



City of Santa Barbara
HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION
MINUTES
AUGUST 4, 2021

1:30 P.M.

This Meeting was Conducted Electronically
SantaBarbaraCA.gov

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Anthony Grumbine, *Chair*
Steve Hausz, *Vice Chair*
Dennis Doordan
Michael Drury
Wendy Edmunds
Ed Lenvik
Bill Mahan
Justin Manuel
Robert Ooley

ADVISORY MEMBER: Dr. Michael Glassow

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON: Kristen Sneddon

PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON: Sheila Lodge

STAFF:

Tava Ostrenger, Assistant City Attorney
Irma Unzueta, Design Review Supervisor
Nicole Hernandez, Architectural Historian
Ted Hamilton, Assistant Planner
Mary Ternovskaya, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

The Full Commission meeting was called to order at 1:32 p.m. by Vice Chair Hausz.

ATTENDANCE

Commissioners present: Grumbine (at 1:35 p.m.), Hausz, Doordan, Drury (absent 3:18 – 5:31 p.m., until 5:50 p.m.), Lenvik (at 1:35 p.m.), Mahan, Manuel (absent 1:57 - 3:18 p.m.), and Ooley

Commissioners absent: Edmunds

Staff present: Unzueta; Hernandez; William Russell, Planning Technician; Tony Ruggieri, City TV Production Supervisor; Hamilton; and Ternovskaya

GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Public Comment:

No public comment.

B. Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Approve the minutes of the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of **July 21, 2021**, as amended.

Action: Mahan/Ooley, 8/0/0. (Edmunds absent.) Motion carried.

C. Approval of the Consent Calendar:

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **August 4, 2021**, as reviewed by Commissioners Mahan and Manuel.

Action: Ooley/Hausz, 7/0/1. (Manuel abstained. Edmunds absent.) Motion carried.

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

1. Ms. Hernandez announced the following:

- a. The Mission Canyon Bridge project will be heard by City Council on Tuesday, August 10, 2021. Chair Grumbine volunteered to represent the HLC at the City Council meeting.
- b. The City has received a grant award to hire a consultant to complete an African American Historic Context Statement from the California Office of Historic Preservation.
- c. The HLC Designation Subcommittee will meet on August 9, 2021 at 10 a.m. to review Mills Act Applications.
- d. Commissioner Mahan and Commissioner Lenvik will represent the HLC at the Grenada Garage solar panel subcommittee.

2. Chair Grumbine announced that Opticos will be working with the City to develop Objective Design standards for non-El Pueblo Viejo District areas.

E. Subcommittee Reports:

No subcommittee reports.

(1:50PM) MISCELLANEOUS ACTION ITEM: STRUCTURE OF MERIT DESIGNATION**1. 1201 ANACAPA ST**

Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-183-035

Reference Number: PLN2021-00039

Owner: 1201 Anacapa Partners

(Review of [Staff Report](#) and Public Hearing to consider Structure of Merit [designation](#) of the Mid-century interpretation of the Mediterranean style building designed in 1951 by architects Winsor Soule, FAIA and John Frederic Murphy, FAIA.)

Actual time: 1:49 p.m.

Present: Nicole Hernandez, Architectural Historian, City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 1:52 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Motion: Adopt Resolution 2021-33 to designate as a Structure of Merit the Mid-century interpretation of the Mediterranean style building designed in 1951 by architects Winsor Soule, FAIA and John Frederic Murphy, FAIA.

Action: Ooley/Hausz, 8/0/0. (Edmunds absent.) Motion carried.

