CALL TO ORDER:
The Full Board meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Chair Gradin.

ATTENDANCE:
Members present: Gradin, Cung (left at 6:46 p.m.), Hopkins, Miller, Tripp and Wittausch.
Members absent: Moore.
Staff present: Limón (arrived at 3:19 p.m., left at 4:07 p.m., returned at 5:31 p.m., and left at 6:46 p.m.), Gantz, and Vaughn.
Planning Comm.: John P. Campanella (left at 6:46 p.m., returned at 7:27 p.m.)

GENERAL BUSINESS:
A. Public Comment:
No public comment.

B. Approval of Minutes:
Motion: Approval of the minutes of the Architectural Board of Review meeting of July 18, 2016, as amended.
Action: Wittausch/Miller, 2/0/3. (Miller [Item 1], Tripp, and Hopkins abstained, Moore absent). Motion carried.

C. Consent Calendars:
Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of July 25, 2016. The Consent Calendar was reviewed by
Wittausch and Suding.
Action: Hopkins/Miller, 6/0/0. (Moore absent). Motion carried.

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

Ms. Gantz announced that Board Member Moore would be absent; and Board Member Miller would step down from Item 2, 325 W. Anapamu Street.

C. Subcommittee Reports.

Board Member Hopkins reported on the Historic Landmarks Commission and Architectural Board of Review special meeting regarding the Draft Wireless Ordinance of July 28, 2016; Board Members Hopkins and Wittausch also attended the meeting.

Board Member Wittausch reported on the Planning Commission meeting of July 21, 2016. He discussed his participation in the discussion on the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) program.

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM

1. **200 STEARNS WHARF**
   
   **HC/SD-3 Zone**
   
   **(3:15)**
   
   **Assessor’s Parcel Number:** 033-120-022
   **Application Number:** MST2016-00288
   **Owner:** City of Santa Barbara
   **Applicant:** City of Santa Barbara Waterfront Dept.

   (Proposal to bring an existing wood guardrail around Stearns Wharf up to code by adding 5,680 linear feet of 2x4 and 2x6 boards to the existing railings. The new materials and colors will match existing.)

   **(Referred up from Consent Agenda on July 11, 2016.)**

   **Actual time:** 3:19 p.m.

   **Present:** Karl Treiber, Waterfront Facility Manager, City of Santa Barbara; Theresa Lawler, Engineering Technician II, Waterfront, City of Santa Barbara; Jaime Limon, Senior Planner II, City of Santa Barbara.

   Public comment opened at 3:24 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

   **Straw vote:** How many Board members could support a cable rail at the end of the pier? 2/4/0 (failed).

   **Straw vote:** How many Board members could support cable rail throughout the pier? 2/4/0 (failed).

   **Straw vote:** How many Board members could support alternative two throughout the pier? 0/6/0 (failed).

   **Straw vote:** How many Board members could support alternative one or two throughout the pier? 2/4/0 (failed).

   **Motion:** Project Design Approval and continued to Consent with comment:
   
   1. A majority of the Board suggested alternative number one should be used for the majority of the railing and some portion of the seaward finger should be finished with a wood cap and cable railing.

   **Action:** Gradin/Hopkins, 3/3/0. (Tripp, Cung, and Wittausch opposed; Moore absent.) Motion
failed.

**Motion:** Continued four weeks with comments:
1. A majority of the rail to be alternative number one and consider an option to add rail at the seaward finger.
2. Provide a start and stop point for the cable railing, as well as photographs of existing installed cable rail at other locations.
3. Board members shall individually visit the site to view installed mock-ups.

**Action:** Gradin/Hopkins, 4/2/0. (Cung and Wittausch opposed; Moore absent.) Motion carried.

**CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM**

2. **325 W ANAPAMU ST**

   **R-4 Zone**

   **(3:45)**

   Assessor’s Parcel Number: 039-212-004
   Application Number: MST2016-00101
   Owner: Cynthia Howard
   Architect: Cearnal Collective LLP.

