

Boardmember Nomura appreciated the colors and textures proposed for the home and landscaping. He suggested that the applicant consider the tone of the Olive trees in relation to the proposed color scheme for the home since the colors seemed too similar and trees would be “washed-out” against the home. Boardmember Ellinwood also suggested that the applicant consider having more of a tonal difference between the siding and stucco materials. He felt that the materials should create more contrast and currently seemed too “gray” and monotone. The Board agreed that the proposed color palette should be considered and deepened to give more character to the structure.

Boardmember Nomura felt that the proposed “waxy privet” was an appropriate hedge and would be attractive. He suggested that the applicant consider softening the landscape as it approached the home and porch areas with the use of low hedges or plantings. He added the additional landscaping would provide a buffer to water intrusion from the landscape irrigation. He also suggested that the stone walkways and porches use the same stone to match the stone veneers shown in the proposal. The applicant explained that the stone veneers would be “Santa Barbara Sandstone.”

Boardmember Ellinwood recommended that the shutters on the second floor windows be reduced in size to match the actual dimensions of the windows. The Board agreed that the shutters appeared unproportional relative to the dimensions of the windows.

Boardmember Araluce considered the front porch support columns undersized for the scale of the porch. The applicant expressed that the owner proposed to reuse the existing structural elements, which were currently 4” x 6” supports rather than the suggested 6” x 6” supports.

ACTION: Motion by Boardmember Johnson, seconded by Boardmember Nomura, to recommend preliminary/final approval to the Community Development Director with the following recommendations to be reviewed over the counter by one member of the ARB:

- Deepen the tone of the proposed colors to create more of a contrast between the shingles and stucco colors and contrast more with the color of the Olive trees;
- Wrap the shingles at least four feet around the return of each side of the home;
- The wrapped shingle should be dimensionally enhanced to create more architectural relief between the shingle and stucco materials, four inches was suggested;
- Reduce the size and scale of the window shutters to more appropriately match the size and scale of the windows;
- Consider additional low plantings near the home and porch area; and
- Consider using matching stone for the walkways to match the stone veneer on the home.

VOTE: 5-0

PROJECT REVIEW

2) Applicant: Steve Genstil for Carpinteria Shores
 Project Number: 10-1553-CDP/ARB
 Project Location: 4975 Sandyland Road
 Zoning: Planned Residential Development (PRD-20)

Planner: Steve Goggia

Hearing on the request of Steve Genstil for 4975 Sandyland Road Association for preliminary review request to install an ADA compliant elevator serving the 36-unit Carpinteria Shores development. The three-story elevator is proposed to be located on the east side of the building, facing the Linden Avenue beach parking lot. The elevator would add approximately 68 sq. ft. to each floor, partially occupying space currently used for storage/laundry. The elevator tower would be a maximum of 31 feet in height, four feet taller than the existing roof. Two sets of stairways would be removed from the east and north building elevations, being replaced by exterior walkways on the second and third floor. The 0.78-acre project site is located at 4975 Sandyland Road and identified as APNs 003-830-CA1 (001-036).

DISCUSSION

The project architects presented the project to the Board. They explained that the proposed location for the elevator was selected because it stays within the roofline of the existing building and therefore minimizes impacts to ocean views. They felt the previous-approved location was problematic due to conflicts with the Edison easement, the potential for loss of parking spaces and potential mountain view impacts to residents. They also clarified that they anticipate placing the elevator equipment in the existing storage room, adjacent to the elevator on the ground floor. Finally, they confirmed that detailing, colors and materials are proposed to match existing.

Public Comment:

One letter was received from Joan Bauman, owner of Unit #211 at Sunset Shores. She opposed the project due to the increased height of the tower over the existing building roof, which could potentially affect her ocean views.

An email was also received from the owners of Unit #303 of the Carpinteria Shores Development noting they did not oppose the project as long as it does not reduce their ocean views and they are not impacted by the noise/vibrations from the operation of the elevator.

Boardmember Discussion:

All of the Boardmembers were in agreement that the proposed location seemed acceptable and made the most sense out of the available options. The Boardmembers were also in agreement that the elevator tower would benefit from a simpler treatment; they generally were not in favor of the fascia banding or plaster reliefs.

Boardmember Ellinwood suggested that the triangle-shaped furred out wall was not needed and the tower should retain its squared off shape instead. The rest of the Board agreed.

Several of the Boardmembers also asked that the roof cap or termination be restudied and simplified. Boardmember Nomura noted that if view impacts are a concern, a flat roof termination or cap might be desirable over other options, such as a pyramid cap.

Boardmember Ellinwood suggested that the elevator tower could be painted a contrasting color (such as a teal to match the handrails) and that horizontal seams (i.e., expansion joints) could be used to break up the verticality of the tower.

ACTION: Motion by Boardmember Reginato, seconded by Boardmember Nomura, to recommend preliminary approval to the Community Development Director with their comments attached.

VOTE: 5-0

OTHER BUSINESS: None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

- Action Minutes of the Architectural Review Board meeting held July 1, 2010.

ACTION: Motion by Boardmember Johnson, seconded by Boardmember Reginato to approve Action Minutes of July 1, 2010.

VOTE: 4-0 (Nomura abstain due to absence)

MATTERS REFERRED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL – None

MATTERS PRESENTED BY STAFF

- Staff indicated they would have a brief slideshow to present “before” and “after” photos of the Palm Avenue and Willow Place intersection documenting the removal of the nearby power pole and overhead wire.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Araluce adjourned the meeting at 6:38 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held at 5:30 pm on Thursday, July 29, 2010 in City Council Chambers. All Boardmembers indicated they would be in attendance.

Secretary, Architectural Review Board

ATTEST:

Chair, Architectural Review Board