CALL TO ORDER

The Full Board meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. by Chair Moore.

ATTENDANCE

Members present: Moore, Cunningham, Insua (at 3:19 p.m.), Olson, Wittausch (at 3:23 p.m.), and Six

Members absent: Watkins

Staff present: Ostrenger, Ozyilmaz, and Ternovskaya

GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Public Comment:

The following individual spoke:

1. Anna Marie Gott

B. Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Approve the minutes of the Architectural Board of Review meeting of July 15, 2019, as amended.

Action: Six/Cunningham, 3/0/1. (Moore abstained. Wittausch, Insua, and Watkins absent.) Motion carried.
C. Approval of the Consent Calendar:

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of July 22, 2019, as reviewed by Board Members Olson and Six.
Action: Cunningham/Olson, 4/0/0. (Wittausch absent.) Motion carried.

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of July 29, 2019, as reviewed by Board Members Cunningham and Six.
Action: Cunningham/Six, 4/0/0. (Wittausch, Insua, and Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

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

1. Mr. Ozyilmaz announced the following:
   a. Board Member Watkins will be absent.
   b. Board Member Insua will be arriving late.

E. Subcommittee Reports:

No subcommittee reports.

(3:15PM) REVIEW AFTER FINAL APPROVAL

1. **VARIOUS LOCATIONS IN THE OC ZONE**
   - Assessor’s Parcel Number: 017-022-003
   - Zone: OC/SD-3
   - Application Number: PLN2014-00017
   - Owner: Various Property Owners
   - Applicant: Torrie Cutbirth
   - Organization: Funk Zone Mural Program

(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 for an additional mural location to be added to the Funk Zone Mural program approved in 2014. The proposed mural location is on the northern building elevation of 24 East Mason Street.

Actual time: 3:20 p.m.

Present: Torrie Cutbirth, Applicant

Staff comments: Mr. Ozyilmaz clarified the intent of the Funk Zone Mural Program and the role of the Board when reviewing proposed mural locations.

Public comment opened at 3:26 p.m.

The following individuals spoke:
1. Anna Marie Gott, opposed
2. Rick Closson, opposed
3. Steve Hausz

Written correspondence from Anna Marie Gott was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 3:31 p.m.

Motion: Approval of Review After Final as submitted.
Action: Cunningham/Six, 5/1/0. (Wittausch opposed. Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

Individual comments: Board Member Wittausch stated that he is opposed because the mural location impacts other elements in the building, however if the area of the mural location was scaled down, he would be supportive of the project.

(3:40PM) PROJECT DESIGN APPROVAL AND FINAL APPROVAL

2. 3775 MODOC RD
   Assessor's Parcel Number: 049-030-030
   Zone: R-2
   Application Number: PLN2019-00285
   Owner: Front Porch Communities and Services
   Applicant: Tony Tomasello

(Proposal for an addition and new patio within an existing residential care facility. Project proposes renovating the existing dining room and adding an additional 2,350 square feet. Also proposed are changes to the landscaping, construction of a trellis/shade structure, installation of accent pavers, outdoor seating, new fireplace, and walkways with benches. No additional residential units are proposed.)

Project Design and Final Approval is requested. Project requires compliance with the Project Compatibility Analysis and the following guidelines: Outdoor Lighting Design Guidelines. Project was last reviewed on July 15, 2019.

Actual time: 3:52 p.m.

Present: Aramis Arciga, Project Manager, RRM Design Group; and Gordon Brewer, RRM Design Group

Public comment opened at 4:11 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Motion: Project Design Approval and continue indefinitely to Consent with conditions:
   1. Revise the landscape details.
      a. Adjust the pavement design and/or Crepe Myrtle tree locations in the alley in order to avoid conflicts.
      b. The strap lighting attachment on the Magnolia tree shall be revised to a screw attachment.
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 location within the City.
   b. It is an infill project that matches the existing architecture to a substantial degree. The design of the project is compatible with architectural qualities and characteristics of the City 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. There are no adjacent Landmarks or other nearby designated historic resources.
   e. The design of the project does not obstruct established scenic public vistas.
   f. The project includes an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping, as the project is part of an existing development.

