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I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 13,510 square-foot site is developed with a 5,203 square-foot, three-story residence, a 408 square-foot detached garage with a 244 square-foot storage loft, and a 167 square-foot, detached accessory building. The proposed project includes permitting 501 square feet of "as-built" additions on the second and third floors of the residence, permitting a 120 square-foot, "as-built" addition to the accessory building, relocation and 60 square-foot addition to the garage, and demolition of the storage loft within the garage. Additional on site improvements include a 540 square-foot brick driveway with an integrated brick inlayed vehicular turntable and the "as-built" replacement of brick walkways.

This project will address violations identified within enforcement case ENF2013-00546 including "as-built" additions to the residence and the detached accessory building and the removal of other "as-built" structures. The permitted site development totals 6,002 square-feet and the proposed site development totals 6,439 square feet. The proposed project is 148% of the required floor-to-lot area ratio (FAR). This property is on the City's List of Potential Historic Resources: "Edwards/Dole House."

This project requires approval by the Planning Commission because the applicant is requesting a Net Floor Area (Floor to Lot Area Ratio) Modification that does not fall under the Staff Hearing Officer's review authority (see below).

II. REQUIRED APPLICATIONS

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

A. Two Front Setback Modifications to permit "as-built" alterations to the detached accessory building to be located within a front yard and within the required thirty-foot front setbacks off Laguna and East Los Olivos Streets. (SBMC §28.15.060, §28.87.160, and SBMC §28.92.110);

B. An Interior Setback Modification to allow the relocated garage to encroach into the required ten-foot interior setback. (SBMC §28.15.060 and SBMC §28.92.110); and

C. A Net Floor Area (Floor to Lot Area Ratio) Modification of the net floor area standards imposed by SBMC §28.15.083 to allow 6,439 square feet of net floor area that would

APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE: 5/12/15
DATE ACTION REQUIRED: 7/11/15

III. RECOMMENDATION

If the modifications are approved, the project would conform to the City’s Zoning and Building Ordinances and policies of the General Plan. In addition, the size and massing of the project are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the project, making the findings outlined in Section X of this report, and subject to the conditions of approval in Exhibit A.

IV. BACKGROUND

The development of the subject property predates the development of the majority of residences on the block. The City’s permit logs show that the original residence was constructed in June 1911, as a part of a larger property with multiple residential buildings. The City adopted its first zoning standards for residential development in 1924 and the property was zoned Class I Residential. The existing development conformed to the 1924 zoning requirements. By 1930, the property was zoned R-1, One-Family Residence zone. The property was down-zoned in 1957 to E-2 One-Family Residence zone. The property was then subdivided in 1959 and resulted in the current lot size and configuration. In 1975, the property was down-zoned to the current zoning designation of E-1, One-Family Residence zone. The requirements for minimum lot size and required setbacks increased with each down-zoning.

Staff used various sources to determine the permitted size and legality of all structures and the “as-built” alterations and additions including street files, photographic documentation, Sanborn maps, and the County of Santa Barbara Assessor’s Residential Building Record for the subject property. Due to the lack of archival plans, it is difficult to put together a concise timeline for
permits. A determination was made by Staff that the permitted development on-site consists of a 5,203 square-foot, three-story residence with a partial basement; a 167 square-foot, accessory building with a 120 square-foot covered porch; and a 408 square-foot garage with a 244 square-foot loft accessory space. The permitted development has been determined to be legal non-conforming to the following requirements of the E-1 zone: 1) The existing residence has a maximum building height of 32 feet and 6 inches. The ordinance allows a maximum building height of 30 feet; 2) The residence is located within the required 30 foot front setback along the primary frontage; 3) The existing garage building is located within the required 30 foot front setback and the required 10 foot interior setback; and 4) The permitted accessory building is located within both of the required 30 foot front setbacks.

A review of the property’s street file indicates that in 1985 the City notified the property owner that a complaint had been received regarding the construction of an addition without a permit. The property owner responded in writing that she would address the concerns upon her return from a business trip; however, there is no evidence in the City’s archive documenting the abatement of this violation.

On April 20, 2013, a Zoning Inspection Report (ZIR2013-00164) was issued. The ZIR discloses a number of outstanding building and zoning violations on the subject property that are subject to enforcement including “as-built” additions to the residence and accessory building, a potential illegal dwelling unit, and accessory structures located in the setbacks.

The “as-built” additions and alterations to the existing buildings were constructed prior to the current property owner, Winn Family Trust, taking ownership of the property in July 2013. Mr. Winn received a copy of the ZIR prior to the closure of escrow and purchasing of the property. The proposed project includes the abatement of the outstanding violations.

V. SITE INFORMATION AND PROJECT STATISTICS

A. SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Trish Allen, Suzanne Elledge Planning &amp; Permitting Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner:</td>
<td>Winn Family Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number:</td>
<td>025-261-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>13,510 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan:</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max 3 du/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>E-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use:</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography:</td>
<td>4% est. avg. slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Land Uses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North – Santa Barbara Mission</td>
<td>East – Mission Historical Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South - Residential</td>
<td>West - Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. PROJECT STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permitted</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Area</td>
<td>4,735 sq. ft.</td>
<td>5,236 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement Living Area</td>
<td>468 sq. ft.</td>
<td>468 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>408 sq. ft.</td>
<td>468 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Space (Loft)</td>
<td>244 sq. ft.</td>
<td>0 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
<td>147 sq. ft.</td>
<td>267 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Development</td>
<td>6,002 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6,439 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. FLOOR-TO-LOT AREA RATIO (FAR)

Maximum Allowed Floor Area: 3,560 sq. ft. (Limited to 85% of maximum FAR due to non-conforming height of building)

Permitted Floor Area*: 5,768 sq. ft. (138% of maximum required FAR)
Proposed Floor Area*: 6,205 sq. ft. (148% of maximum required FAR)

*For the purposes of the floor-to-lot area ratio (FAR), if a basement has a finished grade to ceiling height of less than four feet the square footage is reduced by 50% when calculating the FAR. The 468 square foot basement has a finished grade to ceiling height of less than four feet.

VI. ISSUES

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission focus on the issues of the requested FAR and setback modifications, which are described in detail in Section VII of this Staff Report. When proposals approach or exceed the maximum allowable FAR and building height, applicants are required to provide additional information. As a tool to aid in evaluating compatibility, data for the 20 closest lots surrounding the subject property are provided which show the sizes of the lots, the square footages of houses and garages, and the FARs for comparison with the proposed project.

