Moore, 5/0/0. Motion carried. (Cung/Hopkins absent).

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

a. Ms. Hernandez made the following announcements:
   a) Board members Cung and Hopkins will be absent from the meeting.
   b) Board member Tripp will step down from Agenda Item 3, 116 E. Cota Street.

b. Mr. Limón clarified changes to agendas and additional information that has been added that explains the public meeting procedures to improve time management regarding the sequence of steps for all Agenda items. He also announced that he intends to provide the Board with additional submittal requirement ideas and project assessment tools. It is expected that these additional tools will be specifically used for future AUD projects when making neighborhood compatibility findings. Mr. Limón also announced a pending appeal of the 300 Block of Grove Lane that will be heard at tomorrow’s City Council meeting of Tuesday, May 10, 2016, and requested a volunteer Board member in attendance. He also requested the Board understand the limits regarding requiring mandating landscaping in the parkway.

D. Subcommittee Reports.

There were no reports made at this time.

**CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM**

1. **721 CLIFF DR**

   **R-3/SD-3 Zone**

   **(3:15)**

   Assessor’s Parcel Number: 033-120-025
   Application Number: MST2016-00177
   Owner: Santa Barbara Junior College District
   Applicant: Santa Barbara City College

   (Proposal to add a 675 square foot raised wood deck and minor exterior upgrades at the existing Santa Barbara City College bookstore.)

   *(Required Full Board Courtesy Review for comments only.)*

   Actual time: 3:21 p.m.

   Present: Julie Hendricks, Senior Director of Facilities, Planning and Campus Development for Santa Barbara City College.

   Public comment opened at 3:29 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

   **Full Board Courtesy Review comments:**

   1) A majority of the Board found the proposed deck universally appropriate for the building and site with many amenities for students; and, with minor changes, found the project would be a visual enhancement for the site.

   2) Clarify plan details, such as the wood cover footings in the absence of plantings and address the discrepancy between the plan view and details, i.e., pull the foundation down in front of the deck and bring the skirting down (Detail #4 on plan Sheet A-295).
3) Study to provide a more direct pathway to the outdoor seating.
4) Study opportunities for green screen or vine pockets or other type of landscape screening element in front of the proposed high wall to soften the downward extension of the deck.
5) Restudy the relationship of the two palm trees and the validity of the stair extension and the left side deck.
6) Restudy the mix of materials (redwood, etc.).

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING

2. 927 E ORTEGA ST  
   (3:35) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 031-123-012  
   Application Number: MST2016-00146  
   Owner: Andreas Blomst  
   Designer: Shannon Blomst

(Proposal to construct a new 467 square foot, one-story detached accessory dwelling unit and uncovered parking space to the rear of an existing 943 square foot, one-story single-family dwelling on a 5,000 square foot parcel. Also proposed is to demolish 65 square feet from the existing residence and construct a one-story, 143 square foot addition on the front elevation. Other proposed work will include the following: legalize an as-built carport, replace a 692 square foot concrete driveway with a 1,238 square foot permeable driveway, demolish an existing rear patio cover, replace windows in the same openings, add a new garage door, and a change in building finish from wood to stucco. Landscape changes will include the removal of one orange tree and a planter from the front yard and the removal of three trees (peach, fig, and poinsettia) from the rear yard.)

(Comments only; requires Environmental Assessment.)

Actual time: 3:46 p.m.
Present: Shannon Blomst, Designer; and Andreas Blomst, Owner.

Public comment opened at 3:55 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

Motion: Continued two weeks to Full Board with comments:
1) The Board made a strong recommendation to study the garage level with a preliminary survey done to confirm positive run-off to the street from the driveway.
2) Restudy the relationship between the carport roof and the garage roof.
3) Clarify with Transportation staff to study reducing the width of the driveway and the width of the carport to maximize the landscape area. The Board can support the retention of the orange tree, and the removal of other declining trees.
4) Provide a landscape plan, including drainage and grading.
5) Study the relief from the paving and the edges along the property line, especially along the house, even if only a small buffer area along the property line, such as an ingrade planter buffer between the driveway and the property line to provide a long term softening element.
6) Study providing charm-giving cottage elements such as wood siding instead of stucco, and/or shutters and wainscoting.
7) Study the uniformity of the window treatments; provide details.
8) Provide exterior lighting details.
9) Provide more hardscape details.
10) Study to define the entrance to the second rear unit with a pathway.
11) Board member Wittausch read the following finding into the record: “The ABR finds that the project qualifies for an exemption from further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, based on the City staff analysis and CEQA Certificate of Determination on file for this project.”