   (This is a revised project description: This is a proposal under the Average Unit Density Incentive Program [AUD]. Proposal to demolish an existing single-family dwelling, detached garage, and shed totaling 4,390 square feet and to construct a 5,646 square foot, two-story residential apartment building housing 10 rental units. Also proposed is a 3,263 square foot carport with 10 parking spaces, 10 covered bicycle parking spaces, and a 129 square foot trash enclosure. No grading is proposed. Under AUD, the average unit size is 565 square feet, with a maximum allowed of 901 square feet. The proposed residential density is 45.4 dwelling units per acre, with a maximum of 54 units per acre allowed on this 9,585 square foot parcel with a General Plan Designation of High Density Residential in the Priority Housing Overlay.)

   (Third Concept Review. Comments only; project requires Environmental Assessment. Project was last reviewed on July 5, 2016.)

   Actual time: 4:07 p.m.

   Present: Brian Cearnal, Architect, The Cearnal Collective LLP.

   Public comment opened at 4:17 p.m.

   1. Cynthia Howard, owner, spoke in support of the project as the proposal is at a much smaller scale than what was previously approved, it meets the needs of the community, and complies with R4 zoning.
   2. Katherine Lee spoke in opposition and expressed concerns regarding privacy, parking, and requested the Board consider referring the project to the Planning Commission for further review.
   3. Brett Gewirtzman spoke in opposition and expressed concerns regarding project size, bulk, and scale. Also asked the Board to consider requesting a traffic study for the use of the alley on site.
   4. Bruce Bivans spoke in opposition and expressed concerns regarding traffic, parking, and the project’s size.
   5. Cissy Ross spoke in opposition and expressed traffic should be redirected to come off W. Anapamu Street, not through the small alleyway as proposed.

   Public comment closed at 4:26 p.m.

   Public comment re-opened at 4:40 p.m.
Letters of concern from Geoffrey Ravenhill and Cissy and Richard Ross were acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 4:41 p.m.

*Straw vote:* If the issue regarding traffic and the impact to the alley could be resolved, how many Board members could support the mass, bulk, and scale of the project with some minor design detail and roofline changes? 4/1/0 (passed).

*Straw vote:* How many Board members would like the applicant to study the possibility of reducing the number of units proposed? 2/3/0 (failed).

**Motion:** Continued four weeks with comments:
1. Applicant to provide a study with a recommendation as to the best manner to handle automobile traffic to and from the site, impacting the surrounding neighborhoods to the least degree possible.
2. In general, the mass bulk and scale is acceptable; however, there are still numerous concerns in other areas.
3. To improve privacy, study tree placement and fencing.
4. The wall that divides the two buildings at the front, on the W. Anapamu Street side, should be moved back from the property line by a minimum of five feet or removed completely.
5. Provide an Arborist Report to verify the large oaks in the alleyway and adjacent property would not be damaged by the proposed development.
6. Provide a red that is less bright.

**Action:** Gradin/Wittausch, 5/0/1. (Miller abstained, Moore absent). Motion carried.

*Item reopened at 5:29 to revise motion*

**Motion:** Continued indefinitely with the following comments:
1. Applicant to provide a study with a recommendation as to the best manner to handle automobile traffic to and from the site, impacting the surrounding neighborhoods to the least degree possible.
2. In general, the mass bulk and scale is acceptable; however, there are still numerous concerns in other areas.
3. To improve privacy, study tree placement and fencing.
4. The wall that divides the two buildings at the front, on the W. Anapamu Street side, should be moved back from the property line by a minimum of five feet or removed completely.
5. Provide an Arborist Report to verify the large oaks in the alleyway and adjacent property would not be damaged by the proposed development.
6. Provide a red that is less bright.

**Action:** Gradin/ Wittausch, 5/0/1. (Miller abstained, Moore absent). Motion carried.
FINAL REVIEW

3. 540 W PUEBLO ST  C-O Zone

(4:30) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 025-090-046
Application Number: MST2007-00092
Applicant: Kenneth Marshall
Owner: Cancer Center of Santa Barbara
Architect: The Cearnal Collective, LLP
Landscape Architect: Martha Degasis

(Project consists of a new comprehensive outpatient cancer treatment facility, four-tier parking structure with 180 spaces, two small commercial structures, six rental housing units, and merger of 10 lots located between W. Junipero and W. Pueblo Streets into one 3.38-acre lot. A Substantial Conformance Determination was made to allow the construction of a new Learning Center [with an 80-seat auditorium] rather than a residential duplex on the vacant lot at 529 W. Junipero Street and to allow the building at 525 W. Junipero Street to be converted to a residential duplex rather than a commercial space.)

