

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM

1. 915 E ANAPAMU ST

E-1/R-3 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-201-003

Application Number: MST2007-00331

Owner: Charles Crail

Agent: Suzanne Elledge Permitting and Planning Services

Architect: Cearnal, Andrulaitis

(Proposal to construct 13 two-and three-story residential apartments and demolition of an existing 2,192 square foot single-family residence on a 40,759 square foot parcel in the E-1 and R-3 Zones. The proposal includes two three-bedrooms, two one-bedroom, and nine two-bedroom apartments ranging from 626 to 1,584 square feet, for a total of 14,732 square feet. A total of 3,350 cubic yards of grading is proposed and 28 parking spaces are provided (17 below grade and 11 at grade) in a combination of one and two-car garages, carports, and uncovered spaces. The project requires Environmental Assessment.)

(Second Concept Review. Comments only; project requires Environmental Assessment.)

(3:12)

Present: Brian Cearnal, Architect; Katie O'Riley-Rodgers, Landscape Architect; Susan Elledge, Agent; Melissa Hetrick, City Project Planner.

Public comment opened at 3:37 p.m.

Peter Cohen, opposed: addressed problems regarding access and environment.

C. K. Fleming, stated comments unrelated to the project, suggested a hotel with roof-top parking.

An opposition letter from Paula Westbury was acknowledged by the Board.

Public comment was closed.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Full Board with the following comments:

ARCHITECTURE:

- 1) Study the trash location.
- 2) Study the application of flat roofs, the color, and future solar locations.
- 3) Study the lawn areas for use as recreational play areas.
- 4) Investigate opening the parking garage to provide natural light and ventilation.
- 5) Provide an overall neighborhood context map showing the property in relation to the adjacent County Bowl parking lot.
- 6) Study the massing or screening along Units 4, 5, and 6.
- 7) Provide additional photo documentation from Anapamu Street facing northeast.

- 8) Study providing relief along south elevation of Unit 8.
- 9) It is preferred that the stairs to Anapamu Street be retained as they provide convenient pedestrian street access, however it is understood that they may be required to be removed for ADA accessibility.
- 10) Consider the driveway width to be the minimum required.

LANDSCAPING:

- 1) Study relocating the large existing palm trees and indicate sizes to be removed.
- 2) Study the possibility of providing a variety of sizes, in 15-gallon minimum and larger, for the replacement oaks to resemble a variety of tree ages.

Action: Zink/Sherry, 8/0/0. Motion carried. (Blakeley absent.)

Board Comments: It was understood by the Board that the applicant was to study integration of an elevator into the project's architecture, and the placement of additional plantings on the north (parking lot) side of the retaining wall.

CONCEPT REVIEW – NEW

5. 915 E ANAPAMU ST

E-1/R-3 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-201-003

Application Number: MST2007-00331

Owner: Charles Crail

Agent: Suzanne Elledge Permitting and Planning Services

Architect: Cearnal, Andrulaitis

(Proposal to construct 14 two-and three-story residential apartments and demolition of an existing 2,192 square foot single-family residence on a 40,759 square foot parcel in the E-1 and R-3 Zones. The proposal includes one three-bedrooms, two one-bedroom, and eleven two-bedroom apartments ranging from 555 to 1,618 square feet, for a total of 15,369 square feet. A total of 3,918 cubic yards of grading is proposed and 31 parking spaces are provided (21 below grade and 10 at grade) in a combination of one and two-car garages, carports, and uncovered spaces. The project requires Environmental Assessment and Staff Hearing Officer review for proposed modifications for less than the required distance between buildings and an oversize garage in the E-1 Zone.)

(Comments only; project requires Environmental Assessment and Staff Hearing Officer Review for requested modifications for less than the required distance between buildings and an oversize garage in the E-1 Zone).

(9:28)

Present: Brian Cearnal and Adam Cunningham, Architects; Suzanne Elledge, with SEPPs; Katie O'Reilly-Rogers, Landscape Architect; and Charles Crail, Owner.

Staff presented and explained a memo from the City Environmental Analyst regarding environmental issues.

Public comment opened at 9:50 p.m.

- 1) Paul Tarasick, opposition: concerns with size, scale, and density. Concerns were also expressed regarding traffic and parking during the Santa Barbara Bowl Season.
- 2) Wendy Tarasick, opposition: Traffic and fire concerns on Lowena Drive, and concerns with the SB Bowl considering closing off the end of Lowena Drive.
- 3) Eric Peterson, opposition: privacy issues, size, bulk and scale of the building, and traffic concerns related to the Santa Barbara Bowl.

A letter from Paul Doré, President of Santa Barbara Bowl Foundation, was acknowledged.

An opposition letter from Paula Westbury was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 10:01 p.m.

Motion: **Continued indefinitely to Full Board with the following comments:**

- 1) Applicant to resolve the environmental issues with City environmental review staff prior to returning to the Architectural Board of Review.
- 2) Regarding the requested modifications: a) The 8-foot roof connection elements work but are technical in nature and does not necessarily add to the aesthetic quality of the building; and b) The underground garage has a zero aesthetic impact and is technical in nature.
- 3) Provide 3D aerial, birds-eye views to get a picture of the overall mass.
- 4) Study city requirements for street and sidewalks widths and requirements and how that may affect the over all site plan.
- 5) The current design is too boxy, symmetrical, repetitive, and apartment like. The flat roof is acceptable but a little excessive. Restudy the roof styles and consider a variation of flat roofs and tile roofs.
- 6) To alleviate the starkness provide more variation and articulation between the one and two story massing to provide relief from the excessive massing and relief from the street. Study the stair step approach up the hillside to help reduce massing.
- 7) The Hillside village approach is acceptable, however advises the applicant to restudy the arroyo area in relation to setbacks.

Action: Manson-Hing/Zink, 3/0/1. Motion carried. (Wienke abstained, Sherry/Aurell/Blakely/Gross absent).