

**ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW
MINUTES**

1818 CASTILLO ST (MST2015-00092)

R – NEW MULTIFAMILY

Proposal to demolish an existing single-family home, studio apartment, detached garage, and two sheds, and construct a three-story residential apartment building under the Average Unit Size Density Incentive Program. The project will result in seven units comprising two, 2-bedroom units and five, 3-bedroom units, totaling 6,569 square feet. This 12,656 square foot parcel is designated as Medium High density with a maximum average density allowed of 945 square feet per unit. The average unit size for this project will be 938 square feet. There will be seven covered parking spaces provided on the ground floor of the building.

March 30, 2015

(One-time Concept Review; Comments only.)

Actual time: 5:29 p.m.

Present: Detlev Peikert, Architect; and Gordon Brewer, RRM Design Group.

Public comment opened at 5:37 p.m.

- 1) Brian Barnwell, opposition; expressed concerns regarding neighborhood compatibility of the proposed project for the area.
- 2) Kip Bradley, opposition; expressed concerns regarding neighborhood compatibility.

Public comment closed at 5:40 p.m.

Public comment via email from Pamela Lasker and John Smith was acknowledged and addressed regarding neighborhood compatibility and parking density concerns for the area.

Motion: Continued four weeks to Full Board with following general comments:

- 1) A majority of the Board found the clean, simple, cottage design style and meandering path acceptable, charming, and compatible with the neighborhood.
- 2) Restudy the third story massing and number of units that seem incompatible with the cottage style of the architecture and the narrow size of the lot; consider relocating third story units to the rear of the property.
- 3) Restudy the plate heights.
- 4) Restudy the cantilevers and overhang dimensions into the driveways to be possibly relocated back.

- 5) Provide more useable landscaping and open space.
- 6) Restudy the neighborhood compatibility of the project scale; provide photographs of neighboring three-story buildings.

Action: Wittausch/Miller, 5/0/0. Motion carried. (Hopkins stepped down, Gradin absent).

May 11, 2015

(Second Concept Review. Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Project requires an environmental finding for a CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 Exemption - Projects Consistent with the General Plan. Project was last reviewed on March 30, 2015.)

Actual time: 3:48 p.m.

Present: Detlev Peikert and Lisa Plowman, Architects; and Suzanne Riegle, Associate Planner.

Public comment opened at 4:00 p.m.

- 1) Richard Handler, opposition; spoke of concerns regarding preservation of private view, project size and massing, and parking density issues.
- 2) Kathleen Hoffman, opposition; spoke of concerns regarding the proposed project size and massing, parking density issues, and noise impacts.
- 3) Brian Barnwell, opposition; (submitted a previous email) expressed concerns regarding project size and massing, felt the project was incompatible and out of scale with the predominantly single story neighborhood, parking density issues, and the related tendency for built-in garages to be converted into illegal rental units.
- 4) Pamela Lasker, opposition; (submitted two previous emails) expressed concerns regarding proposed project massing and number of units/bedrooms, and project size not compatible with the surrounding single story neighborhood.
- 5) Steven Harper, opposition; with expressed concerns regarding project size, massing, and amount of parking not compatible with the surrounding single story neighborhood.

Emails of concern from Pamela Lasker and John Smith, Scott Wilson, Deb Archambault, Heather Wright, and Deanne Turner were acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 4:15 p.m.

It was noted that a majority of the Board was either familiar with the project site or had visited or driven by the project site.

Motion: Continued two week to Full Board with comments:

- 1) Provide additional survey and photographs of the existing two story adjacent buildings within a two and one-half block diameter.

- 2) Study reducing the amount of paving and increasing landscaping where possible along the driveway side.
- 3) Study ways the unit at the street can be pulled back further away from the street to increase the landscape buffer. Study reducing the space between the buildings, if possible.
- 4) Two Board members would like the Applicant to study ways to reduce some of the overhangs at the driveways.

Action: Miller/Wittausch, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Hopkins stepped down).

May 26, 2015

(Third Concept Review. Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Project requires an environmental finding for a CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 Exemption - Projects Consistent with the General Plan. Project was last reviewed on May 11, 2015.)

Actual time: 6:53 p.m.

Present: Detlev Peikert and Lisa Plowman, Peikert; Gordon Brewer, RRM Design Group; and Suzanne Riegle, Associate Planner.

Public comment opened at 7:00 p.m.

- 1) Richard Handler, (submitted email) opposition; with expressed concerns regarding parking density impacts.
- 2) Kathleen Hoffman, opposition; expressed concerns regarding planned turnaround space in the driveway, neighborhood impacts such as noise of garbage pick-up; project height effect on available southwest sun exposure; parking density impacts, and increased traffic in the area.
- 3) Stephen Harper, opposition; expressed concerns regarding the lack of neighborhood compatibility of the proposed mass and scale of the project, and parking density impacts.
- 4) Pamela Lasker (submitted email), opposition; expressed concerns regarding neighborhood compatibility impacts of the proposed three story height and mass of the project, and parking density concerns.
- 5) Frederick Lang, opposition; expressed concerns regarding current existing parking density and realty market value in the area.

Emails of concerns from Richard Handler, Pamela Lasker & John Smith, Kemble White and Steve Harper (with photos) were acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 7:15 p.m.

Failed Motion: Continued indefinitely to Full Board with comment for the Applicant

to restudy size, height, bulk and scale of the proposed project; and to consider resizing the proposed parking spaces.

Action: Wittausch. Motion failed due to lack of a seconder. (Hopkins stepped down, Poole (partially absent)/Cung absent)

Substitute Motion: Project Design Approval and continued indefinitely to Full Board with conditions:

- 1) The Chair read the following finding into the record: “The ABR finds that the project qualifies for an exemption from further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, based on the City staff analysis and CEQA Certificate of Determination on file for this project.”
- 2) The Compatibility Analysis criteria (SBMC 22.68.045) were generally met as follows:
 - a) The proposed project design is consistent with applicable ABR Design Guidelines, City Charter passages, and applicable Municipal Code provisions with regard to site design, architecture, and landscaping.
 - b) The project’s design is consistent with the architectural character of the City and appropriate for the neighborhood.
 - c) The project’s size, mass, bulk, size, height, and scale of the proposed development are appropriate for its location and neighborhood.
 - d) The project’s design is appropriately sensitive to adjacent landmarks and historic resources, City structures of merit, sites, or established scenic public vistas.
 - e) The project’s design provides an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping.

Action: Tripp/Miller, 3/1/0. Motion carried. (Wittausch opposed because he could not make the Compatibility Criteria Analysis findings, Hopkins stepped down, Poole (partially absent)/Cung absent).