(Final Approval of the 521 W. Junipero Street residential duplex. Requires compliance with Planning Commission Resolution No. 006-10.)

Actual time: 5:14 p.m.

Present: Brian Cearnal, Architect, The Cearnal Collective LLP; Martha Degasis, Landscape Architect, The Arcadia Studio; and Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner, City of Santa Barbara.

Public comment opened at 5:22 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

Motion: Final Approval and continued one week to Consent with the following comments:
1. Applicant to provide color board.
2. Detail 24/A6.01 needs to show vertical board at the base.
3. Applicant to revise the shrubs around the backflow device to provide screening from the public view.

Action: Hopkins/Tripp, 6/0/0. (Moore absent). Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING

4. 316 W MICHELTORENA/1516 CASTILLO STS  R-4 Zone

(5:15) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 027-212-026
Application Number: MST2016-00125
Owner: Drake Forest Investments, LLC
Architect: Douglas Keep, Architect(Proposal for a new 21 unit residential project using the Average Unit Density Incentive Program [AUD] on two perpendicular lots at 316 W. Micheltorena and 1516 Castillo Streets [APNS 027-212-026 and 027-212-022]. Between the two parcels, there are currently five existing buildings. The proposal would demolish three buildings, two carports, and a portion of Building C [5,049 square-feet]; retain two buildings [6,073 square-feet]; and construct four buildings [8,809 square-feet], for a new total of six residential buildings [14,882 square-feet]. A detailed breakdown is as follows: Building A: Existing, 4,468 square-feet, three-stories, [seven units], Building B: New, 2,580 square-feet., two-stories, [three units], Building C: Existing 1,605 square-feet, two-stories, [two units], Building D: New, 2,320 square-feet, two-stories, [four units], Building E: New, 2,756 square-feet, three-stories, [four units], and Building F: New, 1,153 square-feet, two-stories [one unit]. The unit
mix comprises 13, one-bedroom units and eight, two-bedroom units, with an average unit size of 767 square-feet and a density of 27 dueling units per acre. The project also includes 21 parking spaces, approximately 426 square-feet of detached accessory structures, reconfigured driveways, and new landscaping. Both properties will be merged through a Voluntary Lot Merger and will result in a combined lot area of 35,263 square-feet. The project is in the R-4 zone with a General Plan designation of Medium-High Density.)

(Comments only; requires Environmental Assessment.)

Actual time: 5:31 p.m.

Present: Douglas Keep, Architect; Martha Degasis, Landscape Architect, Arcadia Studio; Jaime Limón, Senior Planner II, City of Santa Barbara; and Megan Lowery, Associate Planner, City of Santa Barbara.

Public comment opened at 5:47 p.m.

1. Jaime Limon presented and reviewed a memo from Nicole Hernandez, the City Urban Historian, which was meant to assist the board in their Compatibility Criteria Analysis of the new construction, which is proposed in close proximity to potential historic resources that are eligible for Structure of Merit status.
2. Mark Sheridan spoke in opposition and expressed concerns regarding the project size, neighborhood compatibility, traffic, and parking. Mr. Sheridan also requested the Board to consider requesting story poles at the site and assure root structure of the California bay tree is preserved.
3. Terri Sheridan spoke in opposition and expressed concerns regarding the preservation of historic structures in the City before they disappear completely.
4. Lorin Green spoke in opposition and expressed concerns regarding parking and asked the Board to consider a less dense location for this AUD project.
5. Edward Rockett spoke in opposition and expressed concerns regarding the scale of the project and felt it is inappropriate for the neighborhood and will cause an overwhelming amount of traffic in an already saturated area.
6. Nathan Caspar Sheridan spoke in opposition and expressed concerns regarding privacy and loss of mountain views.

A letter of concern from Judy Cota was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 6:08 p.m.

Motion: Continued indefinitely with comments:
1. Study and incorporate the comments provided by the City of Santa Barbara Urban Historian into the design.
2. Redesign Building E to be more in keeping with the historic context, in particular the central stairway, which adds impact to the overall massing.
3. Study simplifying the pedestrian path off W. Micheltorena Street.
4. Restudy the bike parking locations.
5. Restudy the perimeter and landscape screening adjacent to driveways and parking areas and along the perimeters of the project.
6. Provide fencing that enhances privacy for neighbors.
7. Provide information on the larger species trees being removed.
8. Study the possibility of adding parking closer to the unit being served.
9. Avoid having a pedestrian path directly adjacent to a living room without a landscape buffer in between.
Action: Gradin/Tripp, 6/0/0. (Moore absent). Motion carried.