Action: Wittausch/Tripp, 5/0/0. Motion carried. (Cung/Hopkins absent).
CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM

3. 116 E COTA ST  C-M Zone
(4:15) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 031-201-003
Application Number: MST2015-00627
Owner: Cota Street, LLC
Architect: AB Design Studio

(This is a revised project description: Proposal for a new four-story mixed-use building on a 10,865 square foot vacant parcel adjacent to Plaza Vera Cruz. The project includes 15 two-bedroom, two-bathroom residential units and approximately 738 square feet of commercial space. Sixteen covered parking spaces will be provided on the ground level. Residential units will be on the second, third, and fourth floors. The proposed building height is 45 feet, with a 457 square foot rooftop deck. Under the Average Unit Density [AUD] Incentive Program, the proposed residential density is 61 dwelling units per acre, with an average unit size of 827 square feet. A maximum density of 63 dwelling units per acre is allowed on this 10,865 square foot parcel designated Medium-High Density and within the Priority Housing Overlay area.)

(Fourth Concept Review. Comments only; requires Environmental Assessment. Project was last reviewed on April 11, 2016.)

Actual time: 4:28 p.m.

Present: Clay Aurell and Eric Behr, AB Design Studio; and Sam Maphis, Landscape Architect.

Mr. Limón clarified referrals to the Planning Commission should be for projects with high visibility to the public and requested the Board provide clear direction to the Applicant on specific design elements that require change or restudy.

Public comment opened at 4:57 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

Straw vote: How many Board members find it not necessary to send the proposed project to the Planning Commission? 4/0 (unanimous).
Straw vote: How many Board members could support the fourth floor unit closest to the street remaining as long as the architectural elements can be resolved? 4/0 (passed).
Straw vote: How many Board members could support project design approval at this time? 1/3 (failed).

Motion: Continued four weeks to Full Board with comments:
1) The Board finds acceptable the fourth floor unit closest to Cota Street to remain conditional upon resolution of the architectural elements.
2) Study certain areas of the arch design that are currently problematic, especially the Cota Street elevation and the elevation as it turns east down the street at the corner.
3) Suggestions were made to provide architectural elements at the first floor that help to tie it to the adjacent building.
4) Restudy the design of the vertical slot openings in the stair tower and at the north east corner.
5) Provide a way of demarcation or distinguishing the residential entrance from the commercial and garage entrance areas.
6) Restudy the north east corner elevation as it faces the park to be more consistent with the simplicity and boldness of the rest of the design.
7) Provide larger plantings and vines along the eastern elevation to grow on the building.
8) Implement significant trees at the Cota Street elevation, and provide larger than 24-inch box within the northern elevation.
9) Study the design of the low site wall at the street elevation in relation to the planter areas.
10) The Board appreciates the Applicant’s efforts to respond to previous comments and willingness to work with the Board.

Action: Wittausch/Miller, 4/0/0. Motion carried. (Tripp stepped down, Cung/Hopkins absent).

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM

4. 133 S SALINAS ST C-P Zone

(5:15)

Assessor’s Parcel Number: 015-243-009
Application Number: MST2014-00639
Owner: Julio Lopez
Architect: Angeli De Covolo, Inc.

(Proposal for a 672 square foot, one-story addition to an existing 1,122 square foot, one-story, single-family dwelling with a detached two-car garage on an 8,134 square foot parcel. Also proposed is a new 496 square foot attached office building and two new uncovered parking spaces. The project will result in 496 square feet of office floor area and a 1,794 square foot dwelling unit. There will be approximately 33 cubic yards of grading excavation. This project will address violations identified in Zoning Information Report ZIR2007-00422.)

(Second Concept Review. Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Requires an environmental finding for a CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 Exemption - Projects Consistent with the General Plan. Project was last reviewed on January 4, 2016.)

Actual time: 5:45 p.m.

Present: Everett Woody, Architect; Chuck McClure, Landscape Architect; and Julio Lopez, Owner.

