

## ACTION MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Jim Reginato, Vice-Chair.

### **ROLL CALL**

**Boardmembers present:** Scott Ellinwood  
Wade Nomura  
Richard Johnson  
Jim Reginato

**Boardmembers absent:** William Araluce

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Approximately 9 interested persons were present.

**PRESENTATIONS BY CITIZENS** – None

### **PROJECT REVIEW**

- 1) Applicant: Peoples' Self-Help Housing Corporation Planner: Steve Goggia  
Project Number: 09-1527-DP/CDP/LLA: Dahlia Court Expansion  
Project Location: 1300 Dahlia Court  
Zoning: Planned Residential Development (PRD 20)

Hearing on the request of Peoples' Self-Help Housing Corporation to consider a revised preliminary review of a proposal to construct 33 new apartments and a 4,347 square foot community center adjacent to the existing Dahlia Court Apartments. There would be 19 new 2-bedroom units and 14 new 3-bedroom units. The community center would include a multi-purpose room, kitchen, reception area, two offices, two classrooms, health screening room, restrooms, laundry room, storage and mechanical rooms to be shared by Dahlia Court residents. The approximately two-acre site is zoned Planned Residential Development (PRD 20) and shown as APNs 003-590-051 and-042.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Steve Goggia, planner, provided a brief staff report and indicated that at the special ARB meeting of December 3<sup>rd</sup>, the Board recommend a preliminary approval, with a direction to come back with a revised preliminary approval showing the following modifications to the plans:

- Adjust the angle of Building #3 in order to significantly open up the view corridor from the corner of Via Real and Santa Ynez Avenue;
- "Tweak" the roofline of Building #2 to open up the same view corridor; and
- Study the articulation of Building #1 per the comments made.

The project Architect responded with revised plans showing how Building #3 was rotated clockwise, away from the intersection. In addition, the second floor plate height on Building #2 was lowered one foot, in turn, equally lowering the structure's overall height. The stairwells on Building #1 were recessed in order to help break up the linear façade.

### **Boardmember Discussion:**

Boardmember Johnson indicated that he would like to see Buildings #3 and 4 shift further south and closer together in order to open up more of a view from the Via Real/Santa Ynez intersection. He also

suggested that Building #1 could use additional articulation. Boardmembers Nomura, Ellinwood and Reginato were in agreement that the revised site plan was acceptable, with no need to further move buildings south. Several agreed that it would be nice to get natural light into the stair tunnels of Building #1 either with dormers, cupolas or skylights.

**ACTION:** Motion by Boardmember Nomura, seconded by Boardmember Ellinwood, to recommend Revised preliminary approval with the following comments:

- Introduce natural light into the staircase areas of Building #1; and
- Keep the location of Buildings #3 and 4 as shown on the revised plans.

**VOTE** 3-1 (Johnson no)

### PROJECT REVIEW

- 2) Applicant: Ray Ames for Mike and Susan Ahn Planner: Nick Bobroff  
 Project Number: 09-1539-DP/CDP  
 Project Location: 4848 Seventh Street  
 Zoning: Planned Residential Development (PRD-15)

Hearing on the request of Ray Ames, agent, for Mike and Susan Ahn to consider Case No. 09-1539-DP/CDP for preliminary review of a proposal to demolish two existing residences and construct a two-story 2,742 square foot single family residence with an attached 696 square foot studio unit and three garage spaces totaling 747 square feet. Total square footage for the structure would be 4,185 square feet and the maximum height of the residence would be 25 feet in height from finished grade. The property is a 11,121 square foot parcel zoned Planned Residential Development (PRD-15) and shown as APN 003-304-010), located at 4848 Seventh Street.

### DISCUSSION

Nick Bobroff, planner, provided the staff report and asked that the Board comment on the following items:

- Size of side yard setbacks;
- Revisions to scaled down second floor;
- Impacts to existing mountain views;
- Overall size, bulk and scale;
- Pedestrian character of street frontage (including front setback distance);
- Front yard wall height; and
- Preliminary landscape plan.

Ray Ames, agent, explained that the applicants have attempted to incorporate all of the Board's comments from the conceptual review, including moving the garages back several additional feet.

### Public Comment:

Jack Bowie, 4850 Seventh Street, noted that while he is supportive of the project in general, he feels that the increased front yard setback (approx. 12 feet greater than required) negatively affects his privacy and mountain views. He asked that the applicants move the house forward in the lot up to the front setback line in order to minimize impacts to his property.

The applicants indicated they would be amendable to this if the Board and staff supported it as well.

**Boardmember Discussion:**

All of the Boardmembers noted that the revised second floor reduces the perceived size, bulk and scale of the structure and adequately responded to their comments from the conceptual review. Several of the Boardmembers noted that reducing the width of the second floor also helped to maintain more of the existing mountain views.

Boardmember Nomura stated that while the structure is large, it is not unreasonably sized for a duplex and he felt it was a unique design in that it only appears to be a single family home when viewed from the street.

The Board was not concerned with the relatively small change in side yard setback distances, as the reduction to the second floor width largely addressed their previous concerns.

