City of Santa Barbara

ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW
MINUTES
AUGUST 22, 2022

3:00 P.M.
David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street
SantaBarbaraCA.gov

BOARD MEMBERS:
Kevin Moore, *Chair*
Richard Six, Vice Chair
Lauren Anderson
David Black
Steve Nuhn
Leon A. Olson
Dennis Whelan

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:
Mike Jordan

PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:
Roxana Bonderson

STAFF:
Tava Ostrenger, Assistant City Attorney
Ellen Kokinda, Design Review Supervisor
William Russell, Assistant Planner
Kira Esparza, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

The Full Board meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Chair Moore.

ATTENDANCE

Members present:	Moore, Six, Anderson, Nuhn, Olson and Whelan
Members absent:	Black
Staff present:	Kokinda, Russell, and Esparza

GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Public Comment:

Written correspondence from Kathleen Dagg and Bob Cunningham was acknowledged.

B. Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Approve the minutes of the Architectural Board of Review meeting of **August 8, 2022**, as submitted.
Action: Six/ Moore, 6/0/0. (Black absent.) Motion carried.

C. Approval of the Consent Calendar:

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **August 15, 2022**, as reviewed by Board Members Whelan and Moore.
Action: Whelan/ Olson, 6/0/0. (Black absent.) Motion carried.

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **August 22, 2022**, as reviewed by Board Members Whelan and Moore.
Action: Moore/ Whelan, 6/0/0. (Black absent.) Motion carried.

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

1. Ms. Kokinda announced the following:
   a. Due to the length of the meeting, there will be a coffee break at the Board's discretion.
   b. There is a current work effort pertaining to Single Family Deign Board that may be of interest to the Architectural Board of Review. Staff will be doing outreach to architect and development community, and the design boards for input.

E. Subcommittee Reports:

No subcommittee reports.

(3:15PM) DISCUSSION ITEM

1. 105 HARBOR WAY

Assessor's Parcel Number:	045-250-013
Zone:	H-C/S-D-3, P-R
Application Number:	PLN2022-00183
Owner:	City of Santa Barbara
Applicant:	Mike Wiltshire, Waterfront Director

(Courtesy review of an installation of a deep-water diving statue.)

No final appealable decision will be made at this hearing.

Actual time: 3:07 p.m.

Present: Don Barthelmessmus; Leslie Leaney, Historical Diving Society; Paul Guiver; Tony Sexton; Mike Wiltshire, Waterfront Director, The City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 3:16 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Discussion held.

(3:30PM) CONTINUED ITEM: PROJECT DESIGN APPROVAL

2. **501 NINOS DR**

Assessor's Parcel Number:	017-362-005
Zone:	P-R/SD-3
Application Number:	PLN2018-00494
Owner:	City of Santa Barbara
Applicant:	Justin Van Mullem, Capital Projects Supervisor Parks and Recreation Department

(The Dwight Murphy Field Renovation Project consists of the renovation of an existing 8.3-acre City park and includes the conversion of the existing grass soccer field to a multi-sport synthetic turf field; new natural turf baseball field; new natural turf informal activity area; new inclusive playground; new fitness area; new family picnic area; new trash enclosure; and new restroom. The project includes the demolition of the existing restroom, playground, ball field, and fitness area. Other amenities include accessible pathways, a bus loading zone, fencing, and lighting. Onsite vehicular parking would increase from 128 to 159 spaces. Perimeter parking would increase from 68 to 93 spaces. A total of 37 trees would be removed and 125 new trees would be planted. A portion of Sycamore Creek would be restored. The project includes improvements to vehicular circulation by preventing traffic from entering Park Road from Calle Puerto Vallarta. The project received Planning Commission approval on August 19, 2021.

Project Design Approval is requested. Project requires compliance with the Project Compatibility Findings. Project requires compliance with Planning Commission Resolution No. 006-21. Project was last reviewed on July 27, 2020.

Actual time: 3:27 p.m.

Present: Elijah Pierce, Architect, RRM Design Group; Marisa Peltier, Landscape Architect, RRM Design Group; Jeff Ferber, Landscape Architect, RRM Design Group; Justin Van Mullem, Capital Projects Supervisor Parks and Recreation Department; and Jill Zachary, Parks and Recreation Director

Staff comments: Ms. Kokinda announced that Board Member Black did review the prior meeting materials and did submit his comments and questions for the project in a staff memo that was distributed to the Board prior to the meeting.

