



City of Santa Barbara

Planning Division

HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION MINUTES

Wednesday, November 1, 2006 **David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street** **1:30 P.M.**

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

- PHILIP SUDING, Chair – Present
- WILLIAM LA VOIE, Vice-Chair – Present
- LOUISE BOUCHER – Present
- STEVE HAUSZ – Present at 1:58 p.m.
- VADIM HSU – Absent
- ALEX PUJO – Present
- CAREN RAGER – Present
- FERMINA MURRAY – Present
- SUSETTE NAYLOR – Present
- DR. MICHAEL GLASSOW – Absent
- ROGER HORTON – Absent
- WILLIAM MAHAN – Absent

ADVISORY MEMBER:

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:

PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:

STAFF:

- JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor – Present until 3:16 p.m.
- JAKE JACOBUS, Urban Historian – Present
- DEBRA ANDALORO, Project Planner/Environmental Analyst – Present until 1:42 p.m.
- HEATHER BAKER, Project Planner – Present 2:19 p.m. to 3:17 p.m.
- SUSAN GANTZ, Planning Technician II – Present
- GABRIELA FELICIANO, Commission Secretary – Present

Website: www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov

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 <u>folded plans</u> are required <u>at the time of submittal & each time plans are revised</u> . <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. <u>Plans</u> 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. <u>Materials</u> 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 October 27, 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 (1:30):

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.)

Cheri Rae McKinney, resident, expressed concern about the Historic Structures Report (HSR) for the former St. Francis Hospital site prepared by Shelley Bookspan and stated there is an appeal scheduled to be heard by the City Council on November 21, 2006, as to the Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital Workforce Housing Project. She stated many professionals she consulted consider Ms. Bookspan's involvement as a conflict of interest since her spouse is a Cottage Hospital employee. She also read from a letter written by the Bungalow Haven Association's preservation attorney giving a legal analysis of the issues in question. Ms. McKinney suggested that the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) take this matter under advisement before the appeal hearing date and submit appropriate comments to the City Council, including that: 1) a new HSR be commissioned and prepared by an independent expert with no ties to the applicant; 2) the new HSR contain a full and complete cultural analysis as required by CEQA; and 3) new guidelines be drafted so that from now on every consultant who appears before the HLC be required to reveal any potential conflict of interest.

B. Approval of the minutes of the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of October 18, 2006.

Motion: Approval of the minutes of the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of October 18, 2006, with corrections.

Action: Boucher/Murray, 6/0/1. (Pujo abstained. Hausz/Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

C. Consent Calendar.

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

Action: Boucher/Naylor, 7/0/0. (Rager abstained from Item C. Hausz/Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

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

1. Ms. Gantz made the following announcements:

- a) Commissioners Naylor and Rager will be stepping down from Item 10, 2300 Garden Street.

- b) Commissioner Rager will be stepping down from Items 6 and 7, 227 E. Pueblo Street.
- c) Item 2 on today's agenda, the Discussion Item for 35 State Street, has been postponed two weeks at the applicant's request due to complications in assessing the structural alternatives.
- d) The utility upgrade project at 2300 Garden Street, which was postponed two weeks to today's hearing and is not shown on this agenda, has been postponed for another two weeks to November 15, 2006, at Staff's request. The applicant is still waiting for the Archaeological Letter Report to be prepared and submitted for Staff review.
- e) There will be a Cabrillo Blvd. Bridge Subcommittee meeting on November 2nd at 2:30 p.m. in the Public Works Conference Room at 630 Garden Street.
- f) There will be a site visit of the Commission to 924-J Garden Street at 10:00 a.m. on Monday, November 13th.
- g) Copies of a letter were distributed as drafted by Mayor Blum to CalTrans on behalf of the ABR and Sign Committee restating their concerns about the proposed installation of a changeable-message sign to be posted at the intersection of Highway 101 and Las Positas Road. Attached to that was a reply from CalTrans regarding those concerns.

Mr. La Voie requested, in response to Mayor Blum's letter, that Staff advise her that the Highway 101 Guidelines prohibit this type of signage. Jaime Limón, Senior Planner, stated that the proposed area where the sign will be installed is outside of the City's sphere of influence. He also mentioned that Staff will be speaking with the Sign Committee to see how the proposed design can be revised.

- 2. Ms. Boucher reminded the Commission that there is a sign-up sheet for the December 10th HLC Holiday Party.
- 3. Mr. La Voie inquired as to the HSR prepared for the Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital Workforce Housing Project. Jaime Limón, Senior Planner, responded that the City attorney will be asked if it would be appropriate for HLC to discuss the issues raised by Ms. McKinney during today's public comment since there is an ongoing appeal.

Ms. Rager made a brief comment as to how possible conflicts of interest can be handled in the future. Mr. Suding requested that Staff agendize this topic as a discussion item for the next HLC meeting.

