CALL TO ORDER:

The Full Board meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by Planning Technician Cameron.

ATTENDANCE:

    Members present: Gradin (left at 8:06), Moore, Tripp, Wittausch, and Watkins
    Members absent: Miller
    Staff present: Limón, Cameron, and Vaughn

GENERAL BUSINESS:

A. 2017 Election of Chair and Vice Chair

   Mr. Cameron opened nominations for the offices of Chair and Vice Chair.

   1. Nominations for Chair: Gradin

      A vote was taken and Board Member Gradin was elected as Chair.

   2. Nomination for Vice Chair: Tripp

      A vote was taken and Board Member Tripp was elected as Vice Chair.

B. 2017 Consent Review Representatives and Subcommittee Appointments.

   Appointments were made to fill the following subcommittees:
1. **ABR Consent Calendar:**
   - Primary: Tripp
   - Alternate: Wittausch

2. **ABR Consent Landscape Review:**
   - Primary: Miller
   - Alternate: *None*

3. **Sign Committee:**
   - Primary: Wittausch
   - Alternate: Moore

**Standing Subcommittees:**

4. **Highway 101 Joint Subcommittee:**
   - Primary: Wittausch
   - Alternate: Gradin/Miller

5. **Visual Arts in Public Places (VAPP):**
   - Primary: Miller/Moore
   - Alternate: *None*

6. **Design Awards Subcommittee:**
   - Primary: Gradin/Watkins
   - Alternate: *None*

**Ad Hoc Subcommittees:**

7. **Ad hoc Sign Ordinance Review Committee:**
   - Primary: Wittausch
   - Alternate: Moore

8. **Architectural Details:**
   - Primary: Wittausch
   - Alternate: Gradin

9. **Lower Mission Creek Design:**
   - Primary: Wittausch/Miller
   - Alternate: Tripp

10. **ABR Multi-Unit/Mixed-Use Design Guidelines:**
    - Primary: Tripp
    - Alternate: Gradin

**Motion:** Adopt the 2017 subcommittee appointments.
**Action:** Wittausch/Tripp, 5/0/0. (Miller absent.) Motion carried.

C. **Public Comment:**

   None

D. **Approval of Minutes:**

   **Motion:** Approval of the minutes of the Architectural Board of Review meeting of January 3, 2017, as submitted.
   **Action:** Wittausch/Tripp, 5/0/0. (Miller absent.) Motion carried.

E. **Consent Calendars:**

   **Motion:** Ratify the Consent Calendar of January 9, 2017. The Consent Calendar was reviewed by Wittausch, Miller, and Tripp.
   **Action:** Wittausch/Moore, 5/0/0. (Miller absent.) Motion carried.

   **Motion:** Ratify the Consent Calendar of January 17, 2017. The Consent Calendar was reviewed by Wittausch and Miller.
   **Action:** Wittausch/Moore, 5/0/0. (Miller absent.) Motion carried.

F. **Announcements, requests by applicants for continuances and withdrawals, future agenda items, and appeals:**

   Mr. Cameron announced the following:
   1. Board Member Miller will be absent from today’s meeting.
2. Board Member Watkins will step down from Item 4, 401 & 409 E Haley Street.
3. Board Member Gradin will step down from Item 7, 101 S Canada St.

Mr. Limón had an announcement regarding the as-built installation of artificial turf on a recently approved gasoline station remodel project on Milpas St. and read the current city ABR landscape guideline into the record. The guideline reads that “the installation of artificial turf is generally discouraged and inappropriate in visible locations”. However, he advised that the installation of artificial turf is something that could be evaluated on this current project which was approved with the condition that it use of high quality synthetic turf. Staff will monitor the installation to see if it remains in good condition.

C. Subcommittee Reports.

There were none.

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. STORY POLES AS A DESIGN REVIEW TOOL
(3:20) Staff: Renee Brooke, City Planner
     Jaime Limón, Design Review Supervisor

   (Discussion and a recommendation to City Council on an appropriate trigger to require story poles for review of development projects.)

   Actual time: 3:24 p.m.

   Present: Renee Brook, City Planner, City of Santa Barbara; and Jaime Limón, Design Review Supervisor, City of Santa Barbara

   Public comment opened at 3:54 p.m.

   John Campanela, Planning Commission Liaison, asked for clarification on the Boards dimension suggestion for the requirement of story poles.

   Board Comments:
   1. Story poles could be required if:
      a. A project has four stories or more.
      b. A project is over 30 feet tall or is three stories tall and there are no other three story developments within a 300 foot radius.
      c. The new three story development is in a residential zone.
      d. If a properties grading makes a projects mass appear to be equivalent to or greater than a three story building.
      e. If the project is referred by the Board, to the Planning Commission for comments.
   2. Story poles should go up sometime after the first concept review and before Project Design Approval is granted.

