



City of Santa Barbara

Planning Division

HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION MINUTES

Wednesday, May 31, 2006

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street

1:00 P.M.

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

- PHILIP SUDING, Chair – Present
- WILLIAM LA VOIE, Vice-Chair – Present
- LOUISE BOUCHER – Present, left at 6:08 p.m.
- STEVE HAUSZ – Absent
- VADIM HSU – Present
- ALEX PUJO – Present
- CAREN RAGER – Present
- FERMINA MURRAY – Present
- SUSETTE NAYLOR – Present at 1:32 p.m., left at 5:28 p.m.

ADVISORY MEMBER:

DR. MICHAEL GLASSOW – Absent

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:

ROGER HORTON – Absent

PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:

WILLIAM MAHAN – Absent

STAFF:

- JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor – Present from 3:00 p.m. to 3:10 p.m. and from 5:00 p.m.
- JAKE JACOBUS, Urban Historian – Present, left at 4:15 p.m.
- SUSAN GANTZ, Planning Technician II – Present, left at 4:15 p.m.
- GABRIELA FELICIANO, Commission Secretary – Present

HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST (See El Pueblo Viejo District Guidelines & Design Review Submittal Requirements for Details)		
CONCEPT REVIEW	Required	<u>Master Application & Submittal Fee</u> - (Location: 630 Garden Street) <u>Photographs</u> - of the existing building (if any), adjacent structures, composite panoramic view of the site, surrounding areas & neighborhood streetscape - mounted or folded to no larger than an 8.5" x 14" photo display board. <u>Plans</u> - three sets of folded plans are required at the time of submittal & each time plans are revised. <u>Vicinity Map and Project Tabulations</u> - (Include on first drawing) <u>Site Plan</u> - drawn to scale showing the property boundaries, existing & proposed structures, building & area square footages, building height, areas to be demolished, parking, site topography, conceptual grading & retaining walls, & existing landscaping. Include footprints of adjacent structures. <u>Exterior elevations</u> - showing existing & proposed grading where applicable.
	Suggested	<u>Site Sections</u> - showing the relationship of the proposed building & grading where applicable. <u>Plans</u> - floor, roof, etc. <u>Rough sketches</u> are encouraged early in the process for initial design review to avoid pursuing incompatible proposals. However, more complete & thorough information is recommended to facilitate an efficient review of the project.
PRELIMINARY REVIEW	Required	Same as above with the following additions: <u>Plans</u> - floor, roof, etc. <u>Site Sections</u> - showing the relationship of the proposed building & grading where applicable. <u>Preliminary Landscape Plans</u> - required for commercial & multi-family; single family projects where grading occurs. Preliminary planting plan with proposed trees & shrubs & plant list with names. Plans to include street parkway strips.
	Suggested	<u>Color & Material Samples</u> - to be mounted on a board no larger than 8.5" x 14" & detailed on all sets of plans. <u>Exterior Details</u> - windows, doors, eaves, railings, chimney caps, flashing, etc. Materials submitted for preliminary approval form the basis for working drawings & must be complete & accurate.
FINAL & CONSENT	Required	Same as above with the following additions: <u>Color & Material Samples</u> - to be mounted on a board no larger than 8.5" x 14" and detailed on all sets of plans. <u>Cut Sheets</u> - exterior light fixtures and accessories where applicable. <u>Exterior Details</u> - windows, doors, eaves, railings, chimney caps, flashing, etc. <u>Final Landscape Plans</u> - landscape construction documents including planting & irrigation plan. <u>Consultant/Engineer Plans</u> - electrical, mechanical, structural, & plumbing where applicable.