E. Subcommittee Reports.

Ms. Boucher stated that the Landmark Designations Subcommittee met this morning and discussed the Lower Riviera Special Design District Guidelines for the Bungalow Haven area. The Architectural Board of Review has reviewed it and is progressing. An update on the Lower Riviera Neighborhood historic survey was presented to the Subcommittee. The four sites that will possibly be referred for Landmark Designations are: 1732 Santa Barbara Street, 319 W. Ortega Street, 1510 Mission Ridge Road, and 1710 Mira Vista Road. Ms. Rager added that the West Beach Historic District is still pending and should be moving along with the property owner's support.

Mr. La Voie reported that the Airport Subcommittee met and the design for the Airline Terminal Improvement Project has been radically changed. Although it is still a very Hispanic style, it is becoming more unique as opposed to a copy of other buildings in the City. The building has been shifted and the massing is much better. It will be heard one more time by the Subcommittee before it is presented at another HLC/ABR joint meeting for discussion.

F. Possible Ordinance Violations.

No violations reported.

ARCHAEOLOGY REPORT

1. 211 CASTILLO ST R-4/SD-3 Zone
 (1:50) Assessor's Parcel Number: 033-022-009
 Application Number: MST2005-00277
 Owner: Charles B. Butler
 Architect: Jan Hochhauser

(This is a revised project. Concept Review for a proposal to demolish one existing single-family residence and construct seven 3-story condominiums including three, 3-bedroom units, two, 2-bedroom units, one, 1-bedroom unit, and one studio, with 13 residential parking spaces and one guest parking space, all on a 17,050 square foot lot.)

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

Staff comment: Susan Gantz, Planning Technician II, stated that Dr. Glassow has reviewed the report and concluded that the archaeological investigation supports the report's conclusions and recommendations that, due to the absence of prehistoric or historic cultural remains, the project is not expected to result in adverse impacts and no further archaeological measures are required.

Motion: The Commission accepts the report.

Action: Rager/Naylor, 7/0/0. (Hausz/Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

DISCUSSION ITEM

(1:51)

IMPROVEMENTS TO HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION PROCEDURES.

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

1. Expressed appreciation for the training given in the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop.
2. Based on information in the handout given to participants, commented that the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) Chair does a good job in allowing further discussion after a motion is made.
3. Stated that the Chair needs to make sure that the items are not reviewed too fast, and that the applicant and Staff understand and are sure of the motion before it is carried forward.

4. Commented that the workshop was helpful; but, for the most part, HLC is already following the suggested procedures and the current way the HLC meetings are being conducted works well.
5. Mentioned that the workshop instructor suggested that the motion be made before a discussion is held, but that would be confusing and time-consuming. Jaime Limón, Senior Planner, responded that when the HLC feels a project may not get an approval, the Commission could make a motion to approve, even if the motion fails. The public may perceive a denial in a negative manner if the Commission does not at least *attempt* to propose a motion to approve. An initial motion for approval conveys the idea that there was not a pre-assumption of denial, but that the HLC objectively listened, considered the applicant's presentation, and is willing to work with the applicant to see how the project can receive an approval.
6. Appreciated that the workshop was not a directive, but rather suggestions as to how to better conduct meetings.
7. Commented that it is important for the Commission to refine statements that give clear directions to the applicant and better communicate what the Commission would like to see. An example would be to stop using the word "study" so often because it can be understood differently by different people. Motions should be reworded with more precise statements. Commented that the word "study" allows the applicant to explore other options, not necessarily that the project is not acceptable to the Commission and emphasized that to say that "the applicant should study" does not necessarily force the applicant to present the outcome of other avenues explored and there was a consensus to use the phrase "explore other options", in applicable situations, in place of "study". Stated that it would be better direction to the applicant to say that an area of the design is definitely unacceptable, if that is the case. Commented that, in order to not make decisions for the applicant, it is important to give direction that conveys objectiveness and not the means to arrive at a design that would be acceptable to the Commission.
8. Commented that, although it is difficult to determine all Commission members' point of view without listening to all their comments, the Chair can get a sense of a consensus without the need for the applicant to sit through the same negative comments for a prolonged period of time.
9. Asked if the meeting procedures could be included in the agenda. Mr. Limón responded that a large sign outlining the procedures will be placed on the wall behind the Commission for the benefit of the applicant and others attending the meetings. Instead of including the procedures in the agenda, the public could be given a handout that explains how the meetings function. He also stated that, when new Commission members are introduced, Staff will make sure that they receive the parliamentary procedures in their packet.
10. Asked if the maker of the motion must vote "yes" on the motion. Mr. Limón responded that the maker of the motion can always vote against it.

Public comment opened at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Kellam De Forest, resident, asked if it would be possible for the Historic Structures Reports (HSR) to be made available for public review before they are presented to the HLC for approval. Susan Gantz, Planning Technician II, responded that any member of the public can request to review the HSRs at the Planning and Zoning counter at any time before the scheduled meeting. Jake Jacobus, Associate Planner/Urban Historian, added that the public cannot be given a copy for personal use until the HSRs are approved by the HLC.

Public comment closed at 2:03 p.m.