   Motion: Approval of the above listed comments as the Boards Direction to City Council:
   Action: Watkins/Wittausch, 5/0/0. (Miller absent.)
REVIEW AFTER FINAL

2. VARIOUS LOCATIONS IN THE OC ZONE  
   OC/SD-3 Zone  
   (3:35) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 017-022-003  
   Application Number: MST2014-00017  
   Owner: Various Property Owners  
   Owner: Steplemann Community Property Trust  
   Owner: Yanonali Properties LLC  
   Owner: Mesa Lane Partners  
   Applicant: Marcello Ricci, Arts Fund Santa Barbara  
   (Proposal for a neighborhood-wide art and mural program in the Funk Zone. The approximate project area  
   is bounded by Highway 101, Helena Street, Santa Barbara Street, and E. Cabrillo Boulevard.)  
   (Review After Final of additional proposed locations for a previously approved mural program.)  
   Actual time: 3:56 p.m.  
   Present: Marcello Ricci, Applicant, Arts Fund Santa Barbara  
   Public comment opened at 4:00 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it was closed.  
   Staff Comments:  
   Mr. Cameron announced that the Miramar Building is potentially a historic resource and will need to be  
   review by the Historic Landmarks Commission and cannot be heard at the ABR.  
   Motion: Final Approval for location 11, MichaelKate Interiors Building, and location 13,  
   Channel Coast Corporation Building, with those walls to be used at the discretion of  
   the artist.  
   Action: Gradin/Tripp, 5/0/0. (Miller absent.) Motion carried.

PROJECT DESIGN REVIEW

3. 325 W ANAPAMU ST  
   R-4 Zone  
   (4:00) 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 5,633 square foot, two-story residential apartment building housing 9 rental  
   units. Also proposed is a 3,464 square foot carport with 10 parking spaces, 10 covered bicycle parking  
   spaces, and a 129 square foot trash enclosure. No grading is proposed. Also proposed is the removal of  
   five trees. Under AUD, the average unit size is 626 square feet, with a maximum allowed of 970 square  
   feet. The proposed residential density is 40.9 dwelling units per acre, with a maximum of 63 dwelling  
   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.)  
   (Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Project requires an environmental  
   finding for a CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 Exemption - Projects Consistent with the General  
   Plan and Conditions of Approval for an AUD project within the Priority Housing Overlay. Project  
   was last reviewed on August 1, 2016.)
Actual time: 4:06 p.m.

Present: Brian Cearnal, Architect, The Cearnal Collective; Scott Schell, Associated Transpiration Engineer; Chelsey Swanson, Associate Transportation Planner, City of Santa Barbara; and Jaime Limón, Design Review Supervisor, City of Santa Barbara.

Public comment opened at 4:27 p.m.

The following people spoke in opposition or with concerns:
1. Richard Ross, neighbor, commented that the project is too large for this area, is effecting neighborhood trees and the community negatively.
2. Brett Gewirtzman, commented that the parking lot proposed for property is inadequate and will not function appropriately as designed.
3. Ed Baum, commented that this project is not compatible with the neighborhood and will negatively affect his ability to maintain his livelihood as a piano teacher.
4. Geoffrey Ravenhill, presented concerns regarding privacy, the landscaping, views, and the fumes from the elevated carport.
5. Katherine Lee presented the need to send this project up to the planning commission for further review.
6. Leslie Brueckner commented that the neighborhood is already too dense and causing issues for the neighborhood and adding an additional multiunit project in this neighborhood doesn’t fit.
7. Bruce Bruam commented that the parking is inadequate and will negatively affect this already dense area.
8. Donald Kolstad commented that he is not opposed to development in the city however this area is already too dense and the addition of this scale of project will cause public safety issues because of the increased traffic and congestion.
9. Brandon Steets had comments regarding the inability to maneuver in the current traffic conditions and adding this development it will further negatively impact the neighborhood.

Public comment closed at 4:49 p.m.

Motion: Continued to the next available agenda with comments:
1. Study the possibility of moving the planter finger off the alley, up against the building so as to provide more maneuverability within the alley when the parking space is vacant.
2. Study the reduction of the mass, bulk, and scale of the rear unit.
3. Incorporate some of the traditional detailing that has been applied to the front units to the back units.
4. Provide more privacy screening from both sides of the garage level to the neighbor.
5. Study the two windows on the west elevation and make revisions as necessary to decrease the privacy impacts to the neighbor.
6. Study adding variation to the materials used, to give the south elevation more interest and compatibility.
7. Study reducing the plate height at the second floor elevation to 8 feet to help reduce the massing of the building.
8. Re-study the color of the red trim.

