

ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW MINUTES

1818 CASTILLO STREET (MST2015-00500)

R – NEW MULTI-FAMILY

Proposal to demolish an existing single-family home, studio apartment, detached garage, and two sheds, and construct a two-unit, two-story duplex and a 5-unit two- and partial 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 6,609 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 944 square feet. There will be eight uncovered parking spaces including one accessible parking space between the two proposed buildings along the southerly property line.

November 9, 2015

(Comments only; requires Environmental Assessment.)

Actual time: 6:23 p.m.

Present: Detlev Peikert, Architect and Lisa Plowman, Planning Manager for Peikert & RRM Design Group; and Mark Edwards, Agent for the Owner.

Public comment opened at 6:33 p.m.

- 1) Pamela Lasker, (submitted letter) opposition; expressed concern regarding parking density and neighborhood compatibility; requested a reduced the number of units and proposed height of the building.
- 2) Richard Handler, (neighbor) opposition; requested story poles and expressed concern regarding parking density and requested the proposed third story element be eliminated.
- 3) Stephen Harper, opposition; expressed concern regarding parking density, traffic congestion, and the proposed height of the project.
- 4) Rick Lang, opposition; expressed concern regarding setting a precedent for three-story structures in the neighborhood, and neighborhood compatibility.
- 5) John Campilio, opposition; expressed concern regarding parking density.

Emailed letters of expressed concern from Pamela Lasker & John Smith, Jim Turner, and Cynthia Ellestad were acknowledged.

And an email of support from Greg Christman was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 6:44 p.m.

Motion: Continued four weeks to the December 7, 2015 Full Board meeting with comments:

- 1) Return with a landscape plan and a color board.
- 2) Provide a lighting plan including details.
- 3) Provide a site drainage plan including details.

- 4) Return with utility details.
- 5) Provide a diagram that shows the south elevation and similar two- to three-story structures and massing in the neighborhood area.

Action: Wittausch/Poole, 4/0/0. Motion carried. (Hopkins stepped down, Miller/Cung absent).

Board comments: The project is vastly improved. One Board member requested the Applicant study ways to enhance the courtyard experience for residents.

January 4, 2016

(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 November 9, 2015.)

Actual time: 6:13 p.m.

Present: Detlev Peikert, Architect; and Lisa Plowman, Architects.

Public comment opened at 6:45 p.m.

- 1) Brian Barnwell commented that he prefers craftsman architecture and carport parking instead of a third story, and requested consideration of adding tandem parking.
- 2) Rick Lang, (submitted letter) opposition; spoke of concerns regarding the proposed parking and density issues.
- 3) Kathleen Hoffman (submitted letter & photos), opposition; spoke of concerns regarding the proposed parking and density issues in the neighborhood, and lack neighborhood compatibility and story poles.
- 4) Pamela Lasker, (submitted letter) opposition; spoke of concerns regarding the height of the proposed building, and lack of story poles or Board requested 3D rendering, and neighborhood compatibility.
- 5) Eric Werniche, opposition; spoke of concerns regarding lack of neighborhood compatibility for most AUD projects, and requested a policy or guideline that would incorporate City statistics and data, and requested a beneficial parking survey for the neighborhood. He also encouraged tandem parking as a possible solution to increase available parking and relieve parking density in the area.
- 6) Suzanne Smith, opposition; spoke of concerns regarding blocked natural light, additional noise activity, and garbage, increased on-street parking density, and increased short-term vacation rentals in the area.

Emails of concern from Pam Lasker & John Smith, Kemble White, and Frederick (Rick) Lang were acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 7:00 p.m.

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

- 1) The Board has reviewed the proposed project and the Compatibility Analysis criteria (SBMC 22.22.145.B. and 22.68.045.B.) were generally met as follows:
 - a. **Compliance with City Charter and Municipal Code; General Consistency with Design Guidelines:** The Board made the finding that the proposed development project's design complies with all City Regulations and is consistent with ABR Design Guidelines.
 - b. **Compatible with Architectural Character of City and Neighborhood.** The proposed design of the proposed development is compatible with the distinctive architectural character of the Santa Barbara and of the particular neighborhood surrounding the project.
 - c. **Appropriate size, mass, bulk, height, and scale.** The proposed development's size, mass, bulk, height, and scale are appropriate for its neighborhood.
 - d. **Sensitive to Adjacent Landmarks and Historic Resources.** (This criteria was not applicable to the proposed project).
 - e. **Public View of the Ocean or Mountains.** The design of the proposed project responds appropriately to established scenic public vistas.
 - f. **Appropriate Amount of Open Space and Landscaping.** The project's design provides an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping.
- 2) The following finding was later read 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."

Action: Cung/Tripp, 5/0/0. Motion carried. (Moore/Wittausch absent).

The ten-day appeal period was announced.