



City of Santa Barbara
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW
MINUTES
APRIL 9, 2018

3:00 P.M.
David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street
SantaBarbaraCA.gov

BOARD MEMBERS:

Kirk Gradin, *Chair*
Amy Fitzgerald Tripp, *Vice Chair*
Bob Cunningham
Kevin Moore
David R. Watkins
Wm. Howard Wittausch

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON: Jason Dominguez

PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON: John Campanella

STAFF:

Irma Unzueta, Design Review Supervisor
Matthew Cameron, Planning Technician
Kathleen Goo, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

The Full Board meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. by Chair Gradin.

ATTENDANCE

Members present: Gradin (absent 4:51-6:30 p.m.), Tripp, Cunningham (absent 3:54-4:51 p.m.), Moore, and Wittausch
Members absent: Watkins
Staff present: Unzueta (6:52-7:28 p.m.), Cameron, and Goo

GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Public Comment:

No public comment.

B. Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Cameron stated that for the minutes of February 26, 2018, for Item 5, 402 Anacapa Street, there is ambiguous language in Item 6 of the motion. The sentence should reflect that the Board was requesting “*floor and site plans*,” and not “*plants*.” He stated that Board Member Tripp, as maker of the motion, reviewed the corrected motion and confirmed the correction. Board Member Cunningham, seconder of the motion, mentioned that he recalled a landscaping comment was included in the motion regarding “plants.” Mr. Cameron advised the Board to move forward, and as the project is currently agendaed as Item 5 at today’s meeting, any landscaping comments can be included in the current review of the project.

Original motion read as follows:

Motion: Continue four weeks with comments:

1. Provide an aerial neighborhood site plan, showing the different uses of the surrounding properties.
2. Add an additional street tree along the Gutierrez parkway.
3. Study adding a third parking space for the third unit.
4. Provide a trash enclosure at the proposed refuse location.
5. Provide screening for the condensing unit.
6. Provide both existing and proposed plants on the plan.

Action: Tripp/Cunningham, 5/0/0. (Gradin absent.) Motion carried.

Corrected motion reads as follows:**Motion: Continue four weeks with comments:**

1. Provide an aerial neighborhood site plan, showing the different uses of the surrounding properties.
2. Add an additional street tree along the Gutierrez parkway.
3. Study adding a third parking space for the third unit.
4. Provide a trash enclosure at the proposed refuse location.
5. Provide screening for the condensing unit.
6. Provide both existing and proposed *floor and site plans*.

Action: Tripp/Cunningham, 5/0/0. (Gradin absent.) Motion carried.

Motion: Re-ratify the minutes of the Architectural Board of Review meeting of **February 26, 2018**, as amended.

Action: Tripp/Cunningham, 4/0/1. (Gradin abstained. Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

Motion: Approve the minutes of the Architectural Board of Review meeting of **March 12, 2018**, as amended.

Action: Cunningham/Moore, 4/0/1. (Wittausch abstained. Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

The **March 26, 2018** meeting was cancelled due to lack of quorum.

C. Consent Calendar:

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **March 19, 2018**, as reviewed by Board Member Moore.

Action: Moore/Tripp, 5/0/0. (Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **March 26, 2018**, as reviewed by Board Member Moore.

Action: Moore/Cunningham, 5/0/0. (Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **April 2, 2018**, as reviewed by Board Member Cunningham.

Action: Cunningham/Tripp, 5/0/0. (Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **April 9, 2018**, as reviewed by Board Member Moore.

Action: Moore/Cunningham, 5/0/0. (Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

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

1. Mr. Cameron announced the following:
 - a. Board Member Watkins will be absent from today's meeting.
 - b. Board Member Cunningham will be stepping down on Item 2, 926 Indio Muerto.
 - c. Chair Gradin will be stepping down on Item 3, 101 S. Canada St., and Item 4, 217 S. Milpas St.
 - d. A joint City Council and Planning Commission work session meeting will be held this Friday, April 13, 2018 at 9:30 a.m., to discuss current and future work efforts.

E. Subcommittee Reports:

No subcommittee reports.