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

11. Asked if it would be possible to require HSRs in digital format to potentially be posted on the City's Web site and commented that PDF converters can be obtained at a low or no cost. Mr. Jacobus, Associate Planner/Urban Historian, stated this issue has been discussed, but *invalid* HSRs that are still being edited could be printed out by the public as if it was a final version, which would create confusion. Mr. Limón added that Staff is advocating that consultants provide HSRs in PDF format, but some consultants are reluctant, saying that it would be an additional cost to applicants. Staff has offered to place that capacity in the Planning Division's lobby for the consultants' convenience. The City has the ability to pull up documents into a database and is attempting to make them available on the City's Web site for historic research purposes. The City asked that DPR forms be included in the HSRs, which is a requirement of the City's MEA, yet that would require that the consultants acquire the City's database.
12. Suggested marking HSRs that are not yet approved by the HLC as a "draft" and, once approved, simply leave the final version without that notation. Mr. Jacobus responded that Staff will consider this and figure out the ramifications.
13. Suggested giving a timeframe so that the public is aware that HSRs will eventually be required to be turned in by the consultants in digital format.
14. Requested that Staff provide a report to find out ahead of time Staff's recommendations on HSRs and mentioned that other committees receive a Staff Report before the meetings with recommended mitigation measures. Mr. Jacobus responded that it is rare for Staff to disagree with the conclusions found in the HSRs because they work closely with the applicant to come up with a version that would be approvable to the HLC. He also stated that the City does not want to give the impression that Staff is leading the HLC in its decision-making. Mr. Limón added that a summary of what is contained in the HSR can be included on the agenda.
15. At least three Commission members agreed that it would be helpful for the City to increase the size of staff that is dedicated to historic preservation and referred to comments made at the May 17, 2006, HLC meeting wherein the Commission expressed concern that there are pending historic landmark designations, but much time is being spent on new projects so that there is no protection for many important structures that need to be recognized. Mr. Limón encouraged the HLC members to request that there be a budget increase for such purpose at the time that the Community Development Director and the City Planner present the proposed financial plan, which is done at the beginning of every fiscal year. Another opportunity would be at the semi-annual joint meeting between City Council and all Boards and Commissions.

DISCUSSION ITEM

(2:13)

PRESERVE AMERICA COMMUNITY SIGN PLACEMENT.

The Staff presentation was given by Susan Gantz, Planning Technician II; Jaime Limón, Senior Planner; and Jake Jacobus, Associate Planner/Urban Historian.

Ms. Gantz stated the HLC had been requested to think about a possible location for placement of the sign and presented photographs of gateways to the City. Mr. Limón commented that the Transportation Division has standards that state a sign must be away from any intersection and should be placed where it would not block any other traffic sign. Mr. Jacobus mentioned the Secretary of the Interior's visit to Santa Barbara next week.

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

1. Suggested locating the sign at the bottom of State Street at Cabrillo Blvd., which is a gateway to downtown. There is a lot of traffic going through that area.
2. Stated they would not support the addition of another sign past the intersection at E. Cabrillo Blvd. and Los Patos Way.
3. Commented that a metal sign is not appropriate and asked if there is a provision in the budget for a tile sign. Mr. Jacobus responded that the City is licensed to use the logo and the "Preserve America" name, so that the sign does not necessarily need to be a metal sign, nor does it have to be used as currently designed. There is a possibility, for example, to have a representation of the courthouse on the sign to make it more appropriate to Santa Barbara. The sign could be placed somewhere in the City on a temporary basis until another design is agreed upon.
4. Asked how the Commission would feel about temporarily placing the sign as presently designed.
5. Suggested placing the sign on Carrillo Street coming into the city on the street, past the off-ramp.
6. Agreed with placing the sign on Lower State Street or W. Carrillo Street.
7. Suggested that the sign not be placed on the highway, but rather somewhere in the historic ways that access the City.
8. Found it ironic that America's history is being preserved by adding more visual clutter and commented that visitors have already made a choice to come to Santa Barbara and will not be attracted to the City through signage, so that there is not a need for it.
9. Suggested that, if the Secretary of the Interior will be arriving by plane, the sign be placed at the Santa Barbara Airport and later be moved to a more appropriate place.

Public comment opened at 2:21 p.m.

Mr. Kellam De Forest, resident, commented that the sign does not have a logo pertaining to Santa Barbara and requested that a Hispanic logo of some kind be placed on the sign.

Public comment closed at 2:21 p.m.

DISCUSSION ITEM

2. 35 STATE ST HRC-2/SD-3 Zone
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 033-102-004
 Application Number: MST97-00357
 Applicant: Santa Barbara Beach Properties, LP
 Architect: Doug Singletary
 Agent: Ken Marshall
 Landscape Architect: Philip Suding
 Engineer: Patrick Gibson & Bryan Mayeda
 Engineer: Penfield & Smith
 Business Name: Ritz-Carlton Club

(Proposal for the Ritz-Carlton Club involving the private redevelopment of portions of three blocks of properties located at 22-120 State Street, 15 East Mason Street, 125 State Street, and the State Street right-of-way between Mission Creek and the Union Pacific Railroad right of way.)