The summarized data show a wide range of lot sizes and house sizes in the immediate area (Exhibit D). The proposed project ranks fourth largest in FAR, third largest in floor area, and is the largest in percentage of maximum allowable FAR. The subject lot was one of the first lots developed in this neighborhood, making this site unique from other lots in the neighborhood. Photo documentation is also included in the project plans to aid in determining compatibility, and confirms that the proposed addition will not affect the existing streetscape.
VII. POLICY AND ZONING CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

A. ZONING ORDINANCE CONSISTENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Requirement/ Allowance</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (Primary)</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>7'</td>
<td>25' *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (Secondary)</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>6' - 6''</td>
<td>6' - 6'' *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>6' - 8''</td>
<td>4' - 1'' *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>&gt;10'</td>
<td>&gt;10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>&gt;30'</td>
<td>&gt;30'**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>2 covered</td>
<td>2 covered</td>
<td>2 covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Yard</td>
<td>1,250 sq. ft.</td>
<td>&gt;1,250 sq. ft.</td>
<td>&gt;1,250 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,686 s.f.</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving/Driveway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,600 s.f.</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8,224 s.f.</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Modification requested
**The "as-built" improvements do not exceed 30 feet in height.

With the approval of the Modifications described below, the project would meet the requirements of the E-1, One-Family Residence Zoning Ordinance.

1. MODIFICATIONS
   a. Front Setback Modifications

   The corner lot is constrained by the location of the existing permitted development and the required setbacks which make up approximately 40% of the lot area (5,402 square feet). The required front setbacks are roughly 25.5% (3,452 sq. ft.) of the total lot area.

   The existing detached accessory building is located entirely within the required thirty-foot front setback along the secondary (Laguna Street) frontage and a portion of the building, including a portion of the "as-built" additions, encroaches five-feet into the required front setback along the primary frontage (Los Olivos Street). Any addition to increase the size of the existing accessory building would be located both within the required front setbacks and the front yard requiring zoning modifications.

   It is believed that the "as-built" improvements were constructed sometime after 1968 and prior to the 2013. The proposed addition is located under the previously permitted roofline. The porch extension was constructed to the west of the building between the permitted accessory building and the residence. The resulting
accessory building totals 267 square feet and will not exceed the maximum allowed size of 500 square feet.

The majority of the accessory building is screened from view by the existing hedges along both property frontages; therefore, the proposed setback modifications to allow additions and alterations to the accessory building within the required front setbacks and front yard are necessary to construct an appropriate improvement on the lot. A permitted, smaller, accessory structure has historically existed on the lot and the proposed additions and alterations are not anticipated to have an adverse impact on the visual openness of the public street frontage or the adjacent neighbors to the south.

b. Interior Setback Modification

The existing detached garage was constructed seven-feet from the front lot line and 6'-8" from the interior property line to the west and was determined to be non-conforming to the minimum required interior width of 20 feet. The applicant is proposing to construct a 60 square-foot addition to the center of the garage to increase the ridge height and maintain the architectural characteristics of the existing building. In order to relocate the building, the garage will be required to be dismantled and reconstructed using the same materials. The applicant is proposing to relocate the garage 30 feet from the front lot line and 4 feet, one inch from the interior property line to the west when the building is reconstructed. The installation of the new driveway and the relocation of the garage will allow the existing driveway apron in the public right-of-way to align with the garage door opening. The building could not be relocated to east due to a “no build” easement that is required to protect a historic resource, a portion of the existing Mission Aqueduct that is located on the site.

The proposal includes a vehicular turntable within the extended driveway to allow a vehicle to be turned 180° to allow a vehicle to enter the street in a forward motion. The turntable is voluntarily proposed and is not a requirement for the project. The proposed relocation of the garage is not anticipated to adversely impact the adjacent neighbor to the west and will provide the additional garage width required for the storage of two standard sized vehicles.

c. FAR Modification

The permitted development at the time of adoption of the FAR regulations (in 2007) was already 138% of the maximum FAR requirements. The ordinance allows for cumulative, total additions not to exceed 100 square feet for those buildings that are determined legal non-conforming to FAR requirements specified in SBMC §28.15.083, without a zoning modification. In this case, the proposed project requires a FAR modification to allow a net addition of 437 square feet. The proposed “as-built” addition represents a 9% increase in square-footage and represents a minor increase in the size of the home. The development is consistent with home sizes on larger lots in the Upper East neighborhood and is not readily visible from the public street frontage.
VIII. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Archaeological Report

Due to the project’s location being mapped within an archaeologically sensitive area and a portion of the historic Mission Aqueduct being located on the property site, a Phase I Archaeological Report prepared by Dudek was submitted for review by the Historic Landmarks Commission. The report outlined several mitigation measures to protect the existing portion of the Mission Aqueduct and create a “no-build” easement extending five feet on either side of the aqueduct segment and extending from the front property line on Los Olivos Street to the rear property line. Staff has incorporated the mitigations into the recommended conditions of approval as conditions B.2. and D.2.e.1-4. With the incorporation of the required mitigation measures, the project potential impacts on archaeological resources have been reduced to a level of less than significant. The Historic Landmarks Commission accepted the report and its conclusions at the November 5, 2014 meeting.

Historic Structures and Sites Report

Post / Hazeltine Associates prepared a Historic Structures and Site Report (HSSR) for the proposed project (Exhibit F). The HSSR outlines the history of the site and the history of the construction on the project site. The HSSR states that the property is eligible for designation as a City Landmark and for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. The report analyzes the proposed project including the “as-built” additions and alterations and has determined that with the incorporation of a recommended mitigation measure to redesign the garage doors facing Los Olivos Street to be more in keeping with the garages American Colonial Revival style architecture the proposed projects impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant. Staff has added a recommended condition of approval (Condition C.1.) to address this recommended mitigation measure. The Historic Landmarks Commission accepted the report and its conclusions at the October 8, 2014 meeting.