While the Board liked the larger-than-required front setback, they were not opposed to moving the home forward in the lot, both to better align with adjacent homes and to minimize impacts to the neighbor's views and privacy. The Board did not provide a specific distance and suggested the applicant could explore different options (moving the house six to 12 feet forward in the lot).

The Boardmembers were in agreement that the courtyard wall would benefit from being simplified (i.e., remove pilasters) and/or lowered in height. It was suggested that if the structure is moved up to the setback line, then the wall should be no more than three feet in height or could be removed entirely.

Several of the Boardmembers felt that the elevations, and the front elevation in particular, were too animated and would benefit from being simplified. Boardmember Johnson suggested making some of the garage doors have rectangular openings rather than arched openings. He felt some of the other arches used throughout the design could be replaced with a different detail or treatment.

With respect to the landscape plan, Boardmember Nomura provided the following comments:

- Provide a scale on the landscape plan;
- Provide a plant legend with the following information: quantity, size, name, botanic name, remarks (including spacing, pruning requirements, etc.).
- Provide an irrigation plan;
- Plant palette could be simplified;
- 3 gallon plant size should read 2 gallon; and
- Consider the following comments on specific plant choices:
  - Pride of Madeira will be too large for selected area;
  - Fig tree needs more space; and
  - Camellias are difficult to transplant.

In terms of colors and materials, the Board indicated that a slightly darker color should be selected for the plaster finish. The Board also recommended that the applicants use a two-piece clay roofing tile rather than a one-piece S-tile. With respect to windows, Boardmember Johnson commented that three-panel windows or windows with break-ups would be nicer and more appropriate to the architectural style than the two-panel windows shown in the drawings.

**ACTION:** Motion by Boardmember Johnson, seconded by Boardmember Nomura, to recommend

preliminary approval with the following comments:

- Move the building forward on the lot and reduce courtyard wall height or eliminate the wall altogether;
- Simplify animation of the garage doors;
- Replace S-tiles with a 2-piece roofing tile;
- Re-study window break-ups;
- Select a darker body color for plaster exterior; and
- Incorporate Boardmember Nomura’s landscape plan comments into the final landscape plan.

**VOTE** 4-0

-----

**OTHER BUSINESS:** None

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

- Action Minutes of the Architectural Review Board meeting held December 17, 2009.

**ACTION:** Motion by Boardmember Reginato, seconded by Boardmember Nomura to approve Action Minutes of. December 17, 2009 with a revision to replace the Suggested London Plane or Alder trees with Coast Live Oaks in the comments by Boardmember Nomura.

**VOTE: 4-0**

**MATTERS REFERRED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL – None**

**MATTERS PRESENTED BY STAFF**

Public Works Director Charles Ebeling requested the Board to comment on a required revision to the Eight Street Bridge. Overall, the Board indicated that it would be acceptable to install the ADA handrail on the Calle Ocho side, while keeping the Eighth Street side as currently shown on the plans, only not using chain link fence material.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Vice-Chair Reginato adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held at 5:30 pm on Thursday, February 11, 2010 in City Council Chambers. Boardmember Nomura indicated he would not be in attendance.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary, Architectural Review Board

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice-Chair, Architectural Review Board

## ACTION MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by William Araluce, Chair.

### **ROLL CALL**

**Boardmembers present:** Scott Ellinwood  
Richard Johnson  
Bill Araluce  
Jim Reginato

**Boardmembers absent:** Wade Nomura

### **PRESENTATIONS BY CITIZENS – None**

### **PROJECT REVIEW**

- 1) Applicant: Bryan Pollard, AIA for John & Michaela Frontera Planner: Nick Bobroff  
Project Number: 09-1517-DPA/CUP/CDP  
Project Location: 4964 Sixth Place  
Zoning: Planned Residential Development (PRD-20)

Hearing on the request of Bryan Pollard, agent/architect for John and Michaela Frontera to consider Case No. 09-1517-DPA/CUP/CDP for revised preliminary review of a request to construct a one-story 240 square foot addition to an existing residential triplex property. The addition would expand an existing two-bedroom unit into a larger two-bedroom unit. The property is a 7,020 square foot parcel zoned Planned Residential Development (PRD-20) and shown as APN 003-312-024 located at 4964 Sixth Place.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Bryan Pollard, architect, described the changes made to the triplex, including replacing the lattice work on the second floor deck of the duplex building with wood louvers.

#### *Boardmember Discussion:*

Boardmember Johnson suggested that the exterior stairway on the duplex be wrapped in stucco rather than left as is. He also suggested that the plate heights on the new addition could be raised up a little higher.

Boardmember Reginato agreed, stating that using black plastic mesh to screen the trash enclosure under the stairs seemed at odds with the quality construction being used for the rest of the triplex. He too suggested stucco or a similar solid material. He suggested the applicants consider re-organizing the garage assignments so that each unit has a garage space that is closer to the respective residence.