(2:05PM) CONTINUED ITEM: CONCEPT REVIEW**2. 630 CHAPALA ST, 25 W. ORTEGA ST, AND 17 W. ORTEGA ST**

Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 037-131-001, -002, -022

Zone: M-C

Application Number: PLN2021-00189

Owner: Third Generation SB, LLC

Applicant: Tom Meaney & Mary Reichel Meaney

(The proposal is for construction of a new three- and four-story mixed-use development. The project includes 5,119 square feet of commercial space and 31,617 square feet of residential space consisting of 39 rental units proposed under the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program. A voluntary lot merger between 630 Chapala Street and 25 W. Ortega Street is proposed, as well as an ingress/egress easement with 17 W. Ortega Street. In order to effectuate the proposed easement, the demolition of a 1,102-square-foot storage building on 17 W. Ortega Street is also requested. The existing sandstone wall separating 25 W. Ortega Street and 17 W. Ortega Street would be reconstructed as a privacy wall along the south property line. The proposed density on the 27,492-square-foot merged site is 63 dwelling units per acre. The project requires Concept Review by the Planning Commission (SBMC §30.150.060), as well as a Community Benefit Height Exception (SBMC §30.140.110.B) to allow the project to exceed 48 ft. in height (50 ft. 11 in. proposed). The project site is adjacent to 17 West Ortega, a Structure of Merit designed in 1905 in the Mission Revival style and 9-15 West Ortega, a Structure of Merit designed in 1926 by architects Sauter and Lockard in the Spanish Colonial Revival, and 614 Chapala Street, a Structure of Merit designed in 1946 by architects Soule, Murphy and Hastings in the Streamline Moderne/Spanish Colonial Revival style. For more information on these sites see the reports attached to the historic resources web map at www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov/historicpreservation.)

A. Requesting acceptance of a Phase 1 Archeological Report prepared by David Stone of Stone Archeological Consulting.

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

Actual time: 1:55 p.m.

Present: Tom Meaney, Applicant; Mary Meaney Reichel, Applicant; and Megan Arciniega, Project Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Staff comments:

1. Mr. Hamilton stated that Dr. Glassow has reviewed the report and agrees with the conclusions and recommendations in the report. In addition, the Commission is requested to comment on the potential use of story poles.
2. Ms. Arciniega requested that the Commission provide specific comments regarding the compatibility and impact of the project on the nearby historic resources.

Public comment opened at 2:00 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Motion: **Accept the report as submitted.**

Action: Hausz/Ooley, 7/0/0. (Edmunds and Manuel absent.) Motion carried.

B. Concept Review. No final appealable action will be taken at this hearing. Project Compatibility Findings are required. The Commission is requested to comment on whether story poles should be required. Project was last reviewed July 7, 2021.

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

Actual time: 2:03 p.m.

Present: Tom Meaney, Applicant; Mary Meaney Reichel, Applicant; and Megan Arciniega, Project Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 2:21 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Straw vote: How many Commissioners can support full story poles? 1/6 Failed.

Straw vote: How many Commissioners can support modified story poles? 6/1 Passed.

Motion: Continue to the Planning Commission with comments:

1. The Commission appreciates the development and design of the project, and finds that it is refined and moving in right direction. The design is very beautiful and continuing to improve.
2. Story poles are appropriate for this project, making the public aware of project and its size. A modified version that shows the heights of the four corners is acceptable. Looking at the north elevation at Ortega Street, the Commission suggests that story poles can be installed for the left building at the left and right corners at the street, with no need for story poles at the rear corners. For the corner building, provide story poles at the left and right of the four-story section, and show the height of three-story at the corner. The story poles will be to the eave line. For the west elevation at Chapala Street, the same story pole locations will apply.
3. The project is sensitive to adjacent historic resources.
4. The landscaping component of the project, per the comments from the previous meeting, still needs to be developed per the ordinance requirements.
5. The roof plan needs to be updated to show that the parapet wall around the deck also exceeds the allowable height and is included in the request for the height exception.
6. The reduction of the height of the project by two-feet is appreciated and the Commission finds the building is even more reasonable in terms of height.
7. Provide a three-dimensional video model of views looking up and down the streets, show street level and aerial views.
8. In general, the Commission finds that the design is positive and the elevations are compatible and fitting well within the context. Before making the findings, the Commission needs to see the three-dimensional model and story poles in order to see how the mass, bulk, and scale fits into the context.
9. Restudy the bridge structure on the Chapala Street elevation, with the suggestion to restudy the wood beams.
10. The Commission makes general comments regarding the Project Compatibility Analysis Findings as follows:
 - a. The project's design is consistent with design guidelines applicable to its location within the City.

