



# City of Santa Barbara

## SINGLE FAMILY DESIGN BOARD MINUTES APRIL 22, 2024

3:00 P.M.  
David Gebhard Public Meeting Room  
630 Garden Street  
[SantaBarbaraCA.gov](http://SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

### BOARD MEMBERS:

Jennifer Lewis, *Chair*  
Lauralee Anderson, *Vice Chair*  
Katie Gerpheide  
Dawn Sherry

### CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:

Mike Jordan

### PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:

Sheila Lodge

### STAFF:

Ellen Kokinda, Design Review Supervisor  
Sebastian Herics, Assistant Planner  
Joanie Saffell, Commission Secretary

---

## CALL TO ORDER

The Full Board meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Lewis.

## ATTENDANCE

Members present: Lewis, Anderson, Gerpheide and Sherry

Members absent: None

Staff present: Ted Hamilton-Rolle, Project Planner; Carly Earnest, Assistant Planner; and Saffell

## GENERAL BUSINESS

### A. Public Comment:

No public comment.

### B. Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Approve the minutes of the Single Family Design Board meeting of **April 8, 2024**, as submitted.

Action: Anderson/Gerpheide, 3/0/1. (Lewis abstained.) Motion carried.

### C. Approval of the Consent Calendar:

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **April 15, 2024**, as reviewed by Board Member Sherry.

Action: Sherry/Lewis, 4/0/0. Motion carried.

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **April 22, 2024**, as reviewed by Board Member Sherry.

Action: Sherry/Lewis, 4/0/0. Motion carried.

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

1. Mr. Hamilton-Rolle, Project Planner and Design Review announced the following:
  - a. The intent of the Clerk's public meeting training is to continue to foster an environment of constructive feedback, and support for applicants, board members, staff, and the public. The meetings should be collegial and collaborative, environments to get constructive feedback on their projects. Comments to stay positive and think of the impact of the words spoken.
  - b. Staff received an appeal of the SFDB's April 8, 2024, Final Approval of the project at 1269 Ferrelo Road, and the appeal hearing is tentatively scheduled for Planning Commission on June 6, 2024.
  - c. Currently, Staff has received three applicants for the Single Family Design Board as part of the Spring Advisory Board recruitment for the one opening. The interviews start tomorrow, April 23, 2024, at City Council for a period of three weeks. There will be weekly interviews to allow applicants enough time to make it to an interview. All applying should make sure interview and to show up for the interviews. Appointments to be made June 11, 2024.
2. Board Member Gerpheide announced she will need to recuse herself from Item #4 for perceived conflict of interest.

### **(3:15PM) DISCUSSION ITEM**

#### **1. PRE-APPROVED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS**

Reference Number: PLN2024-00093

Staff: Ted Hamilton-Rolle, Project Planner and Design Review

(Staff presentation and discussion regarding the City's approach to the implementation of Assembly Bill 1332, which requires local agencies to develop a program for the preapproval of Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) plans.)

**No final appealable decision will take place at this hearing. Staff requests feedback on design parameters and considerations regarding the Single Family Design Board's involvement in the pre-approval process for Accessory Dwelling Units under Assembly Bill 1332.**

#### **[Staff Memo ADU Discussion\\*](#)**

*\*Available for view online at [SantaBarbaraCA.gov/SFDB](http://SantaBarbaraCA.gov/SFDB)*

Actual time: 3:11 p.m.

Present: Ted Hamilton-Rolle, Project Planner and Design Review

Public comment opened at 3:20 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

**Discussion held.**

**Should pre-approved ADU plans be a certain architectural style or styles?**

- Board Member Sherry recommends sub-categories of Cottage such as bungalow, Victorian, Mediterranean, and Contemporary.
- Board Member Gerpheide wanted clarification on if the preference was for different architectural styles or one generic design with different detailing?
- Chair Lewis wants to see what the Santa Barbara Architects create for the competition before identifying style categories. The plans should be conscious of the siting and the City should consider if designs are universally accepted or determined on the design of the existing home. There may be ADUs that fit into the subcategory of styles. Feels the plug-and-play approach is dangerous due to the different detailing involved in the articulation of the style, and not best for Santa Barbara. This can be an interesting design element for the Architects to show an area range of options. The range will help Staff pre-approve of the different types.
- Board Member Anderson main concern is the front yard possibility of the ADU. In the front yard the ADU should be consistent with the Main house. ADUs in the rear yard could follow a “frosting on cake” approach, as we want this to be simple, but not for the front yard. In the front yard should match criteria discussed that matches original design with a landscaping component included then a box can be checked and preapproved.

**Do you agree with the approach of providing several set options for materials (similar to Carpinteria)?**

- Board Member Sherry feels it’s challenging but not impossible to provide a universal plan with added options. If the plan is specific a plug and play can work.
- Board Member Gerpheide & Chair Lewis agreed a plug and play list could possibly be devised for materials but there are challenges.
- Vice Chair Anderson stated some of the ADUs won’t be visible if placed in the rear yard. The main concern is the front yard, and that should be a separate process.