FINAL REVIEW

1. 706 E HALEY ST

C-G Zone

(3:15) Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-301-023
 Application Number: MST2017-00441
 Owner: 706 E. Haley, LLC
 Designer: Shaun Lynch

(Proposal for new commercial office space. Project consists of a new one-story, 563 square foot commercial building on a 10,429 square foot lot currently developed with a mixed-use building containing 2,097 square feet of residential space and 1,409 square feet of commercial space. Also proposed are two new parking spaces, reconfiguration of the existing parking lot, and relocation of the required open yard. No changes are proposed for the existing structures on site.)

(Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Project was last reviewed on November 20, 2017.)

Actual time: 3:22 p.m.

Present: Shaun Lynch, Designer

Public comment opened at 3:32 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Motion: Continue indefinitely to Consent with comments:

1. Add an oak tree as shown on the previously approved landscape plan.
2. Add a street tree and tree well based on the City Arborist's requirements.
3. Remove all notations and/or details indicating a parapet covered by a sheet metal cap (particularly details 9 and 10 on plan Sheet A-701).
4. Detail #3 on plan Sheet A-701 should indicate a concrete wall rather than a CMU wall.
5. Update the sections, keying in relevant details, such as a parapet caps, waterproofing details, and surfacing details.
6. Provide a simplified leader box detail. The proposed leader box location is acceptable.

7. Verify and provide mechanical engineering details or other details showing the exact height of the rooftop platform equipment, attachments, and that the rooftop equipment will not exceed the parapet height by more than currently indicated, which is by no more than 2 inches.
8. Provide detailed structural drawings.

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

Individual comments: Board Member Wittausch stated that he opposed the motion because the proposed building is too uniform in its design and is not designed in a way which makes the front, sides, and rear apparent, and the proposed gutter box should not hidden away at the side of the building, but should be in line with the holistic design of the building.

PROJECT DESIGN REVIEW

2. 926 INDIO MUERTO ST

C-2/SD-3 Zone

(3:45)

Assessor's Parcel Number: 017-284-003
 Application Number: MST2014-00415
 Owner: IWF SB Gateway, LP
 Applicant: John Cuykendall
 Architect: David Thiel

(Proposal to demolish an existing 12,000 square foot commercial building and construct an approximately 55,000 square foot, 45'-0" tall hotel on a 38,122 square foot parcel. The project will comprise a three-story hotel with 111 rooms and a 115 space, semi-subterranean parking lot with supportive amenities. Planning Commission approval was granted on May 18, 2017 for Development Plan Approval, a Coastal Development Permit, and a Transfer of Existing Development Rights.)

(Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Project requires a Substantial Conformance Determination and must comply with Planning Commission Resolution 010-17. Project was last reviewed on February 26, 2018.)

RECUSAL: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Board Member Cunningham recused himself from hearing this item.

Actual time: 3:54 p.m.

Present: Ken Marshall, Dudek; David Thiel, Architect, AGI; Martha Degasis, Landscape Architect, Arcadia Studio; and Kelly Brodison, Assistant Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 4:09 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Motion: Continue indefinitely to Full Board with comments:

1. The Board commended previous changes made since the last review of this gateway project at the entrance to the City are moving in the right direction; however, there appears to be areas of the project where the height can be further reduced, such as:
 - a. the tower element at the entry;
 - b. the tower at the Milpas Street corner;