IX. DESIGN REVIEW

This project and the Historic Structures and Sites Report (HSSR) were reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) on October 8, 2014 (meeting minutes are attached as Exhibit E). The HLC accepted the HSSR as presented, commending the report preparers and the home owners for the thoroughness of the report and the home's preservation. The HLC stated that the project is ready for project design approval and that the two front setback, interior setback, and FAR modifications requested are supportable, in particular the FAR modification, in that the application is not adding in size, bulk and scale to any side of the historic house (as described in Section VIII of the staff report). The HLC also commented that the existing hedge provides screening along Laguna Street providing a shield from its incompatible style of architecture to the Santa Barbara Mission. HLC reviewed the proposed project and Compatibility Analysis Criteria have been generally met for this project.
X. FINDINGS

The Planning Commission finds the following:

A. FRONT SETBACK MODIFICATIONS (SBMC §28.15.060, §28.87.160, AND §28.92.110)

The Planning Commission finds that the Modifications to allow the additions and alterations to the existing accessory structure within the front yard and the required thirty-foot front setbacks are consistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, creates a uniform improvement, and is necessary to secure an appropriate improvement on the lot. The proposed additions and alterations are appropriate because they result in a uniform addition to the accessory building that is not visible from the street frontage and is not anticipated to impact the street or the adjacent neighbors. The corner lot is constrained by the required setbacks and the location of the existing development. Due to the location of the existing accessory building, with the required front setbacks there is no opportunity for a conforming addition to the structure outside of the required setbacks.

B. INTERIOR SETBACK MODIFICATION (SBMC §28.15.060 AND §28.92.110)

The Planning Commission finds that the Interior Setback Modification to allow the reconstruction, addition, and relocation of the existing garage structure within the required ten-foot interior setback is consistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and is necessary to secure an appropriate improvement on the lot. The proposed relocation, addition, and alterations are appropriate because the relocation and the addition will result in a garage with adequate interior width to park two standard size vehicles in a garage that aligns with the existing driveway apron and is consistent in size with the zoning requirement. The garage will be located outside of the required front setback improving the visual openness of the public street frontage making the building less visible from the street frontage and is not anticipated to adversely impact the adjacent neighbors. Due to the location of the existing driveway apron, the historic Mission Aqueduct, and the "no-build" easement, the garage could not be relocated to the east.

C. FAR MODIFICATION (SBMC §28.15.083 AND §28.92.110)

The Planning Commission finds the following with regard to the Modification of the net floor area standard imposed by SBMC Section 28.15.083, to allow a development that would otherwise be precluded by operation of Subsection 28.15.083.D:

a. Not less than six (6) members of the Historic Landmarks Commission have voted in support of the modification following a concept review of the project.

On October 8, 2014, the HLC voted 8/0/0 in support of the FAR modification.

b. The subject lot has a physical condition (such as the location, surroundings, topography, or the size of the lot relative to other lots in the neighborhood) that does not generally exist on other lots in the neighborhood.

The residence, a potential City Landmark, is located on a corner lot and was developed prior to the adoption of the City’s first zoning ordinance. The corner lot is constrained by
the location of the existing development, the required setbacks, and the archaeological “no-build” easement to the west of the existing residence.

c. The physical condition of the lot allows the project to be compatible with existing development within the neighborhood that complies with the net floor area standard.

The existing residence was constructed in 1911, was the first residence on the block, and is non-conforming to building height. The subject lot is situated in a neighborhood with a wide range of lot and house sizes. Eight of the 20 closest lots exceed 100% of the maximum required floor area ratio. The proposed project square-footage is consistent with development on comparable lot sizes within the neighborhood. The 437 square-foot, “as-built” additions represent a net increase of 9% of the existing floor area.

In addition, the “as-built” additions are well integrated into the overall design of the residence and with the size of residences within this neighborhood. The “as-built” additions at the rear of the residence and to the existing accessory building would not exceed the maximum 30 feet building height and are not readily visible from the public right-of-way.

Exhibits:

A. Conditions of Approval
B. Site Plan
C. Applicant’s letter, dated May 13, 2015
D. 20 Closest Homes Analysis
E. HLC Minutes
F. Historic Structures and Sites Report (available upon request)
DRAFT PLANNING COMMISSION CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

340 E. LOS OLIVOS STREET (MST2013-00340)
SETBACK AND FLOOR AREA MODIFICATIONS
JUNE 18, 2015

I. In consideration of the project approval granted by the Planning Commission and for the benefit of the owner(s) and occupant(s) of the Real Property, the owners and occupants of adjacent real property and the public generally, the following terms and conditions are imposed on the use, possession, and enjoyment of the Real Property:

A. **Order of Development.** In order to accomplish the proposed development, the following steps shall occur in the order identified:

1. Obtain all required design review approvals.

2. Submit an application for and obtain a Building Permit (BLD) to demolish any structures / improvements and/or perform rough grading. Comply with condition E “Construction Implementation Requirements.”

3. Record any required documents (see Recorded Conditions Agreement section).

4. Permits.
   
a. Submit an application for and obtain a Building Permit (BLD) for construction of approved development and complete said development.

b. Submit an application for and obtain a Public Works Permit (PBW) for all required public improvements and complete said improvements.

Details on implementation of these steps are provided throughout the conditions of approval.

B. **Recorded Conditions Agreement.** The Owner shall execute a written instrument, which shall be prepared by Planning staff, reviewed as to form and content by the City Attorney, Community Development Director and Public Works Director, recorded in the Office of the County Recorder, and shall include the following:

1. **Approved Development.** The development of the Real Property approved by the Planning Commission on TBD is limited to an approximately 5,704 square-foot, three-story, single-family residence, a 267 square-foot detached accessory building, and a 468 square-foot garage, a brick driveway with an integrated vehicular turntable, and brick walkways and the improvements shown on the plans signed by the chairperson of the Planning Commission on said date and on file at the City of Santa Barbara.

2. **Development Restriction.** The Owner shall not make any use of the restricted portion of the Real Property as designated on the approved plans in order that those portions of the Real Property remain in their natural state. A 5-foot wide no-build area extending from the 2-foot wide aqueduct segment and projected aqueduct corridor extending southward through the project site shall be established to preserve the aqueduct resource in perpetuity. No ground disturbances shall be allowed within this 5-foot wide area. The restricted areas shall be shown on the site and landscape plans. The Owner shall continue to be responsible for maintenance of the restricted area, and compliance with orders of the Fire

EXHIBIT A
Department. Any brush clearance shall be performed without the use of earth moving equipment.

3. **Uninterrupted Water Flow.** The Owner shall allow for the continuation of any historic flow of water onto the Real Property including, but not limited to, swales, natural watercourses, conduits and any access road, as appropriate.

