

**BOARD MEMBERS:**

Kevin Moore, *Chair*
Bob Cunningham
Ivan Insua
Leon A. Olson
Richard Six
David R. Watkins

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:

Jason Dominguez

PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:

John Campanella

STAFF:

Tava Ostrenger, Assistant City Attorney
Irma Unzueta, Design Review Supervisor
Matthew Ozyilmaz, Planning Technician
Mary Ternovskaya, Commission Secretary

City of Santa Barbara

ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW AND MONTECITO BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW SPECIAL JOINT MEETING MINUTES NOVEMBER 18, 2019

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

CALL TO ORDER

The Special Joint meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Chair Moore.

ATTENDANCE

Members present: Moore, Insua, Olson, Six, and Watkins
Members absent: Cunningham
Staff present: Ostrenger, Ozyilmaz, and Ternovskaya

JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW (ABR) AND COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA MONTECITO BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW (MBAR)

1. CONTINUED ITEM: CONCEPT REVIEW

INTERSECTION OF OLIVE MILL RD, COAST VILLAGE RD, AND JAMESON LN

Assessor's Parcel Number: ROW-2812 AND ROW-2819
Application Number: PLN2019-00115 (City)
19BAR-00000-00116 (County)
Owner: City of Santa Barbara,
County of Santa Barbara,
Caltrans
Applicant: Laura Yanez (City), Morgan Jones (County)
Designer: James Faber, TY Lin International

(This is a Joint Public Hearing of the ABR and the MBAR. It is a proposal for improvements to the intersection of Coast Village Road, North Jameson Lane, Olive Mill Road, and United States Highway 101 by creating a new intersection configuration. The project proposes to enhance the traffic operations and safety of the intersection by reconfiguring the intersection to a single-lane roundabout, adding sidewalks, directional crosswalks, and landscaping. Tree removals and replacement street lighting are also proposed. This project will be reviewed by the City's Architectural Board of Review in conjunction with the County of Santa Barbara's Montecito Board of Architectural Review. Members of the Montecito Board of Architectural Review will be in attendance at the meeting to comment on the project.)

No final appealable decision will be made at this hearing. Project requires compliance with the City's Project Compatibility Analysis and the following guidelines: Highway 101 Coastal Parkway Design Guidelines (City), Outdoor Lighting and Streetlight Design Guidelines (City), and Montecito Architectural Guidelines and Development Standards (County). Project was last reviewed on August 12, 2019.

Actual time: 3:03 p.m.

Present: Laura Yanez, Supervising Civil Engineer, City of Santa Barbara; Nicole Lieu, Planner, County of Santa Barbara; James Faber, Designer, TY Lin International; Laurie Romano, Landscape Architect, Arcadia Studios; John Maloney, JMPE Electrical Engineering; and Megan Arciniega, Project Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Staff comments: Ms. Arciniega gave a presentation clarifying the design review process for the project. The project is here today for Conceptual Design Review, the next step will be Project Design Approval, and the last step is Final Design Approval. The Planning Commission will discuss completeness review, policy consistency review, and environmental review. The ABR/MBAR's purview is design review of the project, and Staff asks that the ABR/MBAR provide comments on the overall design, material palette, landscape palette, and provide direction for refining the design.

Public comment opened at 3:43 p.m.

The following individual(s) spoke:

1. Colleen M. Kelly
2. Robert Ludwick, on behalf of the Coast Village Road Association.
3. Douglas E. Fell

Written correspondence from Dana Hansen, Douglas E. Fell, and Pamela Boehr were acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 3:52 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Board Members feel that the palm trees are appropriate? 2/3 Failed

Straw vote: How many Board Members feel that the Coast Village Road sign is appropriate for the entryway? 4/1 Passed

Straw vote: How many Board Members feel that the proposed light fixtures are appropriate? 5/0 Passed

Straw vote: How many Board Members feel that the parking finger should be removed and parking should be added? 5/0 Passed

Motion #1: Continue indefinitely to the Planning Commission with comments:

1. The Board appreciates the efforts of the applicant team and Staff, particularly their outreach to the community and impacted property owners.
2. Continue the community outreach, in particular to the Montecito community and the Coast Village Road Association.
3. The applicant is encouraged to look for locations for the bus stop that will not contribute to safety or congestion hazards.
4. Coordinate bike circulation and provide locations where cyclists could be guided to sidewalks and possibly dismount.
5. Add 'sharrows' to the striping plan.
6. Incorporate art into the design and locate funding sources for art.

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

Motion #2: Continue indefinitely to the Planning Commission with comments:

1. The Board appreciates the efforts of the applicant team and Staff, particularly their outreach to the community and impacted property owners.
2. Continue the community outreach, in particular to the Montecito community and the Coast Village Road Association.
3. The applicant is encouraged to look for locations for the bus stop that will not contribute to safety or congestion hazards.
4. Coordinate bike circulation and provide locations where cyclists could be guided to sidewalks and possibly dismount.
5. Add 'sharrows' to the striping plan.
6. Incorporate art into the design and locate funding sources for art.
7. *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 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. The landscape and conceptual hardscape materials meet the Design Guidelines standards.*
 - c. *The size, mass, bulk, height, and scale of the project are appropriate for its location and neighborhood. The project does not block any views.*
 - d. *The design of the project is appropriately sensitive to adjacent Landmarks or other nearby designated historic resources. The landscaping and materials make the project sensitive to the Landmarks or historic resources.*
 - e. *The design of the project responds appropriately to established scenic public vistas.*
 - f. *The project includes an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping.*

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

*** MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:07 P.M. ***