Public comment opened at 5:57 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

Motion: Project Design Approval and continued indefinitely to Consent Review with comments:
1) Resolve the doors on the southeast elevation to maintain or more closely match the fenestration break-ups on the existing house.
2) All new windows are to match existing and/or comply and relate to each other.
3) Chair Gradin read the following finding into the record: “The ABR finds that the project qualifies for an exemption from further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, based on the City staff analysis and CEQA Certificate of Determination on file for this project.”

Action: Wittausch/Tripp, 5/0/0. Motion carried. (Cung/Hopkins absent).

The ten-day appeal period was announced.
CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING

5. 600 BLK N LA CUMBRE RD
(5:45) Assessor’s Parcel Number: ROW-002-557
Application Number: MST2016-00112
Applicant: Verizon Wireless
Engineer: M.Squared Engineers
Applicant: Sequoia Deployment Services, Inc.

(Proposal for a new Verizon Wireless communications facility consisting of the installation of a 2’ diameter Cantenna to be mounted on an existing Southern California Edison pole near 620 N. La Cumbre Road. Also proposed is a new ground-mounted equipment cabinet, electrical meter, and associated equipment and conduit.)

(Requires No Visual Impact Findings.)

Actual time: 6:04 p.m.

Present: Pete Shubin, Agent for Verizon Wireless.

Mr. Limón requested the Board be very clear on their motion regarding neighborhood compatibility with regard to the location of proposed wireless equipment in light of the similar pending wireless ABR appeal item, 300 Block of Grove Lane, to be reviewed at tomorrow’s Tuesday, May 10th City Council hearing.

The Board requested verification on staff’s recommendation for pole-mounted equipment versus equipment placed on pedestals or at street level within cabinets.

Staff clarified that preferences are in the following order: 1) underground vault placement; or 2) pedestal equipment; or 3) minimum pole-mounted equipment with adequate screening and landscaping to minimize visual impacts where possible.

Public comment opened at 6:12 p.m.

Carol Richards (adjacent neighbor) requested a lower height utility pole so that it does not show above roof height and within his private mountain view.

Public comment closed at 6:14 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Board members are in favor of pedestal and/or ground based equipment at street level rather pole-mounted equipment? 2/3 (failed).

Straw vote: How many Board members are in favor of pole-mounted wireless equipment rather than placement on a pedestal or within street level cabinets in the parkway? 3/2 (passed).

Motion: Project Design Approval and Final Approval as submitted with conditions:
1) For this particular location in an urban residential areas, the Board prefers that the conduit be pole-mounted and run up the proposed pole rather than be placed in the parkway within cabinets adding to the existing street level infrastructure.
2) Minimize the proposed ground mounted pedestals to one, and minimize the pole-mounted radio equipment since it is not located at an intersection with minimal available long lasting screening.

Action: Wittausch/Moore, 3/2/0. Motion carried. (Gradin/Miller opposed, Cung/Hopkins absent).

The ten-day appeal period was announced.
*THE FOLLOWING ITEM WAS REFERRED UP TO FULL BOARD FROM CONSENT REVIEW.*

CONSENT REVIEW

ABR - FINAL REVIEW

A. 400 BLK N CANADA ST

Assessor’s Parcel Number: ROW-001-007
Application Number: MST2015-00382
Agent: Sequoia Deployment Services, Inc.

(Proposal for a new small cell wireless communications facility for Verizon including one 2'-0" diameter Cantenna to be mounted on a new arm at 24'-0" off grade and associated equipment on an existing 36'-0" tall wooden utility pole. Also proposed is a new meter pedestal and pad with equipment cabinet and ground level handhole to be located around the corner on Blanchard Street.

(Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Requires No Visual Impact Findings and a Public Works Encroachment Permit. Project was last reviewed on March 28, 2016.)

Present: Pete Shubin, Agent for Verizon Wireless.

Motion: Final Approval with comments:
1) For this particular location, the Board finds the original plans are more acceptable than the revised plans as the original plans minimize the equipment with less visual impact of two pedestal poles on the side street with less equipment on the poles.
2) The Board finds the proposed project aesthetically appropriate, and minimizes as much as possible the negative visual impacts to the neighborhood and consistency issues with the Architectural Board of Review Guidelines.

Action: Wittausch/Gradin, 3/2/0. Motion carried. (Tripp/Moore opposed, Cung/Hopkins absent).

** MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:01 P.M. **