4. **Recreational Vehicle Storage Limitation.** No recreational vehicles, boats, or trailers shall be stored on the Real Property unless enclosed or concealed from view as approved by the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC).

5. **Landscape Plan Compliance.** The Owner shall comply with the Landscape Plan approved by the Historic Landmarks Commission. Such plan shall not be modified unless prior written approval is obtained from the HLC. The landscaping on the Real Property shall be provided and maintained in accordance with said landscape plan, including any tree protection measures. If said landscaping is removed for any reason without approval by the HLC, the owner is responsible for its immediate replacement.

6. **Storm Water Pollution Control and Drainage Systems Maintenance.** Owner shall maintain the drainage system and storm water pollution control devices in a functioning state and in accordance with the Storm Water BMP Guidance Manual and Operations and Maintenance Procedure Plan approved by the Creeks Division. Should any of the project's surface or subsurface drainage structures or storm water pollution control methods fail to capture, infiltrate, and/or treat water, or result in increased erosion, the Owner shall be responsible for any necessary repairs to the system and restoration of the eroded area. Should repairs or restoration become necessary, prior to the commencement of such repair or restoration work, the Owner shall submit a repair and restoration plan to the Community Development Director to determine if an amendment or a new Building Permit is required to authorize such work. The Owner is responsible for the adequacy of any project-related drainage facilities and for the continued maintenance thereof in a manner that will preclude any hazard to life, health, or damage to the Real Property or any adjoining property.

7. **Areas Available for Parking.** All parking areas and access thereto shall be kept open and available in the manner in which it was designed and permitted.

C. **Design Review.** The project, including public improvements, is subject to the review and approval of the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC). The HLC shall not grant project design approval until the following Planning Commission land use conditions have been satisfied.

1. The garage door design shall be revised to be consistent with American Colonial Revival-style of architecture.

D. **Requirements Prior to Permit Issuance.** The Owner shall submit the following, or evidence of completion of the following, for review and approval by the Department listed below prior to the issuance of any permit for the project. Some of these conditions may be
waived for demolition or rough grading permits, at the discretion of the department listed. Please note that these conditions are in addition to the standard submittal requirements for each department.

1. **Public Works Department.**
   a. **Water Rights Assignment Agreement.** The Owner shall assign to the City of Santa Barbara the exclusive right to extract ground water from under the Real Property in an *Agreement Assigning Water Extraction Rights*. Engineering Division Staff prepares said agreement for the Owner’s signature.

2. **Community Development Department.**
   a. **Recordation of Agreements.** The Owner shall provide evidence of recordation of the written instrument that includes all of the Recorded Conditions identified in condition B “Recorded Conditions Agreement” to the Community Development Department prior to issuance of any building permits.

   b. **Drainage and Water Quality.** The project is required to comply with Tier 3 of the Storm Water BMP Guidance Manual, pursuant to Santa Barbara Municipal Code Chapter 22.87 treatment, rate and volume. The Owner shall submit drainage calculations prepared by a registered civil engineer or licensed architect demonstrating that the new development will comply with the City’s Storm Water BMP Guidance Manual. Project plans for grading, drainage, stormwater facilities and treatment methods, and project development, shall be subject to review and approval by the City Building Division and Public Works Department. Sufficient engineered design and adequate measures shall be employed to ensure that no unpermitted construction-related or long-term effects from increased runoff, erosion and sedimentation, urban water pollutants (including, but not limited to trash, hydrocarbons, fertilizers, bacteria, etc.), or groundwater pollutants would result from the project.

For any proprietary treatment devices that are proposed as part of the project’s final Storm Water Management Plan, the Owner shall provide an Operations and Maintenance Procedure Plan consistent with the manufacturer’s specifications (describing schedules and estimated annual maintenance costs for pollution absorbing filter media replacement, sediment removal, etc.). The Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Creeks Division for consistency with the Storm Water BMP Guidance Manual and the manufacturer’s specifications.

After certificate of occupancy is granted, any proprietary treatment devices installed will be subject to water quality testing by City Staff to ensure they are performing as designed and are operating in compliance with the City’s Storm Water MS4 Permit.
c. **Archaeological Monitoring Contract.** Submit a contract with an archaeologist from the most current City Qualified Archaeologists List for monitoring during all ground-disturbing activities associated with the project, including, but not limited to, grading, excavation, trenching vegetation or paving removal and ground clearance in the areas identified in the Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Report prepared for this site by Dudek, dated July 2014. The contract shall be subject to the review and approval of the Environmental Analyst.

The archaeologist’s monitoring contract shall include the provisions identified in condition D.2.d “Requirement for Archaeological Resources” below.

d. **Requirement for Archaeological Resources.** The following information shall be printed on the grading plans and/or site plan:

1. The 8-foot long, 2-foot wide aqueduct segment and projected aqueduct corridor CA-SBA-4072/H extending southward through the project site shall be protected by plastic fencing during construction placed a minimum of 5 feet from the edge of the aqueduct segment and project corridor to ensure no inadvertent disturbances occur to the resource.

2. All construction activities within 30 feet of the 8-foot long, 2-foot wide aqueduct segment and projected aqueduct corridor extending southward through the project site shall be monitored by a qualified archaeologist to ensure that the fenced buffer adjacent to the aqueduct is maintained.

3. A 5-foot wide no-build area extending from the 2-foot wide aqueduct segment and projected aqueduct corridor extending southward through the project site shall be established to preserve the aqueduct resource in perpetuity. No ground disturbances shall be allowed within this 5-foot wide area.

4. If cultural resources are encountered or suspected during construction, work shall be halted immediately, and the City Environmental Analyst shall be notified. The archaeologist shall assess the nature, extent and significance of any discoveries and develop appropriate management recommendations for archaeological resource treatment, which may include, but are not limited to, redirection of grading and/or excavation activities, consultation with a Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List, (if the resource is prehistoric) etc.