- c. the stair tower;
 - d. the tower at the northeast corner on plan Sheet A-8;
 - e. the roof trellis; and
 - f. the two-story arch at the ramp elevation on plan Sheet A-9.
 - g. Study reducing the arch height wherever the ground floor arches are intruding on framing so that the detailing is not determined by hidden structural elements.
2. Reduce in size the main vehicle entry arch. It appears excessively large, and if it cannot be reduced, then the details should appear authentic to a sandstone arch of that size.
 3. Particularly at the ground floor level, the apparent thickness of the exterior walls should be appropriate to the building size, and at least typically one-foot thick minimum where the thickness of the walls are exposed.
 4. The non-functional pilasters on the Indio Muerto side of the project should either be eliminated or restudied to make the pilasters appear functional, since the pilasters appear to be an anomaly as they are currently drawn on the plans.
 5. Study incorporating varying kinds of smaller scale detailing on other parts of the building, such as corbeling at the projecting plaster balconies, and provide additional detailing at the solid balconies.
 6. Restudy the proposed grill work in the large arches at the parking level.
 7. The variation in window and door sizes and the proportion between solid wall and fenestration achieved on the Indio Muerto side should be also incorporated into the Highway 101 exit ramp side of the project.
 8. The large, visually prominent Milpas Street corner tower element should be reduced in height as much as possible.
 9. One Board member found the proposed mass, bulk, and scale acceptable; that the large pedestrian arch entrance was acceptable as proposed to announce the entrance side of the building; and the height of the Milpas Street corner tower element was acceptable to anchor that corner of the building.

Action: Gradin/Wittausch, 3/1/0. (Tripp opposed. Cunningham and Watkins absent.)
Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM**3. 101 S CANADA ST****R-2 Zone**

(4:30) Assessor's Parcel Number: 017-231-016
Application Number: MST2016-00536
Owner: Edward St. George
Applicant: On Design, LLC

(Proposal for a Tentative Parcel Map for a three-unit condominium development including construction of a 4,176 square foot two-story duplex and a 631 square foot three-car garage on a 13,153 square foot lot. The 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. The development on site will be 7,064 square feet with a residential density of 10 dwelling units per acre on an R-2 (Two-Unit Residential) zoned lot with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Medium Density Residential (max 12 du/acre). There will be 525 cubic yards of grading excavation and 635 cubic yards of fill dirt. Also proposed is the demolition of two unpermitted sheds and a two-car garage. This proposal will address violations identified in Enforcement Case ENF2016-01675.)

(Fourth Concept Review. Comments Only. Project requires review by the Staff Hearing Officer for a Tentative Subdivision Map. Project was postponed due to a lack of quorum on March 12, 2018.)

RECUSAL: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Chair Gradin recused himself from hearing this item.

Actual time: 4:51 p.m.

Present: Noah Greer, Applicant, On Design, LLC; Sam Maphis, Landscape Architect, Earthform Design; and Kelly Brodison, Assistant Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Staff comments: Ms. Brodison stated that the proposed three-unit project is actually returning for a third review as previously continued; however, the project is not currently ready for an approval, and she requested comments from the Board to address the Compatibility Analysis Criteria for forwarding to the Staff Hearing Officer (SHO).

Public comment opened at 5:09 p.m.

The following people expressed opposition or concerns:

1. John Kingsbury spoke in opposition to the size and additional traffic on already damaged roads surrounding the proposed project. Ms. Brodison addressed the Board and stated that the applicant was made aware by Public Works staff that the reconstruction and repaving of the street around the project would need to be brought up to code requirements prior to construction completion as a condition of approval.
2. Jose Arturo Gallegos spoke in opposition to the development of the proposed expensive condominium project due to the lack of available affordable housing for the local working class within the City.

Public comment closed at 5:16 p.m.

Motion: Continue indefinitely to the Staff Hearing Officer for return to the Full Board with comments:

1. The Board finds that the Compatibility Analysis Criteria generally have been met (per SBMC 22.68.045.B.) as follows:
 - a. The project fully complies with all applicable City Charter and Municipal Code requirements. The project's design is consistent with design guidelines applicable to its location within the City.
 - b. The proposed style and design of the project is compatible with the architectural qualities and characteristics of the Spanish style of architecture in Santa Barbara and of the particular neighborhood surrounding the project.
 - c. The size, mass, bulk, height, and scale of the project are appropriate for its location and the surrounding neighborhood, and project is moving in the right direction.
 - d. There are no sensitive to adjacent Landmarks or other nearby designated historic resources applicable in the area of the proposed project.
 - e. The design of the project responds appropriately to established scenic public vistas.
 - f. The project includes an appropriate amount of open space provided in the landscape plan.
2. The Board finds that the style of the project is appropriate for the neighborhood, and the changes made on the project are moving in the right direction.
3. Study and match the window style of Building A with the window style of Building B to tie the project together.
4. Check and verify the street tree species and designation with the City Arborist.
5. The proposed modification is aesthetically appropriate. The proposed modification does not pose consistency issues with ABR Design Guidelines or City Ordinances.
6. Provide hardline drawings and further proposed details on the plans.
7. Provide a drainage plan to ensure any drainage will be retained on-site and not run off-site.
8. Two Board members expressed concern regarding the height and scale of the proposed stair tower on Building B.