(Update on progress of HLC-requested information from hearing of September 20, 2006, and preliminary review of draft historic structures assessment.)

This item was postponed two weeks at applicant's request.

DISCUSSION ITEM

(2:22)

SOLAR DESIGN GUIDELINES AND RECOGNITION PROGRAMS DRAFT PROPOSAL.

Main Documents: Solar Energy System Design Guidelines and Recognition Program Draft; and Passive Solar Design Guidelines and Recognition Program Draft

Applicability: The Draft Solar Energy System Guidelines would generally be voluntary, but may be applied by ABR or HLC in review of some projects. The Passive Solar Design Guidelines and both award programs are completely voluntary.

Location: Citywide

(The Draft Solar Energy System Guideline's main purpose is to educate and encourage the public to consider highly efficient solar installations which appear well integrated with their surroundings. The document also specifies which high performing aesthetically well-integrated solar energy systems are eligible for City Council recognition awards. The Solar Energy System Design Guidelines can provide direction for review of the few projects which are subject to ABR and HLC review due to potentially significant historical or visual impacts. During this discussion, the ABR can also provide comments to Council regarding concepts for potential future City solar system installation requirements for some project types.)

(RECOMMENDATION FOR CITY COUNCIL ADOPTION OF THE GUIDELINES AND RECOGNITION PROGRAMS INCORPORATING HLC COMMENTS IS REQUESTED.)

The Staff presentation was given by Heather Baker, Project Planner.

Ms. Baker provided an overview of Staff's proposed Solar Energy System Design Guidelines and Recognition Program. The proposed guidelines and award program were created by City Staff and initially reviewed through a "Million Solar Roofs Partnership" small working group consisting of City Staff, Community Environment Council (CEC) staff and local solar contractors.

Public comment opened at 2:40 p.m.

Richard White, solar systems contractor, stated that he works with architects to install integrated solar panels in the design of buildings and commented the best installations are those that are not seen.

Public comment closed at 2:51 p.m.

Motion: The Historic Landmarks Commission recommends the Solar Energy System and Passive Solar Design Guidelines and Solar Recognition Program for adoption by City Council, with the following comments: 1) The Commission supports, in concept, some form of mandatory solar energy system installation requirements, including potentially requiring new homes or major additions to have at least 300 square feet of unobstructed south-facing roof, where feasible. 2) The "Which Projects Are Subject to Design Review?" handout should be included within the "Solar Energy System Design Guidelines and Recognition Program" document, rather than as a separate handout. 3) The Commission agrees with ABR's three comments regarding a) page 19, to have two positives on the photographs; b) including a statement somewhere in the document that panels on structures are preferable to maintain ground permeability, and c) supporting flexibility for modifications in the location of solar energy systems. 4) Contrary to the ABR recommendation, the Commission supports some form of mandatory requirement.

Action: Naylor/Boucher, 8/0/0. (Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

Commission

comment: The Commission commends Staff for the efforts involved in the production of these documents.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

3. 1023 BATH ST R-4 Zone
(3:17) Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-262-015
Application Number: MST2006-00467
Owner: Cathcart Living Trust
Contractor: Action Roofing

(This is a City Landmark: Botiller-Grand Adobe, and is located outside of El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District. Proposal to replace an existing shake roof with two-piece mission tile.)

(Review After Final of change to approved roofing material.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES HISTORIC RESOURCE FINDINGS AND FINDINGS FOR ALTERATIONS TO A CITY LANDMARK.)

Present: Sharon Fritz, Action Roofing
Robert Cathcart, Owner

Public comment opened at 3:24 p.m. and, as no one wished to speak, it closed at 3:24 p.m.

Motion: Restate the Historic Landmarks Commission's approval for a treated wood shake roof as being the only roofing material appropriate on this particular style and period of landmark, with the following comments: 1) Historic Resource Findings are made as follows: The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. 2) Findings for Alterations to a City Landmark are made as follows: The exterior alterations are being made primarily for the purposes of restoring the landmark to its original appearance or in order to substantially aid in the preservation or enhancement of the Landmark.

Action: 8/0/0. (Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

HISTORIC STRUCTURES REPORT

4. 1025 SANTA BARBARA ST C-2 Zone

(3:25) Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-211-007
Application Number: MST2006-00224
Owner: Haywards Family Partnership
Architect: Cearnal Andrulaitis Architects

(Proposal to demolish 15,371 square feet of existing commercial buildings, demolish surface parking with 45 spaces and construct a new, four-story mixed-use project with 27,145 square feet of underground parking including 66 covered parking spaces, 14,168 square feet of commercial space and 25,419 square feet of one, two and three bedroom condominium units (15 units total) on four separate parcels (APNs 029-211-006, -007, -008, and -009) totaling 31,310 square feet. Two of the condominium units would be affordable. Approximately 10,000 cubic yards of grading excavation is proposed as a part of this project. Planning Commission approval will be required for a Tentative Subdivision Map, a modification of the 10% open space requirement, and a modification of the lot area requirements to allow two over-density units.)