If the discovery consists of possible human remains, the Santa Barbara County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the
Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission. A Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List shall be retained to monitor all further subsurface disturbance in the area of the find. Work in the area may only proceed after the Environmental Analyst grants authorization. If the discovery consists of possible prehistoric or Native American artifacts, materials, or human remains, a Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List shall be retained to monitor all further subsurface disturbance in the area of the find. Work in the area may only proceed after the Environmental Analyst grants authorization. The archaeologist shall determine the need for any other actions, including collecting a representative sample of prehistoric or historic remains, consistent with a Phase 3 Data Recovery excavation as defined in City MEA Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historic Structures and Sites criteria.

e. **Zoning Compliance Declaration.** The Owner shall file a Zoning Compliance Declaration to ensure that the residence shall remain a single-family residence. The detached accessory building may not be used as a separate dwelling unit.

f. **Structural Exploration for Modification.** The Owner shall provide Staff with a report, prepared by a Structural Engineer that includes review of the grading plan and offers recommendations and conclusions on whether the existing accessory building can be re-used as proposed. An exploratory demolition permit would be issued to allow the preparation of the report. If the building cannot be re-used, the front setback Modifications become null and void. Despite the report described above, if the building is required to be demolished beyond what is shown on the plans, the remodeling of the accessory building shall be halted, and the front setback Modifications become null and void.

g. **Design Review Requirements.** Plans shall show all design, landscape and tree protection elements, as approved by the appropriate design review board and as outlined in Section C “Design Review;” and all elements/specifications shall be implemented on-site.
h. **Conditions on Plans/Signatures.** The final Resolution shall be provided on a full size drawing sheet as part of the drawing sets. A statement shall also be placed on the sheet as follows: The undersigned have read and understand the required conditions, and agree to abide by any and all conditions which are their usual and customary responsibility to perform, and which are within their authority to perform.

Signed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. **Construction Implementation Requirements.** All of these construction requirements shall be carried out in the field by the Owner and/or Contractor for the duration of the project construction, including demolition and grading.

1. **Construction Contact Sign.** Immediately after Building permit issuance, signage shall be posted at the points of entry to the site that list the contractor(s) name, contractor(s) telephone number(s), construction work hours, site rules, and construction-related conditions, to assist Building Inspectors and Police Officers in the enforcement of the conditions of approval. The font size shall be a minimum of 0.5 inches in height. Said sign shall not exceed six feet in height from the ground if it is free-standing or placed on a fence. It shall not exceed six square feet if in a single family zone.

2. **Sandstone Curb Recycling.** Any existing sandstone curb in the public right-of-way that is removed and not reused shall be carefully salvaged and delivered to the City Corporation Annex Yard on Yanonali Street.

3. **Construction Storage/Staging.** Construction vehicle/equipment/materials storage and staging shall be done on-site. No parking or storage shall be permitted within the public right-of-way, unless specifically permitted by the Public Works Director with a Public Works permit.

F. **Prior to Certificate of Occupancy.** Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, the Owner of the Real Property shall complete the following:

1. **Repair Damaged Public Improvements.** Repair any public improvements (curbs, gutters, sidewalks, roadways, etc.) or property damaged by construction subject to the review and approval of the Public Works Department per SBMC §22.60. Where tree roots are the cause of the damage, the roots shall be pruned under the
direction of a qualified arborist.

2. **Archaeological Monitoring Report.** A final report on the results of the archaeological monitoring shall be submitted to the Planning Division within 180 days of completion of the monitoring or prior to the issuance of the Final Inspection.

G. **General Conditions.**

1. **Compliance with Requirements.** All requirements of the city of Santa Barbara and any other applicable requirements of any law or agency of the State and/or any government entity or District shall be met. This includes, but is not limited to, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 [ESA] and any amendments thereto (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.), the 1979 Air Quality Attainment Plan, and the California Code of Regulations.

2. **Approval Limitations.**
   a. The conditions of this approval supersede all conflicting notations, specifications, dimensions, and the like which may be shown on submitted plans.
   b. All buildings, roadways, parking areas and other features shall be located substantially as shown on the plans approved by the Planning Commission.
   c. Any deviations from the project description, approved plans or conditions must be reviewed and approved by the City, in accordance with the Planning Commission Guidelines. Deviations may require changes to the permit and/or further environmental review. Deviations without the above-described approval will constitute a violation of permit approval.

3. **Site Maintenance.** The existing site/structure(s) shall be maintained and secured. Any landscaping shall be watered and maintained until demolition occurs.

4. **Litigation Indemnification Agreement.** In the event the Planning Commission approval of the Project is appealed to the City Council, Applicant/Owner hereby agrees to defend the City, its officers, employees, agents, consultants and independent contractors ("City's Agents") from any third party legal challenge to the City Council's denial of the appeal and approval of the Project, including, but not limited to, challenges filed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (collectively "Claims"). Applicant/Owner further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City and the City's Agents from any award of attorney fees or court costs made in connection with any Claim.

Applicant/Owner shall execute a written agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, evidencing the foregoing commitments of defense and indemnification within thirty (30) days of being notified of a lawsuit regarding the Project. These commitments of defense and indemnification are material conditions of the approval of the Project. If Applicant/Owner fails to execute the required defense and indemnification agreement within the time allotted, the Project approval shall
become null and void absent subsequent acceptance of the agreement by the City, which acceptance shall be within the City’s sole and absolute discretion. Nothing contained in this condition shall prevent the City or the City’s Agents from independently defending any Claim. If the City or the City’s Agents decide to independently defend a Claim, the City and the City’s Agents shall bear their own attorney fees, expenses, and costs of that independent defense.

NOTICE OF MODIFICATION APPROVAL TIME LIMITS:

The Planning Commission action approving the Modifications shall terminate two (2) years from the date of the approval, per Santa Barbara Municipal Code §28.87.360, unless:

1. An extension is granted by the Community Development Director prior to the expiration of the approval; or

2. A Building permit for the use authorized by the approval is issued and the construction authorized by the permit is being diligently pursued to completion and issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

NOTICE OF TIME LIMITS FOR PROJECTS WITH MULTIPLE APPROVALS (S.B.M.C. § 28.87.370):

If multiple discretionary applications are approved for the same project, the expiration date of all discretionary approvals shall correspond with the longest expiration date specified by any of the land use discretionary applications, unless such extension would conflict with state or federal law. The expiration date of all approvals shall be measured from date of the final action of the City on the longest discretionary land use approval related to the application, unless otherwise specified by state or federal law.
13 May 2015

Planning Commission
c/o Suzanne Riege, Associate Planner
Planning Division, Community Development
City of Santa Barbara
630 Garden St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

RE: 340 E. Los Olivos (APN 025-261-004) – MST2013-00340
Project Description/Applicant Letter

Dear Commissioners,

On behalf of the property owners, Ann and Alastair Winn, we are pleased to submit this Applicant/Project Description letter to supplement the project materials for your review and consideration.

