



City of Santa Barbara California

STAFF HEARING OFFICER STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: September 19, 2007
AGENDA DATE: September 26, 2007, 2007
PROJECT ADDRESS: 102 East Pueblo (MST2006-00451)
TO: Staff Hearing Officer
FROM: Planning Division, (805) 564-5470
 Danny Kato, Zoning & Enforcement Supervisor *DK*
 Roxanne Milazzo, Associate Planner *RM*

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 35,000 square foot project site is located on the corner of Pueblo and Anacapa Streets. Current development on site consists of a 2,331 square foot dwelling with detached two-car garage, accessory structure, and a greenhouse. The proposed project involves a remodel and a 339 square foot first-floor and 570 square foot second-story addition. All parts of the addition will observe current yard requirements. A fountain is also proposed for the front yard facing Pueblo Street. The discretionary application required for the project is a Modification to allow the fountain and alterations to portions of the building located within the front and interior yard setbacks (SBMC §28.15.060). The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15305.

Date Application Accepted: July 1, 2007 Date Action Required: October 1, 2007

II. SITE INFORMATION AND PROJECT STATISTICS

A. SITE INFORMATION

Applicant:	Steve Morando	Property Owner:	Melville Sahyun
Parcel Number:	025-201-021	Lot Area:	15,947 sf
General Plan:	Residential 3 units/acre	Zoning:	E-1
Existing Use:	One Family Residence	Topography:	5 % slope
Adjacent Land Uses:			
	North – Single Family Residence		East - Single Family Residence
	South – Single Family Residence		West - Single Family Residence

B. PROJECT STATISTICS

	Existing	Proposed
Living Area	2,331 sf	909 sf addition
Garage	710 sf	No Change
Accessory Space	1,559 sf	No Change

IV. LOT AREA COVERAGE

Lot Area:	15,947 sf
Building:	6,048 sf; 38%
Hardscape:	2,523 sf; 16%
Landscape:	7,376 sf; 46%

V. DISCUSSION

- This project was reviewed by once by the ABR and once by the HLC. The ABR found the addition to be appropriate to the scale of the original house and lot size. The HLC determined that this potential structure of merit was not being impacted by the proposed improvements.
- Portions of the existing residence are non-conforming to the front and interior yard setbacks. Although the two-story addition has been designed to meet all current setbacks, there are several door and window changes that will affect non-conforming portions of the existing structure. Staff's position is that these alterations, which are driven by the remodel, result in minor changes that do not affect the intensity of use or result in impacts to the neighbors.

VI. RECOMMENDATION/FINDING

Staff recommends that the Staff Hearing Officer approve the project, making the findings that the Modification to make window and door changes to non-conforming portions of the existing residence and the fountain in the front setback are necessary to secure appropriate improvements and are consistent with the purpose and intent of the ordinance.

Exhibits:

- A. Site Plan
- B. Applicant's letter dated June 26, 0207
- C. ABR/HLC Minutes

Contact/Case Planner: Roxanne Milazzo, Associate Planner
(rmilazzo@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Phone: (805)564-5470

Steve Morando
179 El Sueno Rd.
Santa Barbara, CA, 93110
805.698.5791

6-26-07

RECEIVED

SEP 12 2007

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
PLANNING DIVISION

Staff Hearing Officer
City of Santa Barbara
P.O. Box 1990
Santa Barbara CA 93102-1990

Re. Modification request for 102 East Pueblo Street, 025-201-024, E-1

Dear Staff Hearing Officer,

Currently the lot is developed with an existing (2,331 sq. ft.) dwelling, a detached two-car garage (669 sq. ft.) a detached accessory structure (515 sq. ft.) and a detached greenhouse (1,044 sq. ft.). The house sits at the intersection of Pueblo and Anacapa Streets and is legal non-conforming to both front yards and the interior yard. The dwelling sits 20' into the currently required 30' front yard setbacks off Pueblo Street and 10' into the currently required setback off Anacapa Street, as well. All buildings and structure on site have permits according to City records. The dwelling and garage were built in 1952 and the greenhouse and accessory in 1968.

The proposal is to construct a 339 square foot first floor addition and a 570 square second story observing all setbacks. Two modifications are requested to make window and door alterations within the front and interior yard setbacks on the existing non-conforming portions of the dwelling for the interior remodel.

The first modification being requested is to allow two sets of French doors to be installed within the front yard setbacks. The first set of doors are to be installed within the existing window openings and expand vertically to allow for the doors. These doors open onto the private outdoor living area available for the dwelling and do not face the street and therefore do not create neighbor privacy issues. The other French door in bedroom #1 is proposed to meet current egress requirements.

The second modification requested is to alter window locations on the South elevation of the dwelling, which is non-conforming at 5' into the required 10 interior yard setback. The alterations will allow the Jack and Jill bathroom to be expanded and to reconfigure the laundry area to accommodate the new stairwell.

The Historic Structure Report was accepted by HLC on May 2, 2007, and the project returned to HLC for concept review of the design on June 27, 2007, receiving positive comments forwarding the project to the Staff Hearing Officer.