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

Present: Brian Cearnal, Architect
Shelley Bookspan, Architectural Historian
Hugh Hayward, Owner

Staff comment: Jake Jacobus, Associate Planner/Urban Historian, stated that the report concludes that the two buildings that would be demolished and replaced with new construction are not historically significant, mainly due to alterations and lack of integrity. It does find that there is some interest with the association of the Hayward family and recommends that a commemorative plaque be provided. The project will be reviewed, including photograph simulations, after the HSR is considered. If the HLC has any issues with the actual design, it will need to be discussed during the concept review. If HLC approves the report, it is agreeing that the buildings are not historically significant. Staff is concerned with the view from the courthouse since it is a Landmark.

Straw votes: How many of the Commissioners would agree with page 9, paragraph h, as written where it states that neither structure is a significant visual feature in the neighborhood? 2/4/0.

How many of the Commissioners would want to have the report reworded that this is a significant visual feature of the neighborhood? 2/2/2. (The Commission did not have a consensus on this issue.)

Public comment opened at 3:40 p.m.

Mr. Kellam De Forest, resident, requested that the Commission continue the review of this report in two weeks and that the current façade be retained because it has been there so long that it has become part of the Santa Barbara streetscape.

Public comment closed at 3:42 p.m.

Motion: Continued two weeks with the following comments: 1) The writer of the Historic Structures Report should make the following changes to the report: a) On page 10, the second paragraph should be recomposed separating the significance of the building itself and the significance of the family on the site, indicating that the site has a Structure of Merit status and that the building itself does not. b) Additional family history should be incorporated into the report, particularly as to the family's association to the site. 2) The Commission approves the mitigation measure requested for the memorialization of the Hayward family. 3) The Commission disagrees with the assessment of impact described on page 11.

Action: Boucher/Pujo, 7/0/0. (Suding stepped down. Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW

5. 1025 SANTA BARBARA ST

C-2 Zone

(3:49) Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-211-007
Application Number: MST2006-00224
Owner: Haywards Family Partnership
Architect: Cearnal Andrulaitis Architects

(Proposal to demolish 15,371 square feet of existing commercial buildings, demolish surface parking with 45 spaces and construct a new, four-story mixed-use project with 27,145 square feet of underground parking including 66 covered parking spaces, 14,168 square feet of commercial space and 25,419 square feet of one, two and three bedroom condominium units (15 units total) on four separate parcels (APNs 029-211-006, -007, -008, and -009) totaling 31,310 square feet. Two of the condominium units would be affordable. Approximately 10,000 cubic yards of grading excavation is proposed as a part of this project. Planning Commission approval will be required for a Tentative Subdivision Map, a modification of the 10% open space requirement, and a modification of the lot area requirements to allow two over-density units.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL.)

Present: Brian Cearnal, Architect
Shelley Bookspan, Architectural Historian
Hugh Hayward, Owner

Public comment opened at 4:04 p.m.

Mr. Kellam De Forest, resident, commented that it appears the Wells Fargo building is the only three-story building on the block and requested that a simulation be provided of what the structure would look like when viewed from the Culligan building and the courthouse tower.

Public comment closed at 4:05 p.m.

Motion: Continued two weeks with the following comments: 1) The Commission is concerned about the size, bulk and scale. 2) There is concern about the fourth floor. 3) Applicant should incorporate more landscape at the street's edge, the perimeter, and courtyard. 4) Perhaps this is the one building in town that does not need a tower, and definitely not two of them. 5) Applicant should provide a photo montage or drawing of the street elevations found on the block. 6) The Commission waives the requirement for story poles at this time.

Action: Pujo/Boucher, 7/0/0. (Suding stepped down. Hsu absent.)

HISTORIC STRUCTURES REPORT

6. 227 E PUEBLO ST E-1 Zone

(4:28) Assessor's Parcel Number: 025-132-009
 Application Number: MST2006-00429
 Owner: Lori Smyth
 Architect: Tom Meaney

(This structure is City Landmark-worthy: Gansl House. Proposal to remove 4,445 square feet of hardscape walkways, patios and pool deck and install 2,750 square feet of new landscaping in the rear yard. Also proposed is to remodel the existing swimming pool, construct a 170 square foot open air cabana with fireplace, and a 540 square foot three-car carport with realigned driveway. This 25,000 square foot parcel is currently developed with a 5,000 square foot two-story single-family residence, an 800 square foot swimming pool, and an 890 square foot detached accessory structure. A modification is requested to legalize an existing accessory structure which exceeds 500 square feet.)

(Review of addendum to Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Fermina Murray, Consulting Historian.)

Present: Lori Smyth, Owner
 Fermina Murray, Historian
 Justin Storck, Representing Tom Meaney, Architect

Staff comment: Jake Jacobus, Associate Planner/Urban Historian, stated that the building was earlier identified as being landmark-worthy. Staff has read the report and agrees with its findings and recommendations.

Motion: The Commission accepts the report.