- b. The design of the project is compatible with desirable architectural qualities and characteristics that are distinctive of Santa Barbara and of the particular neighborhood surrounding the project.
- c. The size, mass, bulk, height, and scale of the project are appropriate for its location and neighborhood. The height has been reduced and Commission feels it is compatible in that regard.
- d. The design of the project is appropriately sensitive to adjacent Landmarks or other nearby designated historic resources. The building steps down on the corner from the historic resource and has architectural compatibility, therefore it is sensitive.
- e. The scenic public vistas are not relevant to this project. The Macy’s building is taller and the project is not a big impediment to view corridors.
- f. The project includes an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping. It is located in the dense Downtown area and while landscaping is sparse, it is appropriate to the area and beautiful courtyard landscaping is provided. Additional landscaping requirements will be met as the project goes forward.

Action: Hausz/Mahan, 7/0/0. (Edmunds and Manuel absent.) Motion carried.

*** THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 3:09 TO 3:15 P.M. ***

(3:00PM) CONTINUED ITEM: CONCEPT REVIEW

3. 481 W MOUNTAIN DR

Assessor's Parcel Number: 021-103-005

Zone: RS-1A

Application Number: PLN2021-00127

Owners: McMillan Shelton Living Trust; Gault/O’Connor Living Trust; John Norris & Deborah Lowry; Norman J. Hendry & Cassie Jane Hendry Revocable Trust; Gary J. Hill & Helena S. Hill Revocable Trust

Jennifer Reitz William M. McMillan and Kimberlee Shelton, Trustees; Shelley Gault and John K. O’Connor, Trustees; Cassie Jane Hendry, Trustee; Gary J. Hill and Helena S. Hill, Trustees

Applicant: Holly Garcin, SEPPS Inc.

(The series of seven existing cottages constructed in the 1946 was added to the Historic Resource Inventory on April 28, 2021. The single-residential zoned site is developed with seven dwelling units (469-493 W. Mountain Dr.) and various accessory structures on one 4.59 acre lot, and is nonconforming to residential density. The project seeks approval of as-built and proposed new residential remodels, additions, accessory structures, and uncovered rather than covered parking. The project requests a Lot Area Modification and a Setback Modification.)

A. Concept Review. No final appealable action will be taken at this hearing. Project was last reviewed May 12, 2021.

RECUSAL: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Commissioner Drury recused himself from hearing this item due to a long history with the project.

Actual time: 3:18 p.m.

Present: Joseph Andrulaitis, Applicant; Suzanne Elledge, Agent, SEPPS; Holly Garcin, SEPPS; Tim Hazeltine and Pamela Post, Post/Hazeltine Associates; and Tony Boughman, Associate Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Staff comments: Mr. Hamilton stated that a motion and comments can be made for Item B first, and then Item A can follow. The next step for the project is to go to the Staff Hearing Officer and Mr. Hamilton requested that the Commission include comments on the requested modifications.

Public comment opened at 3:41 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Written correspondence from Leslie Gutierrez Jones and Cody Cammbell was acknowledged.

*** Item 3.A was closed at 3:54 p.m., and re-opened at 4:26 p.m. ***

Motion: Continue indefinitely with comments:

1. The Commission is generally favorable of the Lot Area Modification, which allows for the acceptance of the additions. The accessory buildings are the biggest split for the Commission.
2. In general, the Setback Modification is supportable.
3. The Commission recognizes that additional details like colors, etc. will be coming and that the project is very complex.
4. The Commission commends the applicant for the beautification and development of the structures to make them more in compliance with the historic resource, the change and removal of skylights, and the removal of nonconforming pieces.
5. The accessory buildings are the most divisive for Commissioners. Some feel there are too many for this lot, and that they should be combined, organized, or screened; or some combination of all of the above to simplify number and layout.
6. A site visit is most helpful to understand what new structures will look like and what the locations will be. It is important to mark in the field where the proposed buildings will be in order to help the Commission visualize the project. Applicant shall work with Staff to schedule a site visit to evaluate the outbuildings.

Action: Hausz/Mahan, 6/0/1. (Manuel abstained. Drury and Edmunds absent.) Motion carried.