I. General Site Information

The subject property is located at the corner of E. Los Olivos and Laguna Streets, diagonally across from the Historic Old Mission, on a 13,510 square foot lot. The property is zoned E-1, Single Family Residential with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Suburban Residential (5 dwelling units/acre). It is developed with a two and a half story single family residence, a detached garage and an accessory structure. The residence was constructed in 1911 in the American Colonial Revival style.

II. Project Description

The proposed project includes improvements that were carried out without the benefit of permits when the property was under previous ownership as well as several exterior alterations to install historically appropriate fenestrations, and finally to relocate and widen the existing garage in order to improve ingress and egress.

Proposed alterations to resolve unpermitted improvements:

- Permit the enclosed second story sleeping porch (365 SF);
- Permit the existing third floor dormer (154 SF) and deck addition (142 SF);
- Permit an addition to the existing accessory structure and remove the kitchen; and,
- Permit an existing sink in the third floor family room.
Proposed alterations to achieve compatibility with the architecture and improve access:

- Replace the second story sunroom aluminum windows with wood framed windows;
- Replace the existing bubble skylight with a flat glass skylight;
- Relocate and widen existing garage a distance of approximately 23 feet in order to provide for safe access and adequate width for two-vehicle parking;
- Replace garage roll up door with new wood carriage style wood door;
- Remove south window from the garage and install roll up door;
- Remove loft and stair from interior of garage;
- Install car turntable in driveway flush with paving surface; and,
- Repair existing siding on accessory structure.

Please refer to the lot coverage and site data that is reproduced on the cover sheet of the project plans which describes the existing floor areas of each of the structures as well as those project components that were constructed without the benefit of a permit.

Historic Landmarks Commission

The project concept plans were reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) on October 8, 2014. The HLC forwarded the project to the Planning Commission stating that the project was ready for design approval, the requested zoning modifications were aesthetically supportable, made suggestions regarding the third floor balcony design, and stated that the Compatibility Analysis Criteria have generally been met. Following Planning Commission consideration, the project will return to the HLC for both Project Design and Final Approvals.

Phase 1-2 Historic Structures/Sites Report

Due to the historic significance of the subject property, the proposed alterations required preparation of a Historic Structures/Sites Report (HSSR). The Phase 1-2 HSSR was prepared by Post/Hazeltine Associates, dated September 29, 2014. The project architect and property owners worked closely with the project architectural historians to ensure that the non-permitted and proposed alterations would meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards. The report concludes that implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact to significant historic resources. The HSSR was received and approved by the HLC on October 8, 2014.

Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Report

The subject property is located with the following cultural resource sensitivity areas: the Prehistoric Sites and Watercourses, Mission Complex & Waterworks, American Period,
and Early Twentieth Century. A Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Report was prepared by Dudek, dated July 2014 to satisfy the requirements of the Santa Barbara City Master Environmental Assessment Guidelines for archaeological Resources and Historic Structures and Sites. The survey identified an intact segment of the Mission aqueduct water system in the northwest portion of the property.

The proposed project description includes the following action measures to reduce potential impacts to the resources:

- Proposed development will be located no closer than eight (8) feet from the observed aqueduct segment;
- During construction, fencing will be installed along the eight (8) foot long aqueduct and projected aqueduct corridor;
- A five (5) foot wide no build area is established on each side of the two (2) foot wide aqueduct segment, extending along the projected aqueduct corridor southward through the subject site; and,
- Construction monitoring by a qualified archaeologist.

The action measures listed above have been incorporated into the project plans. The Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Report was reviewed and accepted by the HLC on November 5, 2014.

Zoning Modifications

The existing garage is legal non-conforming relative to both the front and interior yard setbacks. The front setback requirement is 30 feet and the garage is currently 7' from the front property line. The primary reason for relocating the garage 23' from its existing location is to provide additional clearance from the right-of-way to allow better visibility for vehicular maneuvering and pedestrian safety. The interior setback requirement is 10 feet and the garage is currently 6' 8" inches from the west property line. The project proposes to relocate the garage a distance of 23' in order to meet the current 30-foot front setback. Because the existing width of the garage, 17' 5", does not accommodate two vehicles, the proposal includes widening the garage to attain a 20' interior clear width. In order to comply with the recommendations contained in the Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Report, specifically the no build area, the garage is proposed to be located 4' 1" from the west property line.

The existing accessory structure was originally constructed sometime between 1911 and 1930 as a washhouse. Sometime after 1931, an addition was constructed on the north side of the structure. The subject property is located on a corner and as a result contains two front yards each requiring a 30-foot front yard setback. In order to permit the unpermitted addition, zoning modifications are required for the encroachment into both the required 30-foot front yard setbacks.
The subject property was subdivided in 1954; prior to the subdivision, the southerly property boundary extended to Junipero Plaza for a total lot area of over 26,000 square feet. Had the property not been subdivided, the property would be subject to the City’s Floor to Lot Area (FAR) as guidelines. Because the current lot area is 13,510 square feet, the FAR maximum is a requirement. The existing residence, without the non-permitted additions, sleeping room enclosure, and garage expansion, exceeds the maximum FAR requirement (127% FAR). The project proposes to permit the additions that were carried without a permit and therefore requires a zoning modification to allow the structure to exceed the maximum FAR. The proposed project is 143% of the maximum FAR – please refer to the FAR calculator reproduced on the cover sheet of the project plans.

Zoning Modification Justifications

As previously stated, the existing garage is located in both the front and interior yards setbacks and is legally non-conforming to these setback standards. The proximity of the garage to the street, only seven (7) feet from the front property line is not desirable in terms of ingress and egress to the property on this busy street and near an intersection. For this reason, the project proposes to relocate the existing garage. As stated above, the existing garage is also legally non-conforming with respect to the required 10 foot interior yard setback. The interior yard setback modification can be justified for the following reasons:

- The existing condition is legal non-conforming relative to current front and interior yard setback standards;
- The proposal improves upon the existing condition by relocating the garage further away from the street to improve ingress/egress as well as pedestrian and vehicular safety;
- The interior yard modification is necessary to provide adequate separation from the aqueduct corridor no build area; and,
- There is an existing 7’ high stucco wall on the immediate neighboring property that provides further buffer.