Action: Boucher/Hausz, 6/0/0. (Murray/Rager stepped down. Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW

7. 227 E PUEBLO ST

E-1 Zone

(4:30) Assessor's Parcel Number: 025-132-009
Application Number: MST2006-00429
Owner: Lori Smyth
Architect: Tom Meaney

(This structure is City Landmark-worthy: Gansl House. Proposal to remove 4,445 square feet of hardscape walkways, patios and pool deck and install 2,750 square feet of new landscaping in the rear yard. Also proposed is to remodel the existing swimming pool, construct a 170 square foot open air cabana with fireplace, and a 540 square foot three-car carport with realigned driveway. This 25,000 square foot parcel is currently developed with a 5,000 square foot two-story single-family residence, an 800 square foot swimming pool, and an 890 square foot detached accessory structure. A modification is requested to legalize an existing accessory structure which exceeds 500 square feet.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND A MODIFICATION TO ALLOW ACCESSORY SPACE IN EXCESS OF 500 SQUARE FEET.)

Present: Lori Smyth, Owner
Justin Storck, Representing Tom Meaney, Architect

Public comment opened at 4:34 p.m. and, as no one wished to speak, it closed at 4:34 p.m.

Straw votes: How many Commissioners could support the *cabaña* as proposed? 4/2/0.

How many Commissioners could support the carport as proposed? 0/6/0. (All Commissioners opposed.)

How many of the Commissioners would entertain a two-car enclosed garage structure in lieu of the proposed carport? 6/0/0.

Motion: Continued two weeks with the following comments: 1) The Commission supports the concept of changing the parking to reduce the asphalt in the rear yard. 2) The elevation drawings need to be expanded to show the relationship between the proposed and existing buildings. 3) The majority of the Commissioners could support the *cabaña* as proposed. 4) The Commission will not support the carport as proposed; however, it will entertain the idea of a two-space enclosed garage structure. 5) The stonework of the *cabaña* should reference the stonework of the site walls.

Action: Hausz/Pujo, 6/0/0. (Murray/Rager stepped down. Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

HISTORIC STRUCTURES REPORT

8. 1900 LASUEN RD R-2/4.0/R-H Zone

(4:58) Assessor's Parcel Number: 019-170-022
Application Number: MST2005-00490
Owner: Orient Express Hotels
Applicant: Project Solutions, LLC
Architect: Henry Lenny
Business Name: El Encanto Hotel

(This is a Structure of Merit. Proposal to review the Master Plan for the El Encanto Hotel. The planned revisions to the site include relocating cottages, adding new cottages, new landscaping, parking additions and improvements and expansion of the main hotel structure. This portion of the work is Phase II and includes the main building, relocation of the swimming pool, the west parking lot, the historic arbor, and units 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29. Review of additional phases will follow. Phase I of the project (MST99-00305) is complete.)

(Review of addendum to Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Alexandra C. Cole, Preservation Planning Associates. This addendum is focused on removal and storage of salvaged architectural details in preparation for demolition and reconstruction of the Main Building of Group B.)

Present: Alexandara Cole, Architectural Historian
Henry Lenny, Architect
Minh Pham, Representing Ownership

Staff comment: Jake Jacobus, Associate Planner/Urban Historian, stated that two mitigation measures were suppose to be addressed in the report and that one of the issues was approved in a Consent Review, but the second mitigation has not been addressed in the report yet, although it is an important issue. The following issues need to be addressed: 1) The Commission gave the applicant flexibility in terms of how the new building would be configured to make it more practical and usable. The limit needs to be clearly defined, including the overall bulk and scale. 2) There is a second-story covered deck, but there is no documentation to indicate whether there was a door there at one time. 3) The new proposed hardscape features on the south-east corner of the building are in the setting of the building and require the removal of fairly large trees. 4) The new retaining walls in the south of the main building. 5) The screening for the proposed massive mechanical equipment on the roof. 6) There is a deck above the new proposed subterranean kitchen; a walkway on the east elevation of that deck appears to take the building, and its associated features, closer to Cottages 4 and 5. Staff is concerned as to how the new swimming pool will fit in that area.

Mr. Jacobus explained that the Commission has two options: 1) Review and accept this report containing only the first mitigation measure. The second issue can be reviewed at another meeting through another Letter Addendum. 2) Continue this item for both mitigation measures to be reviewed together.

Public comment opened at 5:03 p.m. and, as no one wished to speak, it closed at 5:03 p.m.

Motion: Continued four weeks with the following comments: 1) The report should include an evaluation of the impact of the proposed mechanical equipment. 2) The report should address the east and west elevation retaining walls shown on Sheets A01.09.00 and A01.09.01.

Action: La Voie/Boucher, 8/0/0. (Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

FINAL REVIEW

9. 1900 LASUEN RD R-2/4.0/R-H Zone

(5:08) Assessor's Parcel Number: 019-170-022
 Application Number: MST2005-00490
 Owner: Orient Express Hotels
 Applicant: Project Solutions, LLC
 Architect: Henry Lenny
 Business Name: El Encanto Hotel

(This is a Structure of Merit. Proposal to review the Master Plan for the El Encanto Hotel. The planned revisions to the site include relocating cottages, adding new cottages, new landscaping, parking additions and improvements and expansion of the main hotel structure. This portion of the work is Phase II and includes the main building, relocation of the swimming pool, the west parking lot, the historic arbor, and units 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29. Review of additional phases will follow. Phase I of the project (MST99-00305) is complete.)

