

I. NEW ITEMS:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:06 P.M.

A. APPLICATION OF PAUL ZINK, ARCHITECT FOR CHARLES RUDD, 3435 MARINA DRIVE, APN 047-022-005, A-1/SD-3 (ONE FAMILY RESIDENCE AND COASTAL OVERLAY) ZONES, GENERAL PLAN/LOCAL COASTAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, 1 UNIT PER ACRE; (MST2013-00281)

The project consists of the construction of a new three-story single family residence totaling approximately 5,964 square feet, plus 680 square feet of attached garage/storage area, on a vacant 48,787 net square foot lot. The residence consists of a 1,580 square foot basement, a 3,709 square foot main floor and a 675 square foot upper floor. Also proposed are associated improvements including, but not limited to, site walls and gates, a new septic system, removal of an existing concrete drainage ditch and replacement with a natural swale, a swimming pool with associated pool equipment, outside fireplace, patios and decks, and landscaping. The project would include approximately 1,081 cubic yards (cy) of cut and 575 cy of fill; after recompaction it is anticipated that there would be approximately 12 cy of export.

The discretionary application required for this project is a Coastal Development Permit (CDP2014-00002) to allow the proposed development in the Appealable Jurisdiction of the City's Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.44.060).

The project requires an environmental finding pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15183.

Case Planner: Allison DeBusk, Project Planner

Email: ADebusk@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 4552

Allison DeBusk, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Paul Zink, Architect, gave the Applicant presentation, joined by Chris Gililand, Landscape Architect.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing at 1:32 P.M.

The following people spoke in opposition to the project or with concerns:

1. Beth Collins-Burgard, neighbor, submitted 78 pages of written comments and asked that the project provide a 30-foot view corridor on each side, move the first story away from the string line and move the second story behind the string line.
2. Kitch Wilson, neighbor, appreciated the 50' view corridor but was concerned with the landscaping height and asked that the same height requirement

- made of the neighboring lot be applied to this project. The second story is too large and asked that it be removed.
3. Tom Monroe favors design number two and does not think the current plan is right for the area.
 4. Richard Handler does not support the presented plan and favored the second design.
 5. Gary Justice favored design two and stated the current plan puts too much pressure on Cliff Drive.
 6. Eamon Malone, neighbor, supports a 30 foot view corridor and not a 50 foot view corridor; feels pushing the building toward Cliff Drive has negative impacts.
 7. Susan Strick, neighbor, stated that the project juts too far forward on Cliff Drive, contradicts Good Neighbor Guidelines, and impacts the partial ocean views. Proposes house be moved back more in alignment with the string line, perhaps 30 foot setback. As designed it will encourage others to push future additions towards Cliff Drive. Limit the wall heights on the front and the side.
 8. Marc Whitten, immediate neighbor, stated that the project juts too far forward with the second story and will impact his privacy. Supports the second design.
 9. Dan Santee, neighbor, said the view corridor is his primary concern. Stated that the height, bulk and scale of the project are not compatible with the neighborhood and exceeds FAR values. View blockage extends to those looking from the ocean.
 10. Sandy Schoolfield, immediate neighbor, stated that this design is not compatible with the neighborhood and supports the second design. The third design extends too far toward Cliff Drive. Illustrated the current plan's impact on her home.
 11. John Kechejian, neighbor, supports Ms. Collins-Burgard's recommendation, thinks 30 foot setbacks on the sides are enough. This project does not meet Good Neighborhood Guidelines, solar cooling techniques, or passive solar building guidelines. Supports second design.
 12. Morgan Reis could not understand how the project design could be proposed so close to Cliff Drive.
 13. Joe Babine was dismayed by the forward mass of the story poles on Cliff Drive and objects to the design as there's too much mass at Cliff Drive.
 14. Pat Yochum favored design number two.
 15. Penelope Gottlieb, neighbor, stated that the project is very large and impedes public views. The second story is huge and is her main concern.
 16. Peter Tannenbaum concurred with prior comments from other cyclists on impacts to Cliff Drive and supports design number two.
 17. Susan Zalon, neighbor, stated that the proposed plans did not fit in with the rural area and equestrian characteristics of the neighborhood. The proposed home is too tall and too excessive in bulk and size. Project exceeds FAR guidelines. Asked that second story not be approved. Supports the view corridor.