PLEASE BE ADVISED

- ** All approvals made by the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) are based on compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 22.22 and with adopted HLC guidelines. Some agenda items have received a mailed notice and are subject to a public hearing.
- ** The approximate time the project will be reviewed is listed to the left of each item. It is suggested that applicants arrive 15 minutes early. The agenda schedule is subject to change as cancellations occur. Staff will notify applicants of time changes.
- ** The applicant's presence is required. If an applicant is not present, the item will be postponed indefinitely. If an applicant cancels or postpones an item without providing advance notice, the item will be postponed indefinitely and will not be placed on the following HLC agenda. In order to reschedule the item for review, the applicant must fill out and file a Supplemental Application Form at 630 Garden Street (Community Development Department) and submit appropriate plans.
- ** The Commission may grant an approval for any project scheduled on the agenda if sufficient information has been provided and no other discretionary review is required. Substitution of plans is not allowed, if revised plans differing from the submittal sets are brought to the meeting, motions for preliminary or final approval will be contingent upon staff review for code compliance.
- ** Preliminary and Final Historic Landmarks Commission approval is valid for one year from the date of the approval unless a time extension or Building Permit has been granted.
- ** The Commission may refer items to the Consent Calendar for Preliminary and Final Historic Landmarks Commission approval.
- ** **Items before the Commission may be appealed to the City Council. For further information on appeals, contact the Planning Division Staff or the City Clerk's Office. Said appeal must be in writing and must be filed with the City Clerk at City Hall within ten (10) calendar days of the meeting at which the Commission took action or rendered its decision. The scope of this project may be modified under further review.**
- ** **AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT:** In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Division at (805) 564-5470. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements.
- ** **AGENDAS, MINUTES and REPORTS:** Copies of all documents relating to agenda items are available for review at 630 Garden St. and agendas and minutes are posted online at www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov. If you have any questions or wish to review the plans, please contact Susan Gantz, at (805) 564-5470 between the hours of 8:30 a.m. to noon and 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

LICENSING ADVISORY:

The Business and Professions Code of the State of California and the Municipal Code of the City of Santa Barbara restrict preparation of plans for certain project types to licensed professionals. Applicants are encouraged to consult with Building and Safety Staff or Planning Staff to verify requirements for their specific projects.

Unlicensed persons are limited to the preparation of plans for:

- Single or multiple family dwellings not to exceed four (4) units per lot, of wood frame construction, and not more than two stories and basement in height;
- Non-structural changes to storefronts; and,
- Landscaping for single-family dwellings, or projects consisting solely of landscaping of not more than 5,000 square feet.

NOTICE:

- A. That on May 26, 2006 at 4:00 P.M., this Agenda was duly posted on the indoor and outdoor bulletin boards at the Community Development Department, 630 Garden Street, and online at www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov.
- B. This regular meeting of the Historic Landmarks Commission will be broadcast live and rebroadcast in its entirety on Friday at 1:00 P.M. and again the following Friday at 1:00 P.M. on Channel 18.

GENERAL BUSINESS:

A. Public Comment:

Any member of the public may address the Historic Landmarks Commission for up to two minutes on any subject within their jurisdiction that is not scheduled for a public discussion before the Board on that day. The total time for this item is ten minutes. (Public comment for items scheduled on today's agenda will be taken at the time the item is heard.)

No public comment.

B. Approval of the minutes of the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of May 17, 2006.

Motion: Approval of the minutes of the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of May 17, 2006, with corrections.

Action: La Voie/Murray, 7/0/0.

C. Consent Calendar.

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar as reviewed by William La Voie.

Action: Boucher/Rager, 7/0/0. Rager abstained from Item C.

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

1. Ms. Gantz made the following announcements:

- a) Ms. Rager will be stepping down from item #6, 1214 State Street.
- b) Mr. Hsu will be stepping down from item #3, 1926 Santa Barbara Street.
- c) Ms. Naylor will be arriving at approximately 2:15 p.m. and will be leaving at 5:00 p.m.
- d) Item 2, review of a Phase I Archaeological Resources Report for the project at 1235 Veronica Springs Road, has been postponed six weeks to July 12th at the applicant's request.

2. Ms. Gantz suggested that members of the Commission go to 601 Chapala Street (Enterprise Rent-A-Car) to view the color of the new concrete sidewalk. This was a "test case" of the new concrete color specified in the new Chapala Street Design Guidelines.

3. Mr. Suding announced that Mr. La Voie will be absent from the next two meetings. Mr. Pujo will be reviewing the June 14th Consent Calendar and Mr. Hsu will be reviewing the June 28th Consent Calendar.