The accessory or washroom structure is located in both front yard setbacks. It is not clear when the non-permitted addition occurred on the north portion of the structure and therefore we were not able to determine whether the structure would have been required to provide a setback. The addition to the structure resulted in a uniform improvement along the Laguna Street property frontage. The structure is adequately screened by established vegetation, and would not pose an impact to neighboring uses as the structure is on a street corner. Additionally, the HLC was able to aesthetically support the requested zoning modification.

The existing and proposed net floor area totals approximately 5,971 net SF, resulting in 143% of the FAR maximum. For this reason, an FAR Modification is requested as part of
the project. As stated above, the property was originally constructed on a much larger lot in the early 1900s extending to Junipero Plaza to the south. The lot subdivision resulted in a lot size approximately half the original lot size; with less lot area, the FAR calculation increases. In fact, the existing permitted floor area, 5,287 SF results in 127% FAR. The FAR modification request is justified in that the main residence footprint is not increasing: the added footprint involves the provision of additional on-site parking in a neighborhood of constrained parking due to the adjacent public uses (Historic Mission and Rose Garden).

The proposed project and zoning modifications are intended to rectify existing zoning violations, to accommodate adequate parking on site, and to provide safer vehicular maneuverability and pedestrian safety along Los Olivos Street. Additionally, the requested zoning modifications were positively supported by the HLC.

On behalf of the property owners, we thank you for the consideration of the proposed project.

Sincerely,

SUZANNE ELLEDGE
PLANNING & PERMITTING SERVICES, INC.

Trish Allen, AICP
Senior Planner
## 20 Closest Lots Data Ranked by FAR for: 340 E. Los Olivos Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th># of Stories</th>
<th>House Size</th>
<th>Garage/Carport</th>
<th>Total Development</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>325 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-003</td>
<td>27,838</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>7,043</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 E. Los Olivos</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-002</td>
<td>27,450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,034</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>4,496</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-004</td>
<td>27,306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>21 Smallest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 E. Los Olivos</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-001</td>
<td>26,880</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,974</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-003</td>
<td>23,453</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,796</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>5,404</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-002</td>
<td>16,553</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-001</td>
<td>16,471</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,336</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>340 E. Los Olivos</strong></td>
<td><strong>Co. Assessor's Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>025-261-004</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,589</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,737</strong></td>
<td><strong>468</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,205</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-005</td>
<td>12,932</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-005</td>
<td>6,946</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-024</td>
<td>6,485</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-008</td>
<td>6,439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-007</td>
<td>6,383</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-023</td>
<td>6,329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>3,747</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-014</td>
<td>6,319</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-021</td>
<td>6,226</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-003</td>
<td>6,148</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1 Largest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100 Laguna</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-016</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-006</td>
<td>5,979</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-022</td>
<td>5,944</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402/404 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-001</td>
<td>5,846</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average/Mean Total of House + Garage Size (including project proposal): **3,596**

Average/Mean FAR (including project proposal): **0.34**
## 20 Closest Lots Data Ranked by Sq. Ft. of Total Development
for: 340 E. Los Olivos Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th># of Stories</th>
<th>House Size</th>
<th>Garage/Carport</th>
<th>Total Development</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>325 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-003</td>
<td>27,838</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>7,043</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1 Largest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 E. Los Olivos</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-002</td>
<td>27,450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,034</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>4,496</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-004</td>
<td>27,300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 E. Los Olivos</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-001</td>
<td>26,880</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,974</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-003</td>
<td>23,453</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,796</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>5,404</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-002</td>
<td>16,553</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-001</td>
<td>16,471</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,336</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>340 E. Los Olivos</strong></td>
<td><strong>Co. Assessor's Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>025-261-004</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,589</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,737</strong></td>
<td><strong>468</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,205</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-005</td>
<td>12,932</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-005</td>
<td>6,946</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>21 Smallest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-024</td>
<td>6,485</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-008</td>
<td>6,439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-007</td>
<td>6,383</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-023</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>3,747</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-014</td>
<td>6,319</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-021</td>
<td>6,226</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-003</td>
<td>6,148</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100 Laguna</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-016</td>
<td>6,077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-006</td>
<td>5,979</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-022</td>
<td>5,944</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402/404 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-001</td>
<td>5,846</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average/Mean Total of House + Garage Size (including project proposal): **3,596**

Average/Mean FAR (including project proposal): **0.34**
20 Closest Lots Data Ranked by % of Maximum FAR
for: 340 E. Los Olivos Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th># of Stories</th>
<th>House Size</th>
<th>Garage/Carport</th>
<th>Total Development</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Max Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>% of MAX Required FAR</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>325 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-003</td>
<td>27,838</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>7,043</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>118%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 E. Los Olivos</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-002</td>
<td>27,450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,034</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>4,496</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-004</td>
<td>27,306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5,913</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21 Smallest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 E. Los Olivos</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-001</td>
<td>26,880</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,974</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-003</td>
<td>23,453</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,796</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>5,404</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>5,432</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-002</td>
<td>16,553</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4,569</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-001</td>
<td>16,471</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,336</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>4,559</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340 E. Los Olivos</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-004</td>
<td>13,589</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,737</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>6,205</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4,199</td>
<td>148%</td>
<td>1 Largest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-005</td>
<td>12,932</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>4,117</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-005</td>
<td>6,946</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-024</td>
<td>6,485</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2,821</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-008</td>
<td>6,439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-007</td>
<td>6,383</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2,796</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-023</td>
<td>6,329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>3,747</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2,782</td>
<td>135%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-014</td>
<td>6,319</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-021</td>
<td>6,226</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-003</td>
<td>6,148</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>142%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100 Laguna</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-016</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-006</td>
<td>5,979</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411 E. Padre</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-022</td>
<td>5,944</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402/404 Plaza Rubio</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-263-001</td>
<td>5,846</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 20 Closest Lots Data Ranked by FAR for lots >10,000 sq. ft. for: 340 E. Los Olivos Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th># of Stories</th>
<th>House Size</th>
<th>Garage/Carport</th>
<th>Total Development</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>% of MAX Required FAR</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>325 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-003</td>
<td>27,838</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>7,043</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>118%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 E. Los Olivos</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-002</td>
<td>27,450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,034</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>4,496</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-004</td>
<td>27,306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 E. Los Olivos</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-001</td>
<td>26,880</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,974</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-003</td>
<td>23,453</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,796</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>5,404</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-002</td>
<td>16,553</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 Junipero Plaza</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-262-001</td>
<td>16,471</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,336</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>340 E. Los Olivos</strong></td>
<td><strong>Co. Assessor's Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>025-261-004</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,589</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,737</strong></td>
<td><strong>468</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,205</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>148%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 Largest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337 Junipero</td>
<td>Co. Assessor's Office</td>
<td>025-261-005</td>
<td>12,932</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average/Mean Total of House + Garage Size (including project proposal):** 5,016