**Are there any exterior finishes/materials that should NOT be allowed for pre-approved ADU plans?**

- Chair Lewis suggests if the Applicant is proposing something out of the box, there should be some level of compatibility. It does not have to match or be the same. Show context of the design as these will go anywhere and that is the tricky part to navigate. In the Hillside District it would be worth them looking through the requirements so that all requirements are equal for the normal projects and ADUs. The roof detail will be important in Hillside ADUs. Would like to see a concerted effort to engage our Architects in our community, making it clear what the next steps will be and the process to follow. Cast a wide net for interest and talent for this competition.
- Board Member Sherry feels shiny materials to be a problem with our Neighborhood Preservation Findings. For Hillside grading and heights of retaining walls will be important. Possible to exempt certain projects from a portion of projects that have over a 25% slope. Site specific can affect with the buildings look like, there may need to be a slope consideration.

**What is your level of comfort with providing comments/straw votes to vet plans for pre-approval?**

- Board Member Sherry believes that many factors come into play regarding siting, visibility, and neighborhood context. Determining a design without siting it is challenging because you have no orientation.
- Chair Lewis agrees with Board Member Sherry that site specific design is so important to architecture. Building cottage style ADUs that can be picked from plenty of styles to give variety. In the challenge the Architects should place their ADU on two or three different sites. To say yes,

we really want to look at how this will look within the City. Visual placements in the submissions would be important.

- Board Member Sherry feels some of these in the backyard are going to be 4 feet from the property line, or at a non-conforming garage where they will not want the windows, and orientation place a part. Can changes be made? Structural changes occur when windows and doors are added or subtracted. Orientation is a challenge, putting ADU on its forever site requires more attention. The design could come with four different options a north, south, east, or west property lines adjacent to the orientation, in close proximity in particular elevations. Yes and no.
- Vice Chair Anderson suggested there could be zones if sited in different locations. No straw votes.

### **(3:45PM) CONTINUED ITEM: CONCEPT REVIEW**

2. [351 LA MARINA](#)
- |                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Assessor's Parcel Number: | 045-050-005                             |
| Zone:                     | E-3/SD-3                                |
| Application Number:       | PLN2023-00385                           |
| Owner:                    | George Christopher Karcher              |
| Applicant:                | Ken Dickson, Windward Design Affiliates |

(Proposal to convert an existing 446-square-foot detached two-car garage to an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). The project includes a 228-square-foot addition to the garage to connect it to the primary residence and create a 674-square-foot ADU, and a second floor addition above the proposed ADU, consisting of a 296-square-foot "bonus room" (accessory structure) and 341-square-foot deck, and a new 26-square-foot ground-level storage closet. The total 2,568-square-foot development on a 6,227-square-foot lot, is 94% of the maximum Required floor-to-lot-area ratio (FAR). The project is associated with an existing 1,572-square-foot single-unit single-story residence in the Non-Appealable Jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone. A Coastal Development Permit is required for the ADU.)

**No final appealable decision will take place at this hearing. Neighborhood Preservation Findings will be required for Project Design Approval. Project was last reviewed January 16, 2024.**

Actual time: 3:51 p.m.

Present: Kyle Dickson, Windward Design Services; Mark Wienke, Architect

Staff comments: Barbara Burkhart stated that ADUs are included in FAR calculations. When converting a garage to an ADU property owners must replace those parking spaces on site, but they can be uncovered and in this case the Applicant is proposing two tandem spaces in the driveway. The Applicant has support from Public Works and will be getting a waiver at the building permit stage. Parking for ADU is not required due to its location and proximity to public transportation. This proposal complies with FAR at 94% that includes the ADU. If over 100% FAR then would require a Zoning Modification. Once over 85% the Single Family Design Board looks at the proposed projects with more scrutiny to decide size, bulk, and scale. If the Board feels the project is ready Staff is looking for a continuance to the Staff Hearing Officer for consideration of the Coastal Development permit, and if this should be returned to Full Board or Consent.

Public comment opened at 4:01 p.m.

The following individuals spoke:

1. Helen Goode
2. Katharine Taveggia
3. Jim Murdock

Public comment closed at 4:09 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Board Members can support Consent or Full Board? 1/3 Failed.

**Motion: Continue indefinitely to the Staff Hearing Officer with comments:**

1. The Board is in support of the general architectural language and the modifications to the existing house that brings a cohesive language to the existing addition.
2. The Board is in support of the natural material palette suggested and matching the architectural details from the existing home to the proposed.
3. The Board appreciated the siting of second story and balcony that are further back on the property and centrally locating the balcony.
4. The Board is in support of the roof pitches being of a similar design and is open to studying minimizing the pitch on the second story to reduce the tallest height.
5. The Board is in support of the size, bulk, and scale of proposed project as it responds well to the neighborhood.
6. The Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance criteria have been met as stated in Subsection 22.69.050 of the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code:
  - a. The proposed development is consistent with the scenic character of the City and will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.
  - b. The proposed development is compatible with the neighborhood, and its size, bulk, and scale is appropriate to the site and neighborhood.
  - c. The proposed buildings and structures are designed with quality architecture. details. The proposed materials and colors maintain the natural appearance of the ridgeline or hillside.
  - d. Removal of healthy, non-invasive trees is not proposed for this application.
  - e. The public health, safety, and welfare are appropriately protected and preserved.
  - f. The project generally complies with the Good Neighbor Guidelines regarding. privacy, landscaping, noise, and lighting.
  - g. The development, including proposed structures and grading, preserves significant public scenic views of and from the hillside.