E. Subcommittee Reports.

Postponed two weeks to the June 14, 2006, meeting.

F. Possible Ordinance Violations.

No violations reported.

DISCUSSION ITEM:**SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION.**

(1:06)

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE URBAN VILLAGE – PLANNING STRATEGY AND FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS.

The City of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency and the Metropolitan Transit District are currently evaluating various development scenarios for the project site, located on the southeast corner of Chapala and Figueroa Streets, and wish to provide information and receive initial input regarding appropriate land uses and project components on the site; including the potential for a new transit center, a mix of public and private parking, affordable and market-rate housing, and various other commercial, non-profit, and public uses.

Present: Renee Brooke, AICP, Redevelopment Specialist
Dave Gustafson, Asst. Community Development Director/Housing & Redevelopment Mgr.
Brian Bosse, Redevelopment Supervisor
Sherrie Fisher, General Manager of MTD
David Damiano, Manager of Transit Development and Community Relations for MTD
John Kaliski, Architect, Urban Studio
Allan Kotin, Allan D. Kotin & Associates

Planning Commission members present (Roll-call taken by Ms. Gantz):

Chair John Jostice; Vice-Chair Charmaine Jacobs (present at 1:25 p.m.); and Commissioners Stella Larson (present at 1:08 p.m.), Bill Mahan (present at 1:08 p.m.), George C. Myers, Addison S. Thompson, and Harwood A. White, Jr.

Renee Brooke, Redevelopment Specialist, and Brian Bosse, Redevelopment Supervisor, conducted a presentation of the project's background and concept, and the scope of work under the feasibility analysis. John Kaliski posed questions to help frame the discussion that followed.

Public comment opened at 1:48.

Mr. Kellam De Forest expressed concern over the parking that may be reduced by this project and commented that the term "urban village" should not be used in relation to any project in the City.

Public comment closed at 1:49

The Commissioners, either individually or collectively, had the following comments, suggestions, and/or questions:

1. Asked how much public parking versus private parking there will be.
2. Asked how pedestrians will be able to move within and through the project; for instance, from Figueroa Street to Carrillo Street and State Street.
3. Asked how either several scenario programs or a more specific program could be built to explain what the parking demands are, taking into consideration the public's input.
4. Asked if a two-site transit center has been considered in order to integrate the train connection with public transportation.
5. Asked if the Redevelopment Agency has considered talking with other agencies, such as the County, to possibly acquire a portion of the Earl Warren Showgrounds as a fourth alternate location for the transit center since it is close to the freeway and train tracks, while maintaining the downtown port hub.