Sincerely,

Steve Morando

EXHIBIT B

102 East Pueblo Street Design Review Comments

September 5, 2006 (ABR)

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Full Board with the following comments: 1) The Board finds the proposed addition and new second floor area to be appropriate to the scale of the original house and lot size. 2) Provide integration of second story mass to nestle into the roof forms of the original structure, as depicted in previous conceptual sketches. 3) Provide simplification of the following architectural treatments to be more compatible with original style: a. Restudy the street presence of the second story balcony; b. Restudy the deck cantilever on the north elevation; c) Reconsider a simpler bay window that integrates into the second story roof, at the west elevation; d) Restudy the new entry to have a street presence and be more neighborhood friendly. The current proposal is understated and not in keeping with the original design of the structure. 4) There is concern with the shape and detailing of the proposed windows. a. Provide traditional window detailing. b. Mullions shall match the original style of the house. c. Provide traditional proportions, which would not include the shallow arch as presented on the west elevation or the narrow transom on the north elevation. 5) The Board likes the existing living room windows facing west on Pueblo Street. Consider keeping or replacing in kind. 6) The Board is supportive of lengthening the site wall, and development of the new entry because of opportunity for added privacy. 7) The Board understands that there will be additional work to the garage including: a. a trellis eyebrow above the garage doors; b. replacement of the existing garage doors with carriage style doors. 8) Study other roof locations for integration of the solar applications to: a. function better; b. be less visible from the street.

Action: Mosel/Sherry, 7/0/0. Blakeley absent.

June 27, 2007 (HLC)

Second Concept Review. Project originally reviewed by Architectural Board of Review but HSSR determined that this structure is a potential Structure of Merit.)

Staff comments: Jaime Limón, Senior Planner/Design Review Supervisor, stated that, with the adoption of the Updated Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance, the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) has additional guidelines to follow in order to verify neighborhood compatibility. The Commission should consider the following new guidelines: 1) Is the site permeability being affected by the proposed addition? 2) The ordinance has applied a guideline to this lot because it is over 15,000 square feet in size, when considering the floor-to-lot area ratio. The parcel contains a large accessory building, which is placing it over the limits. If the accessory building were removed, the project would be in compliance; otherwise, if included, the HLC shall determine whether it is causing overbuilding of the site. 3) The Commission has the ability to ask for a twenty-closest-homes analysis to determine neighborhood compatibility, along with

showing how the structure fits in with other buildings on the block. 4) There are additional privacy standards that are required findings.

There is a Good Neighbor Guideline suggesting that second-story balconies and decks be at least 15 feet from interior lot lines when possible; in this case, the proposed deck is only 10 feet from the interior lot line. Another Good Neighbor Guideline suggests the inclusion of privacy elements such as screen walls, trellises, or careful placement of windows, in order to mitigate privacy impacts on neighbors.

In response to the Commission's question as to whether the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) will be giving this project final approval:

Mr. Limón explained that this project would need to be reviewed by the ABR for final approval of the design. The applicant has the option, at this time, to waive the waiting period requirements and ask the Commission to place the property on the City's List of Potential Historic Resources to avoid having the project reviewed by another design review board. Mr. Limón will discuss this issue with the applicant.

Mr. Limón stated that, in the future, one way to alleviate the applicants from having projects with a potential historic significance reviewed by both the HLC and the ABR is for the Commission to accept the Historic Structures Report and, at the same time, and with the property owner's permission at that time, move to place the property on the Potential Historic List, which would provide the HLC complete purview for final approval.

Public comment opened at 2:53 p.m.

Mr. Sahyun read into the record a letter from Dr. and Mrs. James Tamborello, neighbors, expressing support for the project.

Public comment closed at 2:53 p.m.

Motion: Preliminary approval and continued indefinitely with the following conditions:
1) Place a tree in the vicinity of the northeast portion between the garage and the property to soften the view of the second story. 2) Resolve the location of the door (that is currently designed half way under the balcony and half way under the structure) to be preferably under the house, and shorten the corresponding overhang. 3) The Commission finds there is no impact to the historic resource.

Action: Boucher/Hausz, 4/0/1. (Murray/Naylor/Sharpe absent. La Voie abstained.)

Motion carried.

Motion: To reopen the item in order to amend the previously stated motion.

Action: Hausz/Adams, 4/0/1. (Murray/Naylor/Sharpe absent. La Voie abstained.)

Motion carried.

Amended

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Staff Hearing Officer with the following comments: 1) The project is ready for preliminary approval. 2) Place a tree in the vicinity of the northeast portion between the garage and the property to soften the view of the second story. 3) Resolve the location of the door (that is currently designed half way under the balcony and half way under the structure) to be preferably under the house, and shorten the corresponding overhang. 4) The Commission finds there is no impact to the historic resource.

Action: Hausz/Boucher, 4/0/1. (Murray/Naylor/Sharpe absent. La Voie abstained.)
Motion carried.