Action: Wittausch/Tripp, 4/1/0. (Watkins opposed. Miller absent.) Motion carried.
CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM

4. 401 & 409 E HALEY STREET  C-M Zone

(4:55) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 031-212-018
Application Number: MST2016-00508
Owner: Laguna Haley Studios II, LLC
Architect: Designarc INC

(Proposal for a new mixed-use development using the Average Unit Density Incentive Program (AUD), in the C-M, Commercial zone. The project will include a voluntary lot merger of Assessor parcels 031-212-017 and 031-212-018 which will result in one parcel of 22,500 square feet. All existing residential and commercial structures totaling 5,828 square feet will be demolished. The proposal will include construction of a three-story, mixed-use building with 29 residential units totaling 22,497 square feet and three commercial spaces totaling 3,306 square feet. A ground level parking garage will provide 58 parking spaces. Roof decks are also proposed. The residential unit mix will include six studios, nine, 1-bedroom units and 14, 2-bedroom units, with an average unit size of 775 square feet. The proposed density on this parcel will be 56 dwelling units per acre on a parcel with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Commercial, Industrial, Priority Housing, and 37-63 dwelling units per acre. No grading is proposed. This project requires Planning Commission comments.)

(Second Concept Review. Comments only; requires Environmental Assessment and Planning Commission review.)

Actual time: 5:40 p.m.

Present: Mark Kirkhart, Architect, Designarc; Jaeson Greer, Architect, Designarc; and Mellissa Turner, Project Manager, Designarc.

Public comment opened at 5:56 p.m.

The following people spoke in opposition or with concerns:
1. Dominic Rios presented concerns regarding the north east corner
2. Natalia Govoni presented concerns regarding the size, style, bulk and scale of this project, and project approved by the Board in the past, and feels they negatively impact the city’s integrity.

Public comment closed at 5:59 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Board Members agree that the applicant should study reducing the podium height whenever it is not needed for stacked parking”? 3/1 Passed

Straw vote: How many Board Members agree that the applicant should study varying the parapet heights on the upper floors and step back the roof decks from the street-facing fronts of the building along East Haley? 2/2 Fail

Straw vote: How many Board Members agree that the applicant should eliminate the trellises that are visible as four story elements from the street level? 2/2 Fail
Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Planning Commission for return to Full Board with comments:
1. Study reducing the podium height whenever it is not needed for stacked parking.
2. Study reducing the massing and visual impact along the east corridor as well as opportunities for pulling back from the property line.
3. Some Board members agree that the applicant should study varying the parapet heights on the upper floors and stepping back the roof decks from the street-facing fronts of the building along East Haley.
4. One suggestion was made to add planting along the parapet edge.
5. Some Board members agree that the applicant should eliminate the trellises that are visible as four story elements from the street level.
6. The Board appreciates that the changes that have been made thus far especially:
   a. The improvements to the pedestrian experience on Haley Street.
   b. The massing being broken up to avoid one long façade.
   c. Adjustments to the railing and wall to reduce the apparent mass.
7. The Board agrees that the project is in keeping with the Haley/Milpas design manual for the following reasons:
   a. The design is a contemporary interpretation of pueblo style architecture.
   b. The design character is slightly different from the Downtown Santa Barbara Spanish Style and has the potential to be less expensive.
   c. The project relates to the architectural character of its industrial surroundings.
   d. The project implements the use of wall niche treatments by integrating planters in the pedestrian parkway, incorporating recessed windows and patios, the use of steel trowel plaster, and the inclusion of accent landscaping.
8. The current Haley/Milpas design manual is an outdated manual, however the project is in keeping with the guideline.

Action: Wittausch/Gradin, 4/0/0. (Watkins stepped down. Miller absent.) Motion carried.

* Note: see ratification of minutes on 1/30/2017 for additional comments *

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING

5. 1062 COAST VILLAGE RD  C-1/SD-3 Zone

(5:40)  Assessor’s Parcel Number: 009-211-014
Application Number:   MST2016-00451
Owner:  David Back Revocable Trust
Architect: The Cearnal Collective, LLP

(Proposal for a new 30,316 square foot, 3-story mixed use development on a 25,215 square foot lot in the non-appealable jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone. The parcel is currently developed with a 10,872 square foot apartment building and carport, and the proposal involves the demolition of all buildings and paving, and the removal of all site trees. The project comprises nine condominium units totaling 20,192 square feet, and a 5,913 private residential garage area providing 18 spaces. The project also includes 966 square feet of commercial space, and 8,724 square feet of commercial and common garage areas providing six parking spaces and one commercial bicycle space. There will be 8,500 cubic yards of grading excavation. This project requires Planning Commission review for a Tentative Subdivision Map.)