6. Asked how the limited lifespan of the Redevelopment Agency will impact the feasibility analysis in terms of the tax-increment financing, public/private partnership, and the economic and physical planning implication of this development on the immediately surrounding areas.
7. Asked if this proposal would be accompanied by a development agreement and, if so, how it would fit into the planning process.
8. Asked for a clarification of the terms “transit center” and a “bus transfer facility”.
9. Asked about the configuration to accommodate buses and whether they could be directed into the center of the block so that they are not idling on the street.
10. Asked if there is freedom in selecting other sites for the transit center if they appear to be more appropriate, in addition to those already selected.
11. Commented that it was not clear what each of the presenters’ ranking and definite goals are, so that it was difficult to frame questions as they concern the Historic Landmarks Commission.
12. Clarified that the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Commission are reviewers, not clients, who review projects that are proposed.
13. Commented that it would be helpful to have the professionals involved in the project describe the efficiencies of the three different sites being considered and the implications of each.
14. Envisions less large buses and more shuttling in the downtown area so that the shuttle use expansion would supplant the automobile to some degree in the downtown and uptown areas.
15. Suggested that the higher emission, noise producing, larger city buses be located away from the housing site and that any proposed dense housing be located on a site with a smaller shuttle hub.
16. Believes that the bus transit center is currently at a great location because it is centrally located in the business district to new housing being built in the downtown area, so that it is more convenient for residents who are being encouraged to ride the bus. It also serves as a gateway to the City.
17. Emphasized the importance of improving the current transfer station with a well-designed, “green” sustainable building and the need to repair the streetscape around it.
18. Requested that more signage be placed around the site to inform bus riders of where they are and how to get to their destination.
19. Thought that a four-story building would loom over the downtown and felt that keeping the parking level underground and out of sight would be feasible.
20. Expressed support for a four-story building inside the block, but not facing the street.
21. Requested a ranking of how each proposed facility would work to improve the bus system and the impact of moving the current facility.
22. Debated that a less frequent residential use of cars should be considered as it is done in New York, where cars are used on weekends and are parked in warehouses during the week; in that sense, more parking in the City would not be reprehensible; and agreed with the idea of less market-rate parking with more consideration towards the community’s public servants.
23. Explained that “urban village” is a term that developers and architects use when they are trying to force too much onto a small site and suggested that a simple transit center be built that will serve the community, for the long term, without trying to make a small site do too much.
24. Envisions a “park-like” area for recreation on the west side of State Street and suggested that an open space with park amenities be integrated into the surface.
25. Pointed out the difficulty pedestrians currently experience to get to the transit center and suggested that the pedestrian and bicyclist connection to the entire surrounding neighborhood be kept in mind, including the comfort of customers as they wait for the bus, such as green space and shade.
26. Thought that a minimum of two sites would be beneficial where amenities such as a coffee shop, childcare, bike rentals, bicycle lockers, and places to charge electric cars could be integrated.
27. Felt the highest priority is that the location and design of the new facility to meet MTD’s needs to maximize effective linkages as an urban revitalization tool with the goal of reducing single-occupant drivers.

28. Shared the experience of being forced into driving in the City because the transit hub is not centrally located, and explained the need to link destinations more efficiently and add more buses.
29. Observed that train use is increasing and, if the City is committing Measure D funds that will support commuter rail, the train location makes more sense for a transit location. A recent survey found that 68 Ventura residents commute to the Santa Barbara and Goleta by train.
30. Disagreed with the use of the train station area because it is a historic building and it would be greatly impacted. Also, the train station has its own buses to connect passengers to other areas of the City.
31. Agreed that if there is housing at the site, it should be rental housing to augment the loss of Section 8 and other subsidized housing that the City is losing on a regular basis, since those are the people who work downtown.
32. Addressed the issue of long-term transportation by saying that a complete, broader plan is needed to avoid future failure of the new facility and, as a result, the waste of funds when the "next step" is ready to be taken.
33. Suggested that the site for the bus transfer station be in the center of the ridership needs, not necessarily in the geographic center of the City, so that it is user-friendly and efficient for the user.
34. Challenged the Commissioners to ride on the bus for a day to experience the difficulty of getting to a destination.

**** THE COMMISSION RECESSED 2:44 P.M. TO 2:54 P.M. ****

ARCHAEOLOGY REPORT

1. 517 CHAPALA ST C-2 Zone
 (2:54) Assessor's Parcel Number: 037-163-007
 Application Number: MST2005-00088
 Owner: Montecito Bank & Trust Trustee
 Applicant: Peikert Group Architects, LLP

(The proposed project consists of a lot merger and the construction of a mixed-use development with six two-bedroom residential condominium units totaling 9,999 square feet (net) and two commercial condominium spaces totaling 2,872 square feet (net). One of the units would be affordable. A modification to allow the 10% open space on the second floor is requested. Seventeen parking spaces are proposed.)

(Review of a Phase I Archaeological Resources Report prepared by David Stone, Stone Archaeological Consulting.)

Staff comment: Susan Gantz, Planning Technician II, stated Dr. Glassow has reviewed the report and concludes that the archaeological investigation supports the report's conclusions and recommendations for archaeological monitoring.

- Motion: The Commission accepts the report.
 Action: Boucher/Pujo, 8/0/0.