Boardmember Ellinwood felt the new entry addition ought to be raised at least two feet higher. He noted that with the extra height, perhaps a clerestory could be added to the addition. He agreed with the other Boardmembers that the lattice work on the stairs/fence/gates needed to be replaced with something more solid.

The Board discussed possible treatments for the duplex stairs and adjacent fence/gates. They asked the architect to consider a solid wall with contrasting gates and to detail the stairs in a manner that is complimentary to the architecture/detailing of the triplex.

The Board was also in agreement that the louvers proposed for the second floor duplex were fine.

**ACTION:** Motion by Boardmember Reginato, seconded by Boardmember Johnson, to recommend revised preliminary approval to the Director with the following comments:

- Raise the plate height on the new addition by a minimum of two feet;
- Try a clerestory element in the new raised section;
- Redesign the stairway and adjacent fence to screen the trash enclosure with a solid wall of approximately five feet in height and detail the stairway to be complimentary to the architecture of the duplex;
- Re-order the garage assignments to work better with the layout of the units; and
- Replacing the lattice with louvers on the second floor deck is acceptable.

**VOTE:** 4-0

---

### PROJECT REVIEW

2) Applicant: Bill Shimer for Sprint/Clearwire  
Project Number: 09-1538-CUPM/CDP  
Project Location: 4558 Carpinteria Avenue  
Zoning Commercial Planned Development (CPD)

Planner: Shanna Farley

Hearing on the request Bill Shimer agent for Sprint/Clearwire to consider Case No. 09-1538-CUPM/CDP for preliminary review of a request to install three panel antennas, one parabolic antenna, and RF screening within an existing rooftop cupola, install one parabolic antenna mounted within a proposed faux chimney and install an equipment cabinet upon the roof of the existing Best Western Inn located at 4558 Carpinteria Avenue. The proposed modifications would be in addition to the existing wireless facility already located on the site. The parcel is zoned Commercial Planned Development (CPD) and shown as APN 004-036-024.

### DISCUSSION

The agent, Nick Gonzalez, explained the technology involved with the proposed antennas and basic requirements involved with the placement and positioning for optimum signal coverage. Mr. Gonzalez explained that certain materials are available to screen the antennas while allow radio frequency signals to pass through them. He explained the limitations of these types of screening materials and how they can typically be used in the types of wireless projects.

#### *Boardmember discussion:*

Boardmember Ellinwood began the discussion expressing concern with the cupola tower elements and explored options to reduce the visibility of the antenna by using textured or colored plexi-glass. He and other members felt that the antennas within the cupola should be better screened or relocated outside of the structure altogether.

Boardmember Araluce expressed concern with the location of any antenna or screening within the cupola. He felt that the cupola structure is the primary architectural feature on the building and should

not be modified as proposed in this application. Boardmember Araluce and Johnson agreed that the proposed RF screening did not respect the “fish tale” peak that currently exists within the arches. A discussion ensued, with the agent, regarding whether the antennas and screening could be recessed further, so as to better respect the style of the arches.

Generally, the Board also agreed that the proposed “faux” chimney should be redesigned to match other elements already existing on the roof. The Board was supportive of either the Spanish style arched faux chimneys or the smaller square tower along the western elevation.

The Board generally agreed they preferred that all of the antennas be placed within the existing structure so that they not to be visible from the exterior of the building. The Board also agreed that should another similar feature be designed to mimic the other elements of the building to house the antennas currently proposed in the cupola tower they would be supportive of this alternative.

Boardmember Johnson raised concerns with any new structures that would be excessively high as compared to the primary roof line. The Board also agreed that the proposed equipment cabinet would not cause a visual impact due to its low height and its location on the roof.

Overall, the Board felt that the architectural style of the structure was an asset to the area and should be valued through a well designed study of alternatives to the proposed screening elements.

**ACTION:** Motion by Boardmember Johnson, seconded by Boardmember Reginato, to continue the review of the project to later date, with the following comments and direction from the Board:

- Study alternative locations for the four antennas shown within the cupola tower, considering first existing structures and elements;
- Study an “architecturally sympathetic” element like a Spanish chimney or other roof element to house the one antenna along the western elevation, using patterns and materials already existing on the structure; and
- Should another tower element be proposed, the height of the structure should be as low as possible.

**VOTE:** 4-0

-----

**OTHER BUSINESS:** None

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

- Action Minutes of the Architectural Review Board meeting held January 28, 2010.

**ACTION:** Motion by Boardmember Johnson, seconded by Boardmember Reginato to approve Action Minutes of. January 28, 2010.

**VOTE:** 3-0 (Araluce abstain)

**MATTERS REFERRED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL – None**

**MATTERS PRESENTED BY STAFF**

- Durtche Residence; 4791 Seventh Street: The Board reviewed the revised plans for the residence and indicated that the applicant/agent had adequately responded to their previous comments made during the preliminary review of the project.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Araluce adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held at 5:30 pm on Thursday, February 25, 2010 in City Council Chambers. All Boardmembers indicated they would be in attendance.

---

Secretary, Architectural Review Board

**ATTEST:**

---

Chair, Architectural Review Board