



Public Comment Received for:
Item 2: 425 Garden St
(PLN2021-00523)

| Name of Sender | Distributed prior to hearing | Distributed after the hearing |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Barry Winick | x | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

From: barry@winickarchitects.com
To: [Community Development ABRsecretary](#)
Subject: 925 Garden Street - ABR Pubic Comment
Date: Monday, November 14, 2022 9:02:50 AM
Attachments: [2022-1114 425 Garden Street ABR.pdf](#)

You don't often get email from barry@winickarchitects.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL

Greetings, Please find my letter re: 925 Garden Street.

Many Thanks, Barry

Barry Winick, AIA, LEED AP, NCARB

WINICK ARCHITECTS INC

T 805 770 3400
F 805 456 1680
C 805 284 1617
404 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101
barry@winickarchitects.com
www.winickarchitects.com

In light of the measures recommended by the CDC and State Government, WA INC has enacted a "work remotely" program and also have a very light staff presence in our office. We are committed to advancing our projects and are staying in regular communication with our clients and collaborative team. Our office phones are usually being answered, in the event they are not, please contact us via email.

Chair Kevin Moore & Members of ABR
City of Santa Barbara, Planning & Development
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101
C/O ABR Secretary, Via email: ABRSecretary@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Re: ABR 08/22/2022 Agenda Item #3 – 425 Garden Street, APN 031-272-006

November 14, 2022

Dear Chair Moore & Members of the Board:

I am writing to share what I hope will be viewed as constructive comments to be considered in the Board's Preliminary Design review of the proposed AUD Residential project at 425 Garden St.

I am writing in several capacities: as a neighbor, business owner and property owner at 404 Garden Street and as an architect in Santa Barbara with community interests.

My observation is that this project which has now been presented both to ABR and Planning Commission represents a missed opportunity for inspiring development that makes a positive contribution to the city environment. This project instead is engineered for maximum square footage and economic return taking advantage of the confluence the State Bonus Density and the City AUD policies. Interestingly the year ago version of the project proposed 33 units with 63 bedrooms and has unfortunately been scaled up to 36 units with a whopping **85 bedrooms**.

The current project is for merely a developer building not a work of architecture. The building has no sensitivity from a scale and proportion point of view with an accrual of odd infill elements. The few nice features that previous were evident have now been infilled with more development. The open view to the interior courtyard with a U Shape embrace to Garden Street has literally been infilled with bicycle parking. Surely this could have been accommodated in another part of the building without compromising the entrance. The elevator tower is emphasized which if it was well positioned and beautifully detailed could be considered a feature. instead it appears like an industrial artifact found on the site.

The project also asks for several concession which are awarded due to the State Bonus Density Guidelines. One is to substitute the requirement for story poles with 3D renderings and the second is to be allowed to not comply with the average 5' front yard setback requirement. These concessions again only further help to compromise the architectural design of the project. The set backs allowance adds to the fact that this building is over imposing to the street and does not step back from the street. The omission of the story poles makes it even harder for the public and ABR to evaluate the project's impact from size bulk and scale perspective.

It is my hope that the ABR will request that the 3D Rendering be required to show not only the building but the context of the neighborhood with nearby building modeled from multiple views as part of the presentation and that the rendering be mounted on 8'x10 boards on site for the general public to view. The streetscape also would benefit from the suggestion that the building step back from the street to keep the feeling of open space as was observed by Commissioner Lodge at the PC meeting. As for the building detailing with its quasi Spanish Colonial detailing it needs to be greatly improved. The developer and architect should be directed to study other Spanish Colonial buildings in town and in Europe in order to improve the detailing. It would be nice if the architect for the building is in attendance at today's meeting and future meetings as the lack of attendance has been noticeable and certainly not benefiting the project.

My hope is that the development team will receive instructive comments from ABR that artfully helps to shape the project to be returned to the board for futher review prior to awarding the project approval of Preliminary Design Approval

With warm regards,



Barry Winick, AIA LEED AP, Principal – Winick Architects,