ARCHAEOLOGY REPORT

2. 1235 VERONICA SPRINGS RD COUNTY Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 047-010-039
 Application Number: MST2003-00793
 Owner: Hillside House
 Architect: Detlev Peikert Group
 Applicant: John Polansky
 Applicant: Carl Steinberg
 Agent: Teri Zuniga

(Proposal to annex the property, demolish the existing 28,700 square foot Hillside House facility and all accessory buildings, construct up to 127 new dwelling units, administration office, community center, leasing and management office, non-profit lease space, and therapy pool.)

(Review of Phase I Archaeological Resources Report prepared by David Stone, Stone Archaeological Consulting.)

Postponed six weeks to July 12th at applicant's request.

ARCHAEOLOGY REPORT

3. 1926 SANTA BARBARA ST E-1 Zone

(2:55) Assessor's Parcel Number: 025-382-022
 Application Number: MST2006-00177
 Owner: Michael & Amy Mayfield
 Architect: Vadim Hsu

(This is on the City's List of Potential Historic Resources: Kennedy House. Review of Historic Structures/Sites Report for a proposed residential addition. Proposal for an addition to an existing detached two-car garage to create a three-car garage, to construct a 500 square foot second-story accessory structure above the detached garages, to add a new pool and an open pool cabana to an existing single family residence.)

(Review of Phase I Archaeological Resources Report prepared by David Stone, Stone Archaeological Consulting.)

Staff comment: Susan Gantz, Planning Technician II, stated Dr. Glassow has reviewed the report and agrees with its conclusions regarding the lack of potential for significant archaeological resources to be present with no mitigation measures required at this time.

Motion: The Commission accepts the report.
 Action: La Voie/Naylor, 7/0/0. Hsu stepped down.

**** THE COMMISSION RECESSED 2:57 P.M. to 3:01 P.M. ****

HISTORIC STRUCTURES REPORT

4. 221 N NOPAL ST

M-1 Zone

(3:02) Assessor's Parcel Number: 017-041-004
Application Number: MST2006-00250
Owner: Roman Catholic Bishop LA/SD
Agent: Ronald Nye

(Review of Historic Structures/Sites Report for future church addition at Our Lady of Guadalupe.)

(Review of Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Ronald L. Nye.)

Present: Ronald Nye, Historian
Father Rafael Marín, Church Pastor
Gil García, Architect

Staff comment: Jake Jacobus, Associate Planner/Urban Historian, stated Staff has reviewed the report and agrees with the conclusions and recommendations found in the report.

Public comment opened at 3:06.

Mr. Kellam De Forest commented that research should indicate where the building was moved from and that the history of the structure would be of interest. Mr. La Voie responded that those issues are addressed in the report.

Public comment closed at 3:07.

Motion: The Commission accepts the report with the following comments: 1) Page 10, item h, where it states that “the property is not essential to the integrity of another landmark because it is not associated with any nearby landmark” shall be corrected to indicate that the church structure across the street shall be added to the potential list of significant historical buildings. 2) The top of page 11 shall be corrected to exclude the wording “has not been determined by the City to be significant, although it”, so that it reads: “The property is listed on the City’s list of Potential Historic Resources”.

Action: La Voie/Murray, 8/0/0.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW

5. 1329 GARDEN ST R-3 Zone

(3:08) Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-072-005
 Application Number: MST2006-00270
 Owner: Michael Hartmann
 Architect: Joe Steuer

(Proposed residential alterations including the demolition of 14 square feet of existing first floor utility space, the remodel of a portion of an existing 695 square foot two-story residence, and the conversion of 302 square feet of existing one-story utility space to residential space on a 6,654 square foot parcel located in El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District. Two covered parking spaces will remain.)

Present: Joe Steuer and Peter Ehlen, Architects

Straw vote: How many of the Commissioners feel that the proposed changes are below the threshold of the Ordinance requirement for Hispanic Mediterranean architecture?
 4/0/4. La Voie/ Boucher/Suding/Murray opposed.

Motion: Continued two weeks with the comment that the adjoining building on the property should be redesigned in a style more evocative of the style of the building in the front, identified as American Colonial Revival, determining that the building is of sufficient significance to waive the Hispanic requirement of the Ordinance.