Action: Tripp/Cunningham, 4/0/0. (Gradin and Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW**4. 217 S MILPAS ST****C-2/SD-3 Zone**

(5:10) Assessor's Parcel Number: 017-251-007
Application Number: MST2018-00018
Owner: Edward St. George
Applicant: Shelby Messner
Architect: Keith Nolan

(One time pre-application consultation for a new hotel in the Coastal Zone. Project consists of the demolition of an existing single-unit residence and detached four-car garage, and the construction of a new 3,398 square foot, three-story, 37-foot tall hotel. The hotel is proposed to contain seven guestrooms. Nine surface level parking spaces are proposed. Project will require Planning Commission review for a Coastal Development Permit.)

(Comments Only.)

RECUSAL: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Chair Gradin recused himself from hearing this item.

Actual time: 5:43 p.m.

Present: Keith Nolan, Architect; Sam Maphis, Landscape Architect; Shelby Messner, Planner; and Kelly Brodison, Assistant Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Staff comments:

1. Ms. Brodison stated that there are only limited plans available for the current one-time pre-application concept review for the proposed project as the applicant still has to contend with Tenant Displacement Assistance Ordinance requirements prior to submitting a formal Development Review application, and for eventual Planning Commission review for a Development Plan approval and Coastal Development Permit.
2. For the current pre-application review, Mr. Cameron requested only the Board's general comments to address the currently proposed size, mass, bulk, style, and location, and not detailed comments.

Public comment opened at 5:58 p.m.

The following people expressed opposition or concerns:

1. Jose Arturo Gallegos spoke in opposition to the proposed hotel project, stating that it will hurt the long-term local small businesses and local workforce in the area, and due to the homeless element in the area, the location for the proposed project is not ideal.
2. Anna Marie Gott spoke in opposition to substantial large size units that may be converted into small/partial kitchens, becoming illegal conversions or additional rental rooms that will ultimately add to the parking density in the area. Victor Reyes, Mary Turner, and Christine Neuhauser ceded their time to Ms. Gott.

Public comment closed at 6:06 p.m.

Board comments:

1. Board Member Wittausch: The proposed second-floor unit over the driveway at the front of the property should be located at the end of the property and reduced to normal building height at that location, with the corridor widened at the end of the property for emergency

access. The proposed bridge is interesting, but huge and overwhelming at 12-13 feet in the air; however, the project details are different yet charming, and appropriate for the long, narrow project site.

2. Board Member Cunningham: In general, the proposed building is acceptable in detailing, height, and style; however, the unit over the driveway is not acceptable with a plain façade not in keeping with the rest of the style of architecture, and the column that supports that unit on the north side is much too light and not massive enough for the proposed Spanish Colonial style of architecture. It appears as if someone unsuccessfully added a unit over the driveway to the building on the south side. He concurred with Board Member Wittausch that the second-floor unit over the driveway should be relocated to the back of the property; however, that unit may be eliminated entirely and squeezed into the rest of the building, if the applicant reduces the size of the units.
3. Board Member Moore: The project is nicely designed; the applicant should restudy the proposed unit over the driveway for a better solution for the massing so that it does not appear pushed-forward on the site. The design to the rear of the property is more sympathetic to surroundings and there is not much at that location, so the massing could be shifted more to the rear of the property to address public impact concerns, more sidewalk space, and emergency access issues. It's unfortunate that the proposed elevator tower is so much taller compared to rest of the structure, so the applicant should study an alternative remote machine room or over-room or alternate elevator lift or type. The project appears nicely detailed, and with changes made to the unit with the high bridge, the proposed massing may be acceptable.
4. Board Member Tripp: Overall, the proposed project may be too tall in some locations compared to the infill and buildings next to it. The unit over the driveway should be repositioned further back as the wall does not appear substantial enough, and should be restudied to step down or be pushed back and integrated into the rest of the building. The elevator tower element appears too high; however, the composition of the general buildings stepping down in front of it appears acceptable. The pedestrian path of travel separated from the driveway through the site, the proposed overall details, variety of openings, treatment of the parapets, and roof details are acceptable. The applicant should study providing a buffer at the sidewalk since the existing building is set back farther from the street.