Action: Cunningham/Olson, 5/0/1. (Insua abstained. Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

(4:25PM) CONTINUED ITEM: CONCEPT REVIEW

3. 1260 COAST VILLAGE CIR
   Assessor’s Parcel Number: 009-291-027
   Zone: C-1/SD-3
   Application Number: PLN2019-00263
   Owner: Christopher T. Compogiannis Trust
   Applicant: George Valdez

(Proposal for an exterior remodel of an existing commercial structure. Project proposes replacement of existing windows, roofing, and siding, as well as the construction of a parapet and faux chimneys, a front patio and site walls, and changes to the parking configuration.)

No final appealable decision will be made at this hearing. Project requires compliance with the Project Compatibility Analysis and the following guidelines: Outdoor Lighting Design Guidelines. Project was last reviewed on July 15, 2019.

Actual time: 4:25 p.m.

Present: Ryan Mills, DMHA Architecture; and Michael Stroh, Architect, DMHA Architecture

Staff comments: Mr. Ozilymaz requested that the Board provide comments on the design of the building at the faux chimney that requires the modification.

Public comment opened at 4:42 p.m.

The following individual spoke:

1. Anna Marie Gott, opposed.

Written correspondence from Anna Marie Gott was acknowledged.
Public comment closed at 4:45 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Board Members can support the design as it relates to the potential modification in the setback? 5/0 Passed

**Motion:** Continue to the Staff Hearing Officer for return to the Full Board with comments:
1. The Board is supportive of the modification, specifically the encroachment of the existing corner of the building with the enhanced chimney and the roof overhang.
2. Provide additional room between tandem parking spaces and trash enclosure in order to provide a landing and steps from the parking level to the rear entrance.
3. Provide an additional tree in a triangular planter adjacent to new accessible parking space.
4. The enclosing walls of the trash enclosure and condensing units shall be stucco to match the building.
5. Remove remnants of old planter wall and provide a wall more compatible with the building.
6. Consult with City Arborist in regards to the location and elevation of the street tree to develop a landscape design which anticipates a possible future sidewalk improvements.
7. Provide recessed windows on the west side and protruding window frames on the east side.
8. The Board provides comments on the Compatibility Analysis Criteria (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 design of the project is compatible with desirable architectural qualities and characteristics that are distinctive of the City and of the particular neighborhood surrounding the project as proposed.
   c. The size, mass, bulk, height, and scale of the project are appropriate for its location and neighborhood because it does not significantly change the existing buildings.
   d. The design of the project is does not affect adjacent Landmarks or other nearby designated historic resources.
   e. The design of the project does not affect scenic public vistas.
   f. The project includes an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping.

**Action:** Wittausch/Olson, 2/3/1. (Olson, Cunningham, and Six opposed. Insua abstained. Watkins absent.) Motion failed.

**Motion:** Continue to the Staff Hearing Officer for return to the Full Board with comments:
1. The Board is supportive of the modification, specifically the encroachment of the existing corner of the building with the enhanced chimney and the roof overhang.
2. Provide additional room between tandem parking spaces and trash enclosure in order to provide a landing and steps from the parking level to the rear entrance.
3. Provide an additional tree in a triangular planter between the new parking space and the new accessible parking space.
4. The enclosing walls of the trash enclosure and condensing units shall be constructed of substantial wood material.
5. Remove remnants of old planter wall and provide a wall more compatible with the building.
6. Consult with City Arborist in regards to the location and elevation of the street tree to develop a landscape design which anticipates a possible future sidewalk improvements.
7. Provide recessed windows on the west side and protruding window frames on the east side.
8. The Board provides comments on the Compatibility Analysis Criteria (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 design of the project is compatible with desirable architectural qualities and characteristics that are distinctive of the City and of the particular neighborhood surrounding the project as proposed.
   c. The size, mass, bulk, height, and scale of the project are appropriate for its location and neighborhood because it does not significantly change the existing buildings.
   d. The design of the project is does not affect adjacent Landmarks or other nearby designated historic resources.
   e. The design of the project does not affect scenic public vistas.
   f. The project includes an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping.

Action: Cunningham/Olson, 3/2/1. (Wittausch and Six opposed. Insua abstained. Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

* MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:35 P.M. *