Public comment opened at 3:48 p.m.,

The following individual spoke:

1. Victoria Strong

Written correspondence from Nick Turner, Paul Ramsey, Lois and Laura Capps, Philip Delio, and JJ McLeod was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 3:54 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Board Members can support Project Design Approval? 5/6 Passed

Motion: **Project Design Approval with the following comments:**

1. The Applicant shall provide significant refinement to the treehouse structure to include more whimsical features and a more stylized aesthetic, with less cartoonish features and less of an attempt to mimic specific architectural styles.
2. The Applicant shall provide refinement to the restrooms.
3. The Applicant shall verify that the tree spacing and tree selection is adequate enough to provide screening to the adjacent residents and hotels from the lighting.
4. The Board finds that the Compatibility Analysis Findings generally have been met (per SBMC 22.68.045.B.) as follows:
   a. The design of the project is consistent with design guidelines applicable to the location of the project within the City.
   b. The design of the project is compatible with desirable architectural qualities and characteristics that are distinctive of Santa Barbara and of the particular neighborhood surrounding the project.
   c. The size, mass, bulk, height, and scale are appropriate.
   d. There are no adjacent Landmarks or other nearby designated historic resources or natural features.
   e. There project responds appropriately to established scenic public vistas.
   f. The project includes an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping.

Action: Whelan/ Moore, 4/2/0. (Nuhn and Olson opposed. Black absent.) Motion carried.

The ten-day appeal period was announced.

Individual comments: Board Member Olson stated that he does agree with the need to refine the treehouse design. Board Member Nuhn agrees with Mr. Olson's comments and stated that he is in support of Project Design Approval but does not support the motion.

*** The item was re-opened at 8:59 p.m. ***

(4:35PM) NEW ITEM: CONCEPT REVIEW

3. **425 GARDEN ST**

Assessor's Parcel Number:	031-272-006
Zone:	M-C
Application Number:	PLN2021-00523
Owner:	425 Garden St, LLC Greg Reitz, Managing Member
Applicant:	Greg Reitz

(The project consists of demolition of all on-site structures and construction of a four-story 33-unit residential complex with common rooftop amenities. The project proposes: two (2) Moderate-Income rental units, four (4) Very Low-Income rental units, and thirty (30) market-rate rental units. No parking is proposed on-site, consistent with the AUD Ordinance. The project is proposed at a density of 94.74 units/acre, which is allowable with the State Density Bonus Law.)

No final appealable decision will be made at this hearing. Project requires compliance with the Project Compatibility Findings. Concept Review by the Planning Commission is required prior to Project Design Approval per SBMC §30.150.060.

Actual time: 4:47 p.m.

Present: Greg Reitz, Applicant, 425 Garden St, LLC; Allison DeBusk, Senior Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Staff comments: Ms. DeBusk stated that under State Density Bonus Law, the applicant is requesting a concession to reduce amount of open yard area and waive story poles. The project is tentatively scheduled for Planning Commission Concept Review on September 15, 2022.

Public comment opened at 4:59 p.m.,

The following individuals spoke:
1. Natasha Todorovic
2. Richard Lloyd
3. Victoria Valente
4. Barry Winick
5. Fred Sweeney
6. Juli Lambers

Written correspondence from Pete Feldman, Barry Winick, A. Barry Capello, and Victoria Valente was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 5:15 p.m.

Motion: Continue to the Planning Commission with comments:

1. The Board appreciates the design changes that have been made from the prior submittal.
2. The Board feels that the reorientation of the courtyard and its opening to the street is appropriate for the area.
3. The Board appreciates the attempt to break the massing down to smaller apparent structures.
4. The Board has concerns over the scale of project relative to site coverage and maximizing the building envelope
5. The Applicant shall study the street façade and find ways to step the building back from the street to reduce the apparent mass.
6. The Applicant shall restudy the design of the proposed balconies to make them appear lighter and less massive.
7. The Applicant shall study the window size, layouts, and locations to make them less repetitive and keep more in line with Santa Barbara style. The Applicant shall provide additional architectural elements and textures to bring variation and interest to the elevation.
8. The Board suggests restudying the entrance to the bike room, perhaps by combining the entrance with the utility driveway location for easier access for residents.
9. The Applicant shall further reduce the apparent massing of the bridge portions.
10. The Applicant shall study ways to increase the livability of the west elevation.

Action: Moore / Six , 4/2/0. (Olson and Whelan opposed. Black absent.) Motion carried.

Individual comments: Board Member Whelan stated that he disagrees with the courtyard orientation. Board Member Olson stated that he agrees with Mr. Whelan regarding the courtyard orientation and disagrees with the direction of dividing the project into smaller structures.