18. Ronald Green, neighbor, stated that a 1973 City Council Resolution preserved the Marina Drive views and established the view corridor. This was a guideline and not written into the deeds. The size of this project is too large for the neighborhood. He asked that the Planning Commission follow the same considerations that were made for the neighboring house by: 1. Limiting the height to one story; 2. Establishing the view corridor on the west side of the property; and 3. Limiting the height of walls on Marina Drive to 3 feet.
19. Beth Clino, neighbor, stated that the story poles look massive; supports the second design over the third.
20. Van A. Jansma stated that the house should be moved away from Cliff Drive; supports second design.
21. Robert Fulmer supports second design.
22. Michael Moore, neighbor, supports the view corridor and a single story house. The project is too large for the neighborhood and needs to follow the FAR guidelines.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 2:02 P.M.

Commissioner's comments:

- Commissioner Jordan finds that providing a 50-foot view corridor is burdensome and is detrimental to other policies. The design contradicts various Good Neighbor Policies. He supports a plan where the house aligns more with parallel lines from Cliff Drive and Marina Drive. Suggested looking at first and second design plans where the back part of the building gets developed more toward the setbacks on either side.
- Commissioner Bartlett supports a continuance to Single Family Design Board (SFDB) for a solution that provides a 30 foot view corridor on the west and is set back approximately 30 feet on the east, not designated as a view corridor, and to pull the house further from Cliff Drive. Thinks that the first floor should be more parallel to Cliff Drive, and the second floor should be perpendicular to Cliff, similar to design number two.
- Commissioner Pujo acknowledged the neighborhood comments received and concurs with colleagues on a continuance. Cliff Drive and its views are dominant in the Local Coastal Plan and Coastal Act. Finds that the third design juts out too far toward Cliff Drive and supports something more in line with the second submittal. Does not want to see FAR creep if it returns for review and, if anything, would like to see a reduced FAR. Is OK with a portion of the house being a second story. Fine with the perimeter wall for privacy and to block glare of night lighting, but only if designed well and with appropriate landscape screening. Would like to see a transition area between landscaping on the east to the proposed wall.
- Commissioner Lodge agrees with colleagues. Sees great emphasis being placed on the value of the views from Marina Drive, yet use by Marina Drive is less than Cliff Drive. Finds the value of the views along Marina to

be less than those along Cliff Drive. Wants to make sure that consideration is given to views for others. The house should be rotated and return to something more like the second design.

- Commissioner Campanella noted that building footprints matter too, not just FAR. Supported a return to the second design but empathized with the challenge of designing and locating the Master Suite. Hopes that SFDB gives latitude for placement of the house relative to the neighbor's privacy concerns due to the cul-de-sac and curve at Cliff. If a one story design, hopes SFDB has flexibility on the design with the ability to do a good master suite.
- Commissioner Thompson concurs with colleagues. Though he does not like sending projects back to design review, and supports the work of the design boards, he thinks it will result in a better project. The direction given previously by the SFDB led to unintended consequences.
- Commissioner Schwartz noted gaps in the documented rationale in the progression of designs. Supports colleagues in a continuance and return to the design review board. Referencing the Local Coastal Program, the Coastal Act, and all guidelines, she cannot support a solid wall on the Cliff Drive side and asks that the semi-rural feel be maintained. Pull the structure back; perhaps rotate it to be more in line with the string line. Does not see justification for a 50 foot setback on the west side; should mirror more of the 30 feet that the neighbor has. Does not see a need to be single story. A small angled second story can work.

MOTION: Lodge/Bartlett

Continue the project indefinitely for additional review by the Single Family Design Board with the Commission's comments.

In further deliberation, the majority of the Commission was supportive of the solid 6' high wall set back from Cliff Drive with landscape screening.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

Chair Schwartz called for a recess at 3:11 P.M. and reconvened the meeting at 3:23 P.M.