B. Requesting acceptance of a Phase 1-2 Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Post/Hazeltine Associates. The report concluded the 7 cottages meet criteria 3 and 5 to qualify to be designated as a whole as a City of Santa Barbara Structure of Merit. The report also concluded that the proposed project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation provided the guidance under Standards, 2, 5 and 6 is implemented. Therefore, project impacts to significant historic resources are considered less than significant.

RECUSAL: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Commissioner Drury recused himself from hearing this item due to a long history with the project.

Actual time: 3:55 p.m.

Present: Joseph Andrulaitis, Applicant; Suzanne Elledge, Agent, SEPPS; Holly Garcin, SEPPS; Tim and Pamela Hazeltine, Post/Hazeltine Associates; and Tony Boughman, Associate Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 4:20 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.
Written correspondence from Leslie Gutierrez Jones and Cody Cammbell was acknowledged.

Motion: Accept the report as submitted.

Action: Mahan/Hausz, 3/3/1. (Manuel abstained. Drury and Edmunds absent.) *Motion failed.*

Discussion held. It was determined that Commissioner Manuel can vote on Item 3.B because the review of the Historic Structures/Sites Report is separate from Item 3.A.

Motion: Accept the report as submitted.

Action: Mahan/Hausz, 4/3/0. (Drury and Edmunds absent.) Motion carried.

(3:55PM) REVIEW AFTER FINAL APPROVAL

4. **806 VINE AVE**
Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-023-009
Zone: R-M
Application Number: PLN2017-00528
Owner: Jack Delano Family Limited Partners
Applicant: Keith Rivera

(The Craftsman style residence, constructed in 1916, relocated from 415 Old Coast Highway, is a designated Structure of Merit. The HLC accepted the Historic Structures/Sites Report (HSSR) for the project on March 21, 2018 and requested a subsequent addendum to the report to evaluate the architectural design changes. Project Design Approval and Final Approval was granted on July 11, 2018. The original proposal included relocation of the historic 1,631 square foot single-unit residence from 415 Old Coast Highway to the lot at 806 Vine Avenue. The project included constructing a new understory consisting of a 1,096 square foot four-car common garage and 608 square feet of habitable area, resulting in a new cumulative 2,239 square foot single-unit residence. The proposal also included associated site paving, landscaping, utilities, and a new 24" inch retaining wall.)

A. Review After Final is requested for alterations to the south and west elevation including adding a window at the front elevation, adding a transom to the lower level door and converting the adjacent window to a door, raising the garage door height, and converting an upper floor window to a door and adding a Juliet balcony. Substantial conformance to the plans granted Final Approval on July 11, 2018 is required. Project was last reviewed May 29, 2019.

Actual time: 5:31 p.m.

Present: Keith Riviera, Applicant, Acme Architecture; and Pamela Post and Tim Hazeltine, Post/Hazeltine Associates

Public comment opened at 5:43 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

- Motion:** **Approval of Review After Final with the following condition and comment:**
1. Condition that the pair of doors at the balcony above the garage door shall be swing doors and the applicant shall work with the Architectural Historian to make all the new doors of an appropriate craftsman style. Staff shall confirm compliance.
 2. The project substantially conforms to the original approval.
- Action:** Hausz/Ooley, 6/0/1. (Manuel abstained. Drury and Edmunds absent.) Motion carried.

The ten-day appeal period was announced.

B. Requesting acceptance of a Phase 2 Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Post/Hazeltine Associates. The report concluded the revised project’s impacts to significant historic resources on and adjacent to the existing location of the resource are Less than Significant (Class III) provided the guidance outlined in Section 6.3.2 of this report is implemented.

Actual time: 5:48 p.m.

Present: Keith Riviera, Applicant, Acme Architecture; and Pamela Post and Tim Hazeltine, Post/Hazeltine Associates

Public comment opened at 5:55 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

- Motion:** **Accept the report as submitted.**
- Action:** Hausz/Ooley, 6/0/1. (Manuel abstained. Drury and Edmunds absent.) Motion carried.

*** MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:01 P.M. ***