(Final Approval is requested for the Main Building of Group B.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES HISTORIC RESOURCE FINDINGS AND COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 057-04.)

Present: Alexandara Cole, Architectural Historian
 Henry Lenny, Architect
 Minh Pham, Representing Ownership

Motion: Continued four weeks with the following comments: 1) The Commission does not support the mechanical equipment and screening as proposed. 2) The detail on Sheet A01.12.12 needs to match the elevation. 3) The Commission does not support the loss of lawn on the south and east side of the building. 4) The beam above the stone columns at the lower level should be reduced in scale to be more appropriate to the scale of the building.

Action: Boucher/Rager, 8/0/0. (Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

**** THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 5:43 P.M. TO 5:58 P.M. ****

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED

10. 2300 GARDEN ST E-1 Zone

(5:58) Assessor's Parcel Number: 025-140-018
 Application Number: MST2006-00611
 Owner: SRS Garden Street, LLC
 Applicant: Mary Rose
 Architect: Machin & Mead Architecture

(This structure is on the City's List of Potential Historic Resources. Proposal to replace an existing wall with a new eight foot tall by 12 inch wide by 45 foot long wall at the northern property line to the north of the shop building. The proposal also includes a new curved stone toe protection wall which will be approximately two feet tall by two feet thick by 45 feet long at the base of the existing retaining wall near the northeast side of the property. Replacement of landscaping is also proposed on this 11.92 acre parcel in El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District Part II.)

(Second Concept Review.)

(ACTION MAY BE TAKEN IF SUFFICIENT INFORMATION IS PROVIDED.)

Present: Mary Rose, Applicant
 George Machin, Architect

Motion: The Commission accepts the wall as proposed, with the comment that Historic Resource Findings are made as follows: The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.

Action: La Voie/Hausz, 6/0/0. (Naylor/Rager stepped down. Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

11. 1129 STATE ST C-2 Zone

(6:03) Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-231-037
 Application Number: MST2006-00197
 Owner: 1129 State Street
 Agent: Erica Faria - SIMA Corporation
 Architect: Douglas Keep
 Landscape Architect: Martha Degasis

(This is on the City's List of Potential Historic Resources and the California Inventory of Historic Resources: San Marcos Court Building. Proposed exterior renovations as follows: on the east elevation, remove existing first floor awnings, reconfigure entry, install new precast entry surrounds to match existing moldings, add cornice dental molding to match existing, add cornice band below second story windows, add new windows and entry doors, and repaint exterior. At the interior arcade off State Street, reconfigure windows and doors and add a tile wainscot. At the courtyard south wall, restore arched openings to match original design (currently filled in), restore existing paving material, reconfigure existing planting areas and add a low curb, and add new plantings in selected areas. At the west elevation, reconfigure stairs to combine 1123 and 1129 rear entrance, install new precast entry surrounds to match existing moldings, and remove existing tile roof appendage. This parcel is approximately 52,801 square feet and is located in El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District.)

(Preliminary approval is requested.)

(ACTION MAY BE TAKEN IF SUFFICIENT INFORMATION IS PROVIDED.)

Present: Doug Keep, Architect

Public comment opened at 6:09 p.m. and, as no one wished to speak, it closed at 6:09 p.m.

Motion: Preliminary approval and continued indefinitely with the following comments: 1) The *rejas* on the small window shall be forward of the opening. 2) The door casing shall be more elaborate in plaster. 3) Applicant shall provide a sample of the proposed tile for the belly band of the arcade. 4) Simplify the west elevation with respect to the railings. 5) The proposed panel above the doors shall be divided into three sections.

Action: La Voie/Boucher, 6/0/0. (Hsu/Naylor/Rager absent.) Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED

12. 514 STATE ST

C-M Zone

(6:21) Assessor's Parcel Number: 037-173-037
Application Number: MST2006-00615
Owner: Judith Garrett
Designer: Josh Blumer
Business Name: Sandbar

(Exterior patio improvements for Sandbar restaurant including a new wrought iron enclosure, tables, and chairs, new built-in seating along the north end of the patio, new fire pit, replacement of exterior doors, repair and replacement of exterior flooring, and removal of existing planters.)

(Second Concept Review.)

(ACTION MAY BE TAKEN IF SUFFICIENT INFORMATION IS PROVIDED.)

Present: Josh Blumer, Designer from AB Design Studio
Greg Newman, Business Owner

Staff comment: Jake Jacobus, Urban Historian, stated that his research into the building's history revealed that the canopy was permitted back in 2003 by the Commission in its review of proposed exterior alterations. He commented that the Commission can now request that improvements be made by the applicant.

Public comment opened at 6:29 p.m. and, as no one wished to speak, it closed at 6:29 p.m.