*** THE BOARD RECESSED FROM 6:20 PM TO 6:37 P.M. ***

(5:30PM) ONE-TIME PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION

4. **1922 DE LA VINA ST**

Assessor's Parcel Number:	025-363-018
Zone:	C-G
Application Number:	PRE2022-00142
Owner:	OP Equity LLC, Managing Member, Oliver Fries
Applicant:	Trish Allen, SEPPS

(Proposal to retain the existing commercial buildings and construct a new 45'-0" high residential apartment structure comprised of three (3) stories above the parking podium level (four stories total), containing 26 residential units, of which 10 will be allowed through State Density Bonus provisions. Three (3) additional loft units are proposed in a portion of the existing commercial building fronting the proposed paseo. The total proposed residential units on site total 29. The site is located in the City's Medium-High Density AUD program area and includes a Lot Line Adjustment with a portion of the adjacent parcel, APN 025-363-019. The residential units will include 40-100 sf private outdoor decks and common outdoor area located on the roof level. The parking structure includes twenty-one (21) residential parking spaces and eleven (11) commercial spaces, 11 surface parking spaces will remain; an outdoor public paseo space is proposed to complement the existing commercial uses. Access will be provided from the existing driveways off Mission Street and De La Vina Street.)

No final appealable decision will be made at this hearing. Project requires compliance with the Project Compatibility Findings.

Actual time: 6:38 p.m.

Present: Trish Allen, Applicant, SEPPS; Bobby Walker, Architect, Bobby Walker Design

Staff comments: Ms. Kokinda stated that this is a onetime pre-application consultation, not a formal application. The applicants are looking for the Board's feedback on the design of the project.

Public comment opened at 6:52 p.m.

The following individual spoke:

1. Richard Lloyd

Written correspondence from Marilyn Rickard, Sharron Sutton, and Richard Lloyd was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 6:55 p.m.

Board comments:

1. Board Member Whelan stated that the stair tower is a central visual element and needs further development and refinement. The Northeast elevation presents a blank face to the adjacent parcel and should be articulated as is the 4th floor. Mechanical venting will help break it up at the ground level. The setbacks from the 2nd and 3rd floor could be more generous to allow for the north neighbors. The giant sycamore tree should be retained. Generally, Mr. Whelan supports the design, size, bulk, and scale.
2. Board Member Olson stated that the project is an innovated and creative design. He would be interested in the neighbors to the East and how they would react to the project. He does not agree with the idea of taking the amenities out.
3. Board Member Nuhn stated that he likes the project and believes that it is heading in the right direction. There is a lot of detail at this early stage. The project is set so far back off of De La Vina St. and Mission St. that it's placement handles any size concerns. If there are no residential properties adjacent, then privacy concerns is not significant, but would like the Applicant to follow up in later presentations. Board Member Nuhn is supportive so far.
4. Board Member Six stated that it is a nicely conceptualized plan and has no problems with the way the site is laid out and organized. He would suggest submerging the ground parking lot to nestle it in more. Any opportunity to provide activity through throat of the paseo would be a plus. Significant development of planting in front of the paseo at the parkway. Overall, it is a palatable project.
5. Board Member Anderson stated that this is a good example of an infill project. The Applicant should pay attention to the utilities and location of the mechanical units and how it might affect the roof. The Applicant should study how to address the access along the Paseo to not allow cars to drive in. A landscape plan is desirable and required. She suggests removing the 4th floor event space and turning it in to a bigger outdoor deck with landscape. The project might be visible from De La Vina, therefore knowing the neighbors and site line will be important. The applicant should study how to keep apartment spaces more functionable. The applicant should study pushing the building back from property line along the Mission elevation for future development and/or increasing the landscape design area. Board Member Anderson Looking forward to next iteration.
6. Board Member Moore stated that this is a fortunate site for this type of infill project. It is a good use of this space, and the project has promise. Projects that include large private amenities are not good for community or residents. It increases the size, mass, bulk, and scale of the projects, as well as the costs of rents. If the unit count doesn't change, then all the units could occur within 3 floors instead of 4 floors. He would encourage the Applicant to study that approach. If that is studied, it would be difficult to find anything wrong with the project. Some additional study of the long uninterrupted wall is necessary to see if it should be broken up or varied in some way.