Action: La Voie/Hsu, 8/0/0.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

6. 1214 STATE ST C-2 Zone

(3:25) Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-183-019
 Application Number: MST2004-00005
 Owner: Santa Barbara Center for Performing Arts
 Architect: Phillips, Metsch, Sweeney & Moore
 Business Name: Granada Theatre

(The proposed project involves partial rehabilitation and modifications of the Granada Theatre, including an addition of 13,360 square feet. Of the 13,360 square feet proposed, 6,634 square feet would be added to the building's footprint. The existing dressing rooms on the north side of the theater would be rebuilt with a 99 foot long, five foot wide and 60 foot high addition to accommodate stage space, exiting, storage, and equipment, as well as a fully accessible dressing room and toilet. An 80 foot long, 10 foot wide and 78 foot high addition to the east side of the theater would provide more stage space and meet stage rigging needs. The south side addition, which is 100 feet long, eight feet wide and 36 feet high, would accommodate access ramps inside the building. The remaining 6,700 square feet would be for the construction of a basement level to provide dressing rooms for the performers. One of the existing ground floor storefronts adjacent to the theater's entrance would be utilized as the theater's ticketing area. Space in the Granada tower at the second floor would also be utilized for the theater's second floor lobby area.)

(Review After Final of added structural columns on the south elevation.)

Present: Steve Metsch, Principal Architect
 Monisha Adnani, Project Manager

Motion: Continued indefinitely for the Historic Structures Report Addendum Letter addressing the specific changes to the building.

Action: Boucher/Naylor, 7/0/0. Rager stepped down.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

7. 523 CHAPALA ST C-2 Zone

(3:36) Assessor's Parcel Number: 037-163-021
 Application Number: MST2004-00854
 Owner: Leon Olson
 Architect: Jeff Shelton

(Proposal for a three-story mixed-use development consisting of seven residential condominium units and two commercial units. The total net residential square footage is proposed at 17,281 square feet and the commercial units are 1,218 and 1,334 net square feet each, for a total of 2,552 square feet. Nineteen parking spaces are proposed.)

(Preliminary Approval of landscape plan is requested.)

Present: David Black, Landscape Architect
 Leon Olson, Development Partner

Public comment opened at 3:46.

Mr. Kellam De forest commented on the importance of the view from Brinkerhoff Avenue and that it should be as green as possible so that the building cannot be seen. The biggest plants and trees that would be green all year around could act as a screen and would be greatly appreciated.

Public comment closed at 3:47.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Consent Calendar with the following comments:
 1) Conform to the Chapala Street Design Guidelines. 2) Use taller trees on Brinkerhoff and taller canopy trees on the north and south property lines.

Action: La Voie/Boucher, 8/0/0.

HISTORIC STRUCTURES REPORT

8. 1314 MORRISON AVE R-2 Zone

(3:48) Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-091-020
 Application Number: MST2006-00222
 Owner: Gail R. Andrews Trust 4/13/04
 Applicant: Lenvik & Minor Architects

(Proposal to construct a new 460 square foot first and second story addition to an existing 847 square foot single-family residence with an existing detached 134 square foot accessory building and an attached one-car carport, all on a 4,500 square foot lot. The structure is located in the proposed Bungalow Haven Historic District.)

(Review of Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Shelley Bookspan.)

Present: Edwin Lenvik, Architect

Staff comment: Jake Jacobus, Associate Planner/Urban Historian, stated Staff has reviewed the report and agrees with the conclusions and recommendations found in the report.

Motion: Continued two weeks with an Addendum Letter to be added addressing the neighborhood context and photo documentation of the neighborhood in that the significance of the house lies, in part, in its context to the neighborhood.

Action: La Voie/Boucher, 8/0/0.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW

9. 1314 MORRISON AVE

R-2 Zone

(3:52) Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-091-020
Application Number: MST2006-00222
Owner: Gail R. Andrews Trust 4/13/04
Applicant: Lenvik & Minor Architects

(Proposal to construct a new 460 square foot first and second story addition to an existing 847 square foot single-family residence with an existing detached 134 square foot accessory building and an attached one-car carport, all on a 4,500 square foot lot. The structure is located in the proposed Bungalow Haven Historic District.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT. ACTION MAY BE TAKEN IF SUFFICIENT INFORMATION IS PROVIDED.)