Action: Lewis/Sherry, 4/0/0. Motion carried.

**\* THE BOARD RECESSED FROM 4:32 P.M. TO 4:37 P.M. \***

**(4:30PM) NEW ITEM: CONCEPT REVIEW**

3. [219 VISTA DEL MAR DR](#)  
Assessor's Parcel Number: 047-051-025  
Zone: E-3/SD-3  
Application Number: PLN2024-00058  
Owner: Anthony Thane Chaves  
Applicant: Chris Cottrell, Dovetail Architects

(Proposal to demolish the legal non-conforming portion of the garage that encroaches into the front setback and construct a 67-square-foot conforming addition to the existing 362-square-foot two-car garage and construct a 482-square-foot Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) above including an 86-square-foot deck and a 46-square-foot balcony. The ADU is under the SFDB purview. An existing 1,717-square-foot single-unit residence will remain. A ministerial Coastal Exemption is required for the addition. Approval of a Coastal Development Permit is required for the ADU by the Staff Hearing Officer. The proposed total of 2,628 square feet of development on a 14,016-square-foot lot is 62% of and maximum required floor-to-lot area ratio (FAR).)

**No final appealable decision will take place at this hearing. Neighborhood Preservation Findings and Hillside Design District & Sloped Lot Findings will be required when the project is reviewed for Project Design Approval.**

Actual time: 4:38 p.m.

Present: Chris Cottrell, Architect, Dovetail Architects

Staff comments: Ted Hamilton-Rolle, Project Planner stated that, if the Board feels the project is ready, to continue this project to the Staff Hearing Officer after today's concept hearing.

Public comment opened at 4:43 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Written correspondence from Norm Gardner was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 4:44 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Board Members can support returning to Consent? 4/0 Passed.

**Motion: Continue indefinitely to Staff Hearing Officer and to the Consent with comments:**

1. The Board is generally in support of the project given its matching existing details, and that the siding of the second story is confined to a portion of the plan.
2. The Board appreciates conversations with the neighbor.
3. The Board looks forward to seeing further articulation of the South elevation.
4. The Board appreciates the slight setback on the second story.

Action: Lewis/Sherry, 4/0/0. Motion carried.

#### **(5:15PM) REVIEW: AFTER FINAL APPROVAL**

4. [1510 SANTA ROSA AVE](#)
- |                           |                |
|---------------------------|----------------|
| Assessor's Parcel Number: | 045-131-027    |
| Zone:                     | E-3/SD-3       |
| Application Number:       | PLN2021-00351  |
| Owner:                    | Kevin Hansen   |
| Applicant/Designer:       | Mark Mansfield |

(Proposal to demolish a detached 400 square foot two-car carport, construct a new 804 square foot basement, new detached 454 square foot two-car garage & new 783 square-foot Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) above garage. The project includes a new 350 square foot deck above the existing family room for the primary residence, and the enclosure of a 33 square foot breezeway for new habitable

space. The proposed total of 3,567 square feet on a 13,503 square foot lot, is 86% of the maximum required floor-to-lot area ratio.)

**Review After Final Approval is requested to permit as-built roof deck above the previously approved Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). Project requires substantial conformance to the plans that received Project Design Approval and Final Approval on March 28, 2022.**

Actual time: 5:02 p.m.

**RECUSAL:** To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Board Member Gerpheide recused himself/herself from hearing this item.

Present: Charlotte and Kevin Hansen, Owners

Staff comments: Ted Hamilton-Rolle, Project Planner, stated that the roof deck is sited in the middle of the parcel, in the middle of the house, and does not involve any major change of the structure's massing, size, scale or architectural details.

Public comment opened at 5:13 p.m.

The following individuals spoke:

1. Tatiana Nazarenko
2. Heather Sturgeon

Written correspondence from Kevin Murphy, M.D., Ray and Sheri Ochs, Chris and Cara Chiarappa, Tatiana Nazarenko, Melanie Freeman, and Heather Sturgeon was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 5:18 p.m.

**Motion: Review After Final Approval with comments:**

1. The proposed roof deck is within substantial conformance to the mass, bulk, and scale of the approved project.
2. The Applicant has located the roof deck beyond the minimum 15-foot guideline for privacy and has oriented the only open railing towards the ocean and away from neighbors, thereby providing a significant amount of privacy to the furthest extent possible for the roof deck.

Action: Sherry/Lewis, 3/0/0. (Gerpheide absent.) Motion carried.

**\* MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:37 P.M. \***