*** THE BOARD RECESSED FROM 6:30 TO 6:52 P.M. ***

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM**5. 402 ANACAPA ST****M-C Zone**

(5:50) Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-271-016
 Application Number: MST2018-00005
 Owner: Inga Frick

(Proposal to convert an existing residential unit to a three-guestroom short-term rental. Two of the guest rooms will have kitchens. Existing development on the site consists of a two-story, 1,508 square foot, two-bedroom single residential unit with two uncovered parking spaces. Minor exterior alterations include relocating an existing driveway gate. A previous project for the site was approved on December 5, 2016 under the Master Application number MST2016-00514, which proposed to convert the residential unit to 1 two-guestroom short-term rental. The project requires Development Plan Approval findings for conversion of residential floor area into commercial use.)

(Second Concept Review. Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Project requires Development Plan Approval findings for new commercial floor space. Project requires an environmental finding for a CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 Exemption - Projects Consistent with the General Plan. Project was last reviewed on February 26, 2018.)

Actual time: 6:52 p.m.

Present: Trish Allen, Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services; Dwight Gregory, Architect; and Irma Unzueta, Senior Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Staff comments: Ms. Unzueta stated that the project complies with the Zoning Ordinance of the General Plan and is additionally located within the Zone of Benefit that allows the project to have the minimum parking requirement of two parking spaces.

Public comment opened at 7:07 p.m.

The following people expressed support:

1. Howard Cantor, neighbor
2. Robin Donaldson, neighbor
3. Mary Ellen Tiffany

The following people expressed opposition or concerns:

1. Anna Marie Gott spoke in concern that two parking spaces is not enough to accommodate the 11 possible guests, and the potential impacts to street parking for the surrounding residences and businesses. She also questioned whether the parking zone of benefit in the Central Business District should apply to a short term rental as the use requires longer parking times than typical businesses in that zone. Victor Reyes, Mary Turner, and Christine Neuhauser ceded their time to Ms. Gott.

Public comment closed at 7:25 p.m.

Motion: Project Design Approval and Final Approval with comments:

1. The Board makes the following Development Plan Approval findings for new commercial floor space:
 - a. The proposed development complies with all provisions of this Title.
 - b. The proposed development is consistent with the principles of sound community planning.
 - c. The proposed development will not have a significant adverse impact upon the community's aesthetics or character in that the size, bulk, or scale of the development will be compatible with the neighborhood based on the Project Compatibility Analysis criteria found in Sections 22.22.145 or 22.68.045 of this Code.
 - d. The proposed development is consistent with the policies of the City of Santa Barbara Traffic Management Strategy (as approved by City Resolution No. 13-010 dated as of March 12, 2013) as expressed in the allocation allowances specified in SBMC Section 28.85.050. (Ord. 5609, 2013.), and parking requirements of the City.
2. The Board finds that the Compatibility Analysis Criteria generally have been met (per SBMC 22.68.045.B.) as follows:
 - a. The project fully complies with all applicable City Charter and Municipal Code requirements. The project's design is consistent with design guidelines applicable to its urban location within the City.
 - b. The design of the project is compatible with desirable architectural qualities and characteristics that are distinctive of Santa Barbara and of the particular neighborhood surrounding the project.
 - c. The size, mass, bulk, height, and scale of the project are appropriate for its location and neighborhood.
 - d. The design of the project is not directly located next to adjacent Landmarks or other nearby designated historic resources.
 - e. The design of the project does not affect established scenic public vistas.
 - f. The project includes an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping.
3. The location is appropriate for the use, the enclosures provided for the utilities are acceptable, and without a parking waiver requirement or parking credit applied, the proposed parking is appropriate and acceptable for its use.