(6:10PM) ONE-TIME PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION

5. **418 N MILPAS ST**

Assessor's Parcel Number:	031-311-033
Zone:	C-G
Application Number:	PRE2022-00116
Owner:	Kallman Family Trust, Robert Ludwick, Managing Member
Applicant:	Jan Hochhauser, Hochhauser Blatter Architecture

(Proposal for a 101,204 square foot, four story, 90-unit mixed-use building, comprised of 34 studio units, 44 one-bedroom units, and 12 two-bedroom units, and 6,118 square feet of commercial / retail space on the ground level for commercial retail (1,557 square feet) and bed & breakfast hotel (4,561 square feet). The project is designed to comply with the City's Average Unit Size Density Incentive program (AUD), City Inclusionary housing requirements, California State Density Program (SDB), and the streamlined housing project program (CA State Senate Bill 330). The project site is 41,473 square feet (.952 acre). Under the AUD priority overlay maximum of 63 units per acre, 60 units would be allowed on the site. The project will include 9 very low-income units (15% of 90 units). This would allow a 50% density bonus under SDB bringing the total to 90 units. The project will also include 6 moderate income units (10% of 60 units) satisfying the City Inclusionary requirement. In total there will be 15 below market units and 75 market units within the 90 total units. The project provides 52 parking spaces for residential units of .5 spaces per bedroom as allowed by the SDB parking incentive for 15% very low-income units. The commercial / retail and bed & breakfast hotel requirements adds 14 additional spaces for a total of 69 spaces. Development Plan approval at Planning Commission is required for the project, along with the request for a 52-foot maximum height as a community benefit project. A waver /concession is requested for relief from solar set back)

No final appealable decision will be made at this hearing. Project requires compliance with the Project Compatibility Findings.

Actual time: 7:25 p.m.

Present: Jan Hochhauser, Architect, Hochhauser Blatter Architecture; Tim Johnson, Hochhauser Blatter Architecture; Ginger Anderson, Council for Owner

Staff comments: Ms. Kokinda stated that this is a onetime pre-application consultation, not a formal application. The applicants are looking for the Board's feedback on the design of the project. Ms. Kokinda gave instructions to members of the public on how to get signed up as an interested party for the project.

Public comment opened at 7:45 p.m.

The following individuals spoke:

1. Natasha Todorovic
2. Jose Gallegos
3. Fred Sweeney
4. Britta Bartels
5. Danny Moreno
6. Chris Scott

7. Julie Stark
8. Carole Wockner
9. Paul Fletcher
10. Susan shields
11. Natalia Govoni
12. Chris Burros
13. Martha Fragosa
14. Victoria Valente
15. Tino De Guevarra
16. Sebastian Aldana Jr
17. Abbey Fragosa

Written correspondence from Cynthia Blanton, Sebastian Aldana Jr, Steve Sherwin, Pat Saley, Steve Dowty, Lyn Proctor, Brian Tanguay, Victoria Valente, Natasha Todorovic-Cowan, Marell Brooks, Lisa Jehle, Ann Hefferman, Brent Ortiz, Christine Neuhauser, Steve Johnson, Lia Romero, Kathryn Clarke, Mary Turley, Susan Sherwin, Eric Stowell, Mary Robles, Christina Stowell was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 8:16 p.m.

Board comments:

1. Board Member Nuhn appreciates the Applicant's effort at achieving the goals of the program. The project does not seem compatible with the relation to neighborhood and is not in favor of the project yet.
2. Board Member Six appreciates the design effort and is sensitive to the constraints of the project. This design is more refined than the previous design that was submitted. Board member Six has significant concerns of the compatibility of the project with the texture of neighborhood. The project would have to be half in height and half in footprint to be compatible in the neighborhood. Board Member Six believes there was a mistake in the priority housing overlay that allows this size of development on Milpas. The blank walls on north elevations are not acceptable. The streetscape on Milpas is not compatible with rhythm of street front. In future meetings, there needs to be documentation of the condition of the neighbors to the east and include the 3D elevation in the presentation.
3. Board Member Anderson stated that the north elevation without relief is not compatible with the neighborhood. The 3rd story at Milpas is not compatible. The street trees that are existing are trees that can ruin existing buildings and will most likely have to be removed at some point. Currently, Board member Anderson cannot support this size or architectural style of the project. The style is not fully developed and is not compatible with neighborhood or Santa Barbara Style. It would benefit the Applicant to study breaking the building up into multiple buildings if possible.
4. Board Member Moore stated that he acknowledges that this is a difficult location. If the project comes back, the Applicant should study the condition and how to juggle massing to better address the contradiction.
5. Board Member Whelan stated that the illustrations are too large and it is on an awkward site. Board Member Whelan agrees with other comments on the North elevation, which speaks to blankness and bulk and scale. It is a good neighborhood for reasonable housing, but this project does not fit in nicely with the neighborhood.
6. Board Member Olson stated that he believes the Applicant has the ability to address the issues with the project, and hopes that as the applicant progresses with this project, that the same level of attention to the west side of the project is given to the neighbors on the east side.

*** MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:01 P.M. ***