Present: Edwin Lenvik, Architect

Straw Vote: How many of the Commissioners feel comfortable reviewing this project based on the previous motion of requiring more contextual information? 8/0/0.

Public comment opened at 4:08.

Mr. Kellam De Forest asked what the status of the bungalow historic district is and asked if the neighbors or the Bungalow Haven Association know about the proposed addition. Mr. Jacobus responded that Post-Hazeltine is finalizing a survey report and this home is found within that Special Design District. The neighbors and the Bungalow Haven Association were notified that the project would be reviewed.

Public comment closed at 4:10.

Motion: Continued two weeks for preliminary approval contingent upon the acceptance of the Historic Structures Report with the following comments: 1) Maintaining the rear yard is important and very much appreciated. 2) Vegetation should not be disturbed. 3) Detailing of the addition is appropriate, but in order to meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards, perhaps the color of the second-story should be different. 4) Perhaps the second-story roof could be lowered with the use of a vaulted ceiling. 5) The window composition on the south and east elevations could use some study.

Action: Hsu/Boucher, 8/0/0.

**** COMMISSION RECESSED 4:15 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M. ****

MISCELLANEOUS ACTION ITEM:**(5:00)****INITIAL REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THE SINGLE FAMILY DESIGN GUIDELINES/NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE UPDATE AND REQUEST TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL ON THIS DRAFT UPDATE PACKAGE.**

Present: Heather Baker, Project Planner
Jaime Limón, Senior Planner

Mr. Limón requested comments and questions about the SFDG/NPO Update from the Historic Landmarks Commission and mentioned that the Architectural Board of Review has requested that the Floor to Lot Area Ratios (FAR) be included only as guidelines in the NPO revisions.

Public comment began at 5:04 p.m.

1. S. Dorothy Fox, Citywide Homeowners Association member, commented on a New York Times article she had previously given to the Commissioners entitled “Families Add 3rd Generation to Households” about current trends in home design and said that the very small sizes and tight restrictions being proposed by the NPO Update are inappropriate for the changing trends in housing needs.
2. Timothy Harding, Citywide Homeowners Association member, expressed opposition to the NPO Draft Update, saying that the FARs as proposed restricts houses, making them too small, and that the current NPO is adequate.
3. Michelle Giddens, Citywide Homeowners representative, distributed a letter expressing the agency’s official opposition and requested that the HLC agree with the recommendation given by the ABR that the FAR be a guideline only.
4. Toby Bradley, Santa Barbara Association of Realtors and Citywide Homeowners Association member, expressed opposition to the NPO Draft Update because it is too restrictive.
5. Naomi Kovacs, Executive Director of the Citizens Planning Association, said that the CPA has supported the NPO since its inception, but expressed opposition to the NPO Update because it is not restrictive enough and referred to a letter that was distributed to the Commission members.

Public comment ended at 5:26.

Straw votes: How many of the Commissioners think that FARs in general are an acceptable means to help guide applicants? 6/1. Pujo opposed.

How many of the Commissioners support the FAR guidelines applying to lot sizes of at least 10,000 square feet? 3/4. Pujo/Murray/Suding/Hsu opposed.

How many of the Commissioners agree with the current recommendation of FARs applying to lots under 7,500? 2/4. Rager/Murray/Suding/La Voie opposed.

If proposed FARs are implemented as an Ordinance, how many of the Commissioners could support Staff’s recommendation that the FAR be applied to an increase of 10,000 square feet? 2/4. Rager/Murray/Suding/La Voie opposed.

How many of the Commissioners think that additional good examples of two-story homes are necessary for the document? 6/0.

How many of the Commissioners agree with the ABR’s position to require a minimum site visit by the super majority of those present? 5/1. Rager opposed.

How many of the Commissioners could support the ABR proposed FAR table if it were implemented as guidelines? 5/1. Murray opposed.