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

The ten-day appeal period was announced.

Individual comments:

1. Board Member Wittausch opposed the motion because the two downstairs bathrooms should be in working order and comply with code requirements.
2. The Board shall make the environmental finding at Consent for a CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 Exemption - Projects Consistent with the General Plan.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING**6. 431 OLD COAST HWY****R-2/SD-3 Zone****(6:50)**

Assessor's Parcel Number: 015-292-012
 Application Number: MST2018-00065
 Owner: Linda L. Padgett Living Trust

(Proposal for additions and alterations to a parcel developed with four residential units. Project consists of first-floor additions, ranging in size from 237 to 281 square feet, to each of the four units. Also proposed are alterations to the façade of the units and reconfiguration of the site plan. Four existing carports will be demolished, and four new two-car garages are proposed. Project proposes to abate violations identified in Enforcement Case ENF2017-01265.)

(Comments Only. Project requires further Environmental Assessment.)

Item postponed indefinitely due to the applicant's absence.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING**7. 3453 RICHLAND DR****R-M/USS Zone****(7:25)**

Assessor's Parcel Number: 051-080-025
 Application Number: MST2018-00108
 Owner: John and Anna Fleming Credit Shelter

(Proposal for landscaping and slope repair on a 31,838 square foot lot. Project consists of slope repair and stabilization for a 47-foot grade change. A total of 1,640 cubic yards of grading is proposed, and a new swale is to be installed at the base of the reconstructed slope. Four trees are proposed to be removed, and five 10-gallon sycamores are proposed to be planted. The project was submitted and should be considered with MST2018-00107, which proposes a similar scope of work on the adjacent parcel.)

(Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided.)

Actual time: 7:30 p.m.

Present: Larry Hecht, Applicant

Public comment opened at 7:41 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Motion: Continue one week to Consent with comments:

1. Provide a landscape plan that shows coastal live Oak trees as opposed to Sycamore trees.
2. Provide a landscape plan that includes a variety of drought-tolerant ground cover that would be supportive for the live oak trees.
3. Provide an irrigation plan to establish the proposed landscaping. The Board expressed concern regarding water retention and/or resolving water drainage off-site.

Action: Wittausch/Cunningham, 5/0/0. (Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING**8. 3458 RICHLAND DR****R-M/USS Zone**

(7:50) Assessor's Parcel Number: 051-080-005
Application Number: MST2018-00107
Owner: 3458 Richland Drive, LLC
Designer: Larry Hecht

(Proposal for landscaping and slope repair on a 27,282 square foot lot. Project consists of slope repair and stabilization for a 52-foot grade change. A total of 1,390 cubic yards of grading is proposed, and a new swale is to be installed at the base of the reconstructed slope. Five trees are proposed to be removed, and five 10-gallon sycamores are proposed to be planted. The project was submitted and should be considered with MST2018-00108, which proposes a similar scope of work on the adjacent parcel.)

(Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided.)

Actual time: 7:53 p.m.

Present: Larry Hecht, Applicant

Public comment opened at 7:56 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Correspondence in opposition from Dr. James Wagner was acknowledged.

Motion: Continue one week to Consent with comments:

1. Provide a landscape plan that shows coastal live Oak trees as opposed to Sycamore trees.
2. Provide a landscape plan that includes a variety of drought-tolerant ground cover that would be supportive for the live oak trees.
3. Provide an irrigation plan to establish the proposed landscaping. The Board expressed concern regarding water retention and for resolving the issue of water drainage off-site.
4. Provide a drainage plan to ensure that the water run-off from the site does not impact adjacent neighbors. Indicate on the plans where the water from the hillside will be directed, and that the water run-off will be contained on the property.

Action: Moore/Cunningham, 5/0/0. (Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

*** MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:00 P.M. ***