(Comments only. Requires Environmental Assessment and Planning Commission review.)

Actual time: 6:40 p.m.

Public comment opened at 6:53 p.m.

The following people spoke in opposition or with concerns:
1. Timothy Fox Harding, neighbor, presented concerns regarding privacy, the size of the project and the negative environmental impact associated with the removal of the sites trees.
2. Sascha Liebowitz, neighbor, presented concerns regarding privacy and impact on the neighborhood.
3. Victoria Green, Montecito Planning Commission, expressed that she would like to see more on the size, bulk and scale of the project.
4. A letter of expressed concerns from Dorothy Fox & Timothy Harding regarding the project’s negative environmental impact, neighborhood incompatibility, and mass, bulk, and scale was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 7:02 p.m.

Motion: Continued indefinitely with comments:
1. The Board is appreciative of the design approach and the style.
2. The Board agrees that the projects style is in keeping with the traditional Santa Barbara style and fits in well with the best examples of Spanish/Mediterranean architecture that currently exists along Coast Village Road.
3. Applicant to return with a landscape plan and existing photographs that illustrates trees or hedges around the perimeter of the project so as to add additional screening for adjacent neighbor.
4. Applicant to continue meeting with the neighbors so as to address any of their concerns.
5. Study shifting the current footprint away from the along Coast Village Road to salvage the healthy trees.
6. Study varying the height of the roof and eave elements along the west property line to give a more village feel.
7. Study reducing the height of the elevator tower at Coast Village Road, and pulling it back away from the street.
8. Study the detailing of the elevator tower.

Action: Wittausch/Gradin, 5/0/0. (Miller absent.) Motion carried.

* THE BOARD RECESSED FROM 7:30 P.M. TO 7:52 P.M. *

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

6. 1200 BLK CLIFF DR

(7:15) Assessor’s Parcel Number: ROW-003-156
Application Number: MST2015-00334
Applicant: Verizon Wireless
Agent: Tricia Knight

(Review After Final of change to approved project to install a 39'-7" tall utility pole in lieu of the previously-approved 28’-5" utility pole. The antenna will be mounted at 38'-1" in lieu of 27'-2". All other aspects of the project will remain unchanged.)

(Review After Final. Requires No Visual Impact Findings. Project was last reviewed on October 24, 2016.)

Actual time: 7:52 p.m.
Present: Tricia Knight, Verizon Wireless

Public comment opened at 7:57 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it was closed.

Straw vote: How many Board Members are in favor of the taller pole and the current location? 4/1 Passed

Motion: Final Approval as noted on sheet A2, the top of the pole to be 39’ 7” and the top of the antenna to be at 38’ 1” and the pole is to remain in its current location with the finding that the visual impact has been minimized.

Action: Gradin/Tripp, 4 /1/0. (Wittausch opposed. Miller absent.) Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING

7. 101 S CANADA ST R-2 Zone

(7:35) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 017-231-016
Application Number: MST2016-00536
Owner: Edward St. George
Applicant: On Design LLC

(Proposal to construct a 4,176 square foot two-story duplex and a 631 square foot three-car garage on a 13,153 square foot lot. An existing 1,046 square foot single-family residence would remain, and would be remodeled to include a 754 square foot second story addition above a new 457 square foot two-car garage and one-car carport. Total development on site will be 7,064 square feet. There will be 525 cubic yards of grading excavation and 635 cubic yards of fill dirt. Also proposed is to demolish two unpermitted sheds and two-car garage. This proposal will address violations identified in Enforcement Case ENF2016-01675.)

(Comments only, project requires Environmental review.)

Actual time: 8:06 p.m.

Present: Keith Knollan, Architect, On Design; Shelby Messner, Planner; and Sam Maphis, Landscape Architect, Earthform Design

Public comment opened at 8:22 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it was closed.

Motion: Continued indefinitely with comments:
1. In general the Board appreciated the project and its direction.
2. The Board thought the style and massing were appropriate, especially since the majority of the larger structure is set back and complimented with a generous amount of open space.
3. Study simplifying the details and architectural features.
4. Study eliminating some bedrooms and implementing some additional private open space.
5. Study the possibility of lowering the second floor plate height to bring the roofline down toward the street and neighboring structures.
6. Utilize the landscape on the property to enhance privacy for the project and its neighbors.
7. Study simplifying the fenestration openings.

Action: Tripp/Moore, 4/0/0. (Gradin stepped down; Miller absent.) Motion carried.
* MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:45 P.M. *