Motion: The Commission recommends to forward the SFDG/NPO Update to City Council along with the following concerns and recommendations: 1) The Update needs to address preserving neighborhood character. 2) The Update does not adequately address design in character. 3) The Update is too confusing. 4) The Update needs to be mostly a regulation, not just a guideline. 5) The Update needs to address traffic and pedestrian access. 6) Requiring submittal of pictures of the 20 closest homes for review is appropriate in addition to the data analysis. 7) The Update needs to have an introduction as to what elements give a neighborhood character. 8) Plate heights/volume need to be addressed as part of the FARs. 9) The majority of the Commissioners believe that the proposed FARs are unreliable because they do not work well as a single tool for the whole city and for different portions of the same neighborhood, "one size" does not fit all. 10) The Commission supports the FAR as a guideline only.

Action: Rager/La Voie, 6/0/0.

CONSENT CALENDAR

FINAL REVIEW

A. 121 W DE LA GUERRA ST C-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 037-082-002
 Application Number: MST2004-00774
 Owner: The Rametto Company
 Applicant: Thomas Luria
 Architect: Brian Cearnal

(Proposal to demolish an existing 1,200 square foot office building and 65 car parking lot and construct 14 residential condominium units (three of which are affordable), a new 3,310 square foot office building and parking for 44 cars, all on a 22,500 square foot parcel in El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District.)

(Final Review of details.)

Postponed to June 28, 2006, at applicant's request.

CONTINUED ITEM

B. 101 E VICTORIA ST C-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-071-013
 Application Number: MST2006-00281
 Owner: 101 East Victoria
 Applicant: Eric Schott

(Concept Review for a proposal to construct exterior alterations to an existing commercial building and parking lot including planters, trellis, and front facade alterations. No new floor area.)

(Second Concept Review.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT. ACTION MAY BE TAKEN IF SUFFICIENT INFORMATION IS PROVIDED.)

Preliminary approval as noted on drawings and continued two weeks to the Consent Calendar for final approval of details.

FINAL REVIEW

C. 2300 GARDEN ST E-1 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 025-140-018
Application Number: MST2006-00190
Owner: SRS Garden Street LLC
Applicant: Mary Rose
Architect: Machin & Mead Architecture
Contractor: Plant Construction Company
Business Name: San Roque High School Garden Street Campus

(This structure is on the City's List of Potential Historic Resources. Proposal for seismic, safety, and utility upgrades in the Main Building of San Roque High School. Improvements include seismic strengthening, installation of new fire sprinkler system, accessibility upgrades including the installation of a new elevator, new drinking fountains, and restrooms. Exterior work includes new rooftop penetrations for ventilation, elevator overrun, and new handrails.)

(Final approval of details is requested.)

Fire escape approved and railings approved for options C and D as noted on the plan. Rager abstained.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

D. 11 E ANAPAMU ST C-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-183-028
Application Number: MST2006-00066
Owner: Frank D. Goss and Patricia Sullivan
Architect: Archart
Owner: Independent Order of Oddfellows
Business Name: Sullivan Goss - An American Gallery

(This proposed project involves two adjacent parcels. For the parcel at 7 East Anapamu Street (APN 039-183-041), which is on the City's Potential Historic Resource List, the proposal is to add a new exterior wait station enclosure at the rear of the building. At 11 East Anapamu Street (APN 039-183-028), the proposal is to replace the entry door and awning with new and add a new exterior patio door and awning at the side of the building. One HVAC compressor is proposed to be located on the roof, which will be screened from view by the existing parapet. Also proposed is to replace the rear entry door and awning on the north elevation. Interior tenant improvements are also proposed at both addresses.)

(Review After Final of changed door type on street elevation and installation of Dura-Last roofing system (cool roof system).)

Final approval of Review After Final as submitted.

FINAL REVIEW

E. 932 DE LA VINA ST C-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-313-001
Application Number: MST2005-00715
Owner: Double P, LLC
Applicant: PCJL Inc.
Business Name: Jiffy Lube
Architect: Archart Inc.

(This is a revised project to abate ENF2005-00210. Proposal to construct a 72 square foot canvas awning cover at the main building for customer waiting.)

Final approval as submitted.

**** MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:33 P.M. ****