Motion: Continued two weeks with the comment that the Commission accepts all components of the design, except for the treatment of the existing awning truss end wall.

Action: La Voie/Hausz, 8/0/0. (Hsu absent.) Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED

13. 1311 STATE ST C-2 Zone

(6:49) Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-131-009
Application Number: MST2006-00479
Owner: Mark Huston
Architect: Doug Reeves

(Proposal for a 792 square foot, two-story addition and facade alterations at the front and rear to an existing two-story 2,697 square foot restaurant. A zoning modification to reduce the required number of parking spaces is proposed.)

(Second Concept Review.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES COMPLIANCE WITH STAFF HEARING OFFICER RESOLUTION NO. 064-06. MODIFICATION GRANTED ON OCTOBER 11, 2006.)

Present: Doug Reeves, Architect
Mark and Margaret Huston, Owners

Motion: Preliminary approval and continued two weeks with the following comments: 1) The majority of the Commission supports Scheme A7b for the front elevation and there was a consensus that a gate shall not be installed. 2) The majority of the Commission supports Scheme A8a for the rear elevation with the addition of some glazing on the pedestrian door and the surface of the trash doors shall be recessed; however, applicant shall resolve the hinge/swing detail on the door. 3) There shall be no change to the State Street balcony railing height. 4) Vertical landscape shall be added to the rear elevation.

Action: Hausz/Naylor, 6/2/0. (Boucher/La Voie opposed. Hsu absent.)

NEW ITEM

A. 1015 LAGUNA ST R-3 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-221-012
Application Number: MST2006-00631
Owner: Lawrence B. and Bettine K. Wallin, Trustees
Architect: Marion Toms
Contractor: Corbu Construction

(Proposal to replace concrete entries, stoops, stairs, and sidewalks; install new drainage pipe and catch basins at southern property line; replace damaged wood beam and metal post supporting balcony in front of units 10 and 11; and, install a new iron bike rack at a 13 unit apartment house on a 15, 368 square foot parcel.)

Final Approval as submitted.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

B. 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 a 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.)

(Review After Final of revised exterior details.)

Final Approval of Review After Final as submitted for the exterior details.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

C. 1214 STATE ST C-2 Zone

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 the partial rehabilitation of and modifications to 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.)

(Final Approval of the Review After Final of changes to north elevation is requested.)

Final Approval of Review After Final with changes as noted on Sheet A-8.7.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

D. 1014 GARDEN ST C-2/R-3 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-221-026
Application Number: MST2002-00806
Owner: Las Villas de los Jardines, LLC
Architect: Everett Woody

(Proposal to demolish an existing 1,072 square foot single-family residence and to construct a 5,379 square foot, two unit, three-story condominium on a 5,075 square foot lot. The first floor would consist of a four-car parking garage while the second and third floors would contain the habitable living areas.)

(Review After Final of two new condenser units at east side of building.)

(PROJECT MUST COMPLY WITH PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 063-03.)

This item was postponed to November 15th at the applicant's request.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

E. 530 STATE ST C-M Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 037-173-026
Application Number: MST2006-00619
Owner: McColm Family Trust 8/13/99
Applicant: Kandur, Inc.
Designer: Magi Myggen
Contractor: Rod Pearson
Business Name: Open Wide Modern Furniture

(Proposal to reinstall, repair (weld saw cuts), and repaint wrought iron entry surround that was removed, and repaint exterior storefront of the former RADD retail store. Reinstallation and repair of wrought iron will abate ENF2006-00848. Also proposed is to permanently remove non-permitted existing security gate at entry and reinstall two wrought iron balconies that were removed from in front of the second floor windows.)

(Review After Final of exterior color selection and broken tile replacement.)

Final Approval of Review After Final as submitted with the tile to be Gainey brand, Elements Series, "Mineral Springs" color 3 inch by 3 inch tile.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

F. 800 STATE ST C-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 037-052-010
Application Number: MST2004-00472
Owner: Westen Family Group
Architect: B 3 Architects
Business Name: Starbucks Coffee Company

(Proposal to remodel the exterior facade of the building, to construct a trash enclosure area and to rehabilitate the building's exterior. Work to include new plaster, replacement of windows like for like except for four windows which will be enlarged, replacement of doors, awnings, and add new wrought iron details. Additionally, the applicant proposes to replace roof tiles and extend the roof area of the building.)

(Review After Final of revised exterior door details.)

Final Approval of Review After Final as submitted for the revised exterior door details.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL

G. 721 CHAPALA ST C-2 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 037-082-006
Application Number: MST2002-00405
Owner: Chadwick Pacific, LP
Architect: Peikert Group Architects
Applicant: Bermant Development Company

(Proposal to demolish an existing 9,788 square foot commercial building and six residential units totaling 2,700 square feet, and to construct 9,788 square feet of commercial space, 29 residential units (including 12 bonus density units) totaling 43,357 square feet, and a 25,533 square foot on-grade parking structure.)

(Review After Final of revision to balcony for Unit 20.)

Final Approval of Review After Final as submitted for the balcony revision in Unit 20.

**** MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:15 P.M. ****