* THE BOARD RECESSED AT 6:46 P.M. AND RESUMED AT 7:09 P.M. *

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

5. 525 E YANONALI ST  
   OM-1/SD-3 Zone  
   (6:30)  
   Assessor’s Parcel Number: 017-540-007  
   Application Number: MST2015-00286  
   Owner: City of Santa Barbara  
   Applicant: Linda Sumansky  
   (Proposal for repairs and maintenance required to reactivate the city's desalination facility to provide drinking water in response to the extreme drought. The work on this 64,000 square foot parcel includes replacement of existing seawater reverse osmosis modules, refurbishment of water storage tanks, new landscaping, and access gate relocations.)

   (Review After Final of change to approved project involving platform and rail color for power distribution center.)

   Actual time: 7:09 p.m.

   Present: Linda Sumansky, Principal Engineer, City of Santa Barbara.

   Public comment opened at 7:29 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

   Motion: Continued indefinitely to Consent with comments:
   1. Paint the new equipment and the rear yellow stairway “Olivine Green”.
   2. Provide drawings to increase the gate height to eight feet.
   3. Study the possibility of adding a street tree in front of the electrical unit at the curb.

   Action: Gradin/Tripp, 5/0/0. (Moore and Cung absent). Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING

6. 1220 & 1222 SAN ANDRES ST  
   R-3 Zone  
   (7:00)  
   Assessor’s Parcel Number: 039-151-010  
   Application Number: MST2016-00211  
   Owner: Edward St. George  
   Applicant: Interdisciplinary Architects  
   Architect: Interdisciplinary Architects  
   (Proposal for a multifamily residential project using the Average Unit Density Incentive Program [AUD] and a voluntary lot merger of the parcels at 1220 and 1222 San Andres Street [APNS 039-151-010 and 039-151-011]. The proposal includes the demolition of an existing duplex and three single-family dwellings totaling 4,831 square feet, and construction of seven new buildings comprising five duplexes and two single-family dwellings, for a total of 12 new dwelling units. Six buildings will have two stories and one building will have three stories. The unit mix will include 10, three-bedroom units, one, two-bedroom unit, and one, one-bedroom unit, with an average size of 1,044 square feet. The proposed density on this 29,291 square foot merged parcel will be 20 dwelling units per acre on a parcel with a General Plan land use designation of Medium-High Residential, 15-27 dwelling units per acre. There will be 18 uncovered and three covered parking spaces, for a total of 21 spaces, and 12 covered and secured bicycle
parking spaces. Grading excavation and fill of 1,196 cubic yards will be balanced on site. Also proposed is the removal of nine trees. Total development on site will be 13,313 square feet. This project will address zoning violations identified in Zoning Information Report ZIR2016-00211 and Enforcement cases ENF2014-000621 and ENF2016-00718.)

(Comments only; requires Environmental Assessment.)

Actual time: 7:46 p.m.

Present: Tim Gorter, Architect, Interdisciplinary Architects; and Shelby Messner, Project Planner, Interdisciplinary Architects.

Public comment opened at 8:11 p.m.

Board Member Hopkins read comments left by Michael Galindo, who is in opposition to the project because of concerns regarding the project size, traffic, and impaired views.

Public comment closed at 8:12 p.m.

Motion: Continued indefinitely with comments:

1. Return only when creek setbacks are resolved. This decision could completely change the project design.
2. Board members are in favor of pushing the units to the street to hide parking, especially Building A.
3. Study reducing the hardscape wherever possible and increasing the landscape with a focus on adding landscape buffer between parking and the building.
4. Define pedestrian pathways from the street and from parking to the units.
5. Reduce the height of Building E tower.
6. There was concern about staying within the tradition relating to the horizontal banding. Refine other details.
7. Return with a site section that goes from the street to the creek.
8. Define any fencing, retaining walls, and paving surfaces.
9. Provide existing tree information and photos.

Action: Gradin/Wittausch, 5/0/0. (Moore and Cung absent). Motion carried.

** MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:30 P.M. **