**Average/Mean FAR (including project proposal):** 0.26
DESIGN REVIEW ACTIVITIES SUMMARY

340 E LOS OLIVOS ST (MST2013-00340)  
R-ALTERATIONS

This property is on the City's List of Potential Historic Resources: "Edwards/Dole House." Proposal for alterations and additions to an existing, three-story, 5,203 square foot, single-family residence, located on a 13,510 square foot parcel. The project includes a request to permit the 139 square foot "as-built" dormer addition, a 142 square foot "as-built" deck constructed on the third floor, and the 362 square foot "as-built" second-story sunroom addition, the replacement of aluminum windows on the "as-built" second-story sunroom with (period-correct) wood windows, and the replacement and installation of new skylights. The proposal also includes additions and alterations to the existing garage including relocating the existing 408 square foot, two-car garage (and 244 s.f. loft above the garage) to comply with required front setback, adding 60 square feet to meet the minimum interior dimensions, and window and door changes. The existing driveway material is to be removed and replaced with a 540 square foot brick driveway including a integrated brick inlaid vehicular turntable. This project will address violations identified within enforcement case ENF2013-00346 including "as-built" window and skylight changes to the existing 267 square foot detached accessory building and the demolition of other unpermitted structures. The proposed site development totals 6,683 square feet. The project is 149% of the required floor-to-lot area ratio (FAR). The application requires Planning Commission review for a requested floor area and setback modifications.

**Status:** Pending

**HLC-Historic Structures Report**

See Concept Review activity comments.

Actual time: 2:22 p.m.

a) HSSR (Review of Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Post Hazeltine.)

Present: Dr. Pamela Post and Timothy Hazeltine, Historical Consultants; Trish Allen, Agent, Senior Planner, SEPPS; and Suzanne Riegle, Associate Planner

Commissioner Murray disclosed that she conducted an individual site visit and spoke to the owners.

Staff comment: Nicole Hernández, Urban Historian, stated that the proposal to replace the unpermitted work with historically accurate materials is supportable and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Public comment opened at 2:30 p.m.

Kellam de Forest, local resident, stated that, although the project is not a designated landmark, it is an important structure. He asked whether a garage existed on Junipero Street and requested that FAR setbacks be considered because of the home's historic nature.

Public comment closed at 2:33 p.m.

Motion: To accept the report as presented commending the report preparers and the home owners for the thoroughness of the report and the home's preservation.

Action: La Voe/Orias, 8/0/0. (Shallanberger absent.) Motion carried.

Additional individual comment:
* If the applicant proposes to change the building color, it was suggested that the original exterior colors should be studied.
b) Project Concept Review. (Comments only; project requires environmental assessment and Planning Commission review for requested floor area and setback modifications.)

Present: Alastair and Ann Winn, Owners; Mark Shellnut, Architect; Trish Allen, Agent, Senior Planner, SEPPS; and Suzanne Riegle, Associate Planner

Public comment opened at 3:02 p.m. and, as no one wished to speak, it was closed.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Planning Commission with comments:
1. This project is ready for project design approval.
2. The two front setback, interior setback, and FAR modifications requested are supportable, in particular the FAR modification, in that the application is not adding in size, bulk and scale to any side of the historic house.
3. The existing hedge is supportable in its existing height along Laguna Street because it provides a shield from its incompatible style of architecture to the Santa Barbara Mission.
4. It was suggested that the porch enclosure breakups be different than the windows currently proposed. They should be suggestive of historic porch enclosures. The railing on the upper level dormer (attic level) should be solid shingle matching others found around the house.
5. Study making the new driveway pavement permeable to the extent possible.
6. The Commission has reviewed the proposed project and Compatibility Analysis Criteria have been generally met for this project (per SBMC 22.22.145.B. and 22.68.045.B.) as follows:
   a. Compliance: The project's design complies with all City regulations and is consistent with design guidelines.
   b. Compatibility: The project's design is compatible with the architectural character of the City and neighborhood as being an historic element of the neighborhood and predating most of it.
   c. Appropriateness: The project's size, bulk, height and scale are appropriate for the site, its history and neighborhood.
   d. Sensitivity: The project's design is sensitive to adjacent historic resources, particularly with the retention of the hedge.
   e. Public views: The proposed design does not block established public views of the mountains or ocean.
   f. Open Space/Landscaping: The proposed design provides an appropriate amount of landscape and open space.
Action: La Voie/Orlas, 8/0/0. (Shallanberger absent.) Motion carried.

Additional individual comment:
* The guardrail on the south elevation would be more successful if it was simplified and treated as the one located around the north elevation open deck.

** THE COMMISSION RECESS FROM 3:19 P.M. TO 3:27 P.M. **

HLC-Archaeology Report

Archeological Report (Review of Archeological Report prepared by Dudek/David Stone.)

Actual Time: 1:55 p.m.

Present: Trish Allen, Applicant, SEPPS; and David Stone, Archaeological Consultant

Staff comments: Joanna Kaufman, Planning Technician, stated that Dr. Glassow reviewed the archaeological report pertaining to the above-mentioned property. He concluded that the archaeological investigation supports the report's conclusions and recommendations. Specifically, he agreed that measures should be taken to protect the aqueduct segment during construction and that a qualified historical archaeologist should monitor the excavation associated with the construction.

Public comment opened at 1:57 p.m.

Kellam de Forest, local resident, asked what the layout was of the Mission Garden that was on the site during the Mexican Colonial period.

Public comment closed at 1:59 p.m.

Motion: To accept the report as presented, expressing appreciation for the owner's diligence in respecting the archaeologically sensitive areas of the site.
Action: Orlas/Mahan, 7/0/0. (Drury/Suding absent.) Motion carried.
Motion: To direct Staff to begin the process of designating the aqueduct as a City Landmark.
Action: Olias/Mahan, 7/0/0. (Drury/Suding absent.) Motion carried.

Additional individual comment:
* The owner is encouraged to apply for listing the aqueduct segment south of the mission on the California Register of Historical Resources.