



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW APPROVED MINUTES Meeting of July 21, 2006

Kathryn Dole	Chair	Santa Barbara County Engineering Building, Room 17 123 East Anapamu Street Santa Barbara, California 93101 (805) 568-2000
Robin Donaldson	Vice Chair	
Pamela Ferguson Ettinger		
Valerie Froscher		
Chris Roberts		
Jeremy Roberts		
Martha Gray		
Anita Hodosy	BAR Secretary	
Allen Bell	Planner III	

The regular meeting of the Santa Barbara County Board of Architectural Review Committee was called to order by the Chair, Kathryn Dole, at 9:00 A.M., in the Santa Barbara County Engineering Building, Room 17, 123 East Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, California.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kathryn Dole	Chair
Robin Donaldson	Vice Chair
Valerie Froscher	
Chris Roberts	
Jeremy Roberts	
Martha Gray	
Anita Hodosy	BAR Secretary
Allen Bell	Planner III

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Pamela Ferguson-Ettinger

REPORTERS: None in attendance

NUMBER OF INTERESTED PERSONS: Approximately 15±

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA:

- I. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.
- II. **AGENDA STATUS REPORT:** All project to be reviewed.
- III. **MINUTES:** C. Roberts moved, seconded by Martha Gray and carried by a vote of 5 to 0 (Ferguson-Ettinger and Froscher absent) to approve the Minutes of June 16, 2006.
- IV. **CONSENT AGENDA:** (Time Certain 8:30 a.m.)

C-1. 05BAR-00000-00295 Breeden Residence Addition Toro Canyon
 05CDP-00000-00141 (Lisa Martin, Planner) **Jurisdiction: Toro**
 Request of Don Gragg, agent for the owners, Lindsey Breeden and Linda Breeden, to consider Case No. 05BAR-00000-00295 for **further final approval on consent of a residence addition of approximately 1,134 square feet.** The following structures currently exist on the parcel: a residence of approximately 2,643 square feet. The proposed project will not require grading. The property is a 18,200 square foot parcel zoned 1-E-1 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 005-330-017, located at **226 Ocean View Avenue** in the Toro Canyon area, First Supervisorial District. (Continued from 1/27/06, 3/24/06, 5/12/06, 6/23/06 & 7/21/06)

ACTION: Donaldson moved, seconded by Jeremy Roberts and carried by a vote of 5 to 0 (Ferguson-Ettinger and Froscher absent) to grant final approval on consent of 05BAR-00000-00295.

V. BAR MEMBERS INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS:

Robin Donaldson attended UCSB's Design Review Committee meeting on the proposed new County building in Isla Vista. Although the proposed building is County-owned, because it is being constructed on university property it is exempt from County permits and BAR review. The project was before the Design Review Committee for the second or third review already. The style of the proposed building would be Mediterranean/Spanish. At the meeting, Robin requested that a different style for the building be considered given the uniqueness of Isla Vista.

Derek Johnson from County Comprehensive Planning was in the room at the time. The BAR asked Derek if the IV Master Plan, including the IV Design Guidelines, are being coordinated with UCSB's campus planning effort as well as UCSB's planning process for Pardall Road in IV (Roma, from the Bay Area is the architect for Pardall Road). Derek stated that they are being coordinated, but recommended that UCSB and Jamie Goldstein of the County's IV Redevelopment District both give presentations to the BAR on their processes and the status of each program.

VI. STAFF UPDATE: None.

VII. STANDARD AGENDA:

Isla Vista/Goleta

1. Discussion Item Goleta Residential Design Guidelines
(Derek Johnson, Planner)

The 1993 Goleta Community Plan included an action item (VIS-GV-1.2) to develop design guidelines for residential development with input from interested neighborhood groups. The mission and goals of the project is to develop reasonable, practical, and objective design guidelines to assist decision-makers, residents, home-owners, and architects during the design development of single family homes in the unincorporated Goleta Valley.

Checklist/Section 1 Introduction (Triggers for SBAR Review)/Section 2 Neighborhood Character and Definition

Public Comments:

- a. Connie Hanna, League of Women Voters – If the trigger for SBAR review is increased from a 500 square foot addition to a 1,000 square foot addition, what is going to be done to ensure that setbacks are met where averaging of setbacks is allowed? How are setbacks evaluated against neighborhood compatibility issues? She does not feel the trigger should go up.
- b. Autumn Brook – For the 1,000 square foot addition trigger for SBAR review, are additions calculated cumulatively from the original footprint of the house or starting from a certain date (e.g., a hopskotching situation where an applicant returns for additions several times over time)?
- c. Cecilia Brown – The County's Oversight Committee is considering making an addition less than or equal to 500 square feet a zoning clearance with no noticing and no appeal period. How would this affect the trigger for SBAR review?
- d. Michael Inbar – Will the cost and length of time for the applicant increase for SBAR review given that the SBAR's work load may increase with these new triggers for SBAR review?

SBAR Comments:

- a. The 1,000 square foot addition trigger for SBAR review is acceptable with the disclaimer that the trigger is either a 1,000 square foot addition or the addition comprises 50 percent or more of the total existing square footage of the principal structure, whichever is less.
- b. For the 1,000 square foot addition trigger for SBAR review, are additions calculated cumulatively (e.g., a hopskotching situation where an applicant returns for additions several times over time)?
- c. If zoning clearances are granted for additions less than or equal to 500 square feet, it is recommended that the County not allow averaging of setbacks or modifications to setbacks.
- d. The Checklist should contain a summary of Good Neighbor Principles like what is contained in the Guidelines themselves. The Checklist should also be handed out to all applicants, whether or not their project is subject to SBAR review and approval.
- e. Request that the Checklist cross reference sections and/or page numbers in the Guidelines.
- f. Request that the Checklist highlight the importance of the "Elements of Design" section of the Guidelines.

Section 3 Site Planning

Public Comments:

- a. Fermina Murray – Regarding the Trees and Vegetation section, can the guidelines really protect specimen trees?

SBAR Comments:

- a. Chris likes the Stormwater Management & Drainage section. He recommends adding the following before the second to last sentence in the section, "Such facilities should usually be natural and not geometric in character."

Section 4 Elements of Design – Introduction

SBAR Comments:

- a. Chris recommended that the first sentence in the section be changed to read as follows: "The shape, height, and size of a house, ~~arrangement of doors and windows, its roof form~~, environmental character, architectural style, building materials."

Section 4 Elements of Design – Neighborhood Scale

Public Comments:

- a. Autumn Brook (Page 18) - Can staff please provide a definition of "transitioning?"
- b. Autumn Brook (Neighborhood Scale Guideline 4.4) - Can the following be emphasized by highlighting in bold, "Such structures shall be held to an exceptionally high standard of design, since they will be highly visible and precedent setting examples for the design of surrounding developments."?
- c. Autumn Brook – Is there a method to catalog neighborhood character over time?

SBAR Comments:

- a. Neighborhood participation in design review is critical to help define neighborhood character over time. One idea would be to have neighbors generate their own definition of the character of their neighborhood and submit it to the County.

- b. **Chris recommends adding Neighborhood Scale Guideline 4.5 “The plantings in architectural transitions should be consistent with the neighborhood and reinforce the neighborhood’s environmental character.”**

Section 4 Elements of Design – Second Stories

Public Comments:

- a. **Cecilia Brown – Second Story Guideline 4.5 is stated passively to allow greater discretion of the SBAR. For example, if the guideline were reworded to read as follows “the second story shall be no greater than 50% of the ground floor living area,” then applicants are more likely to propose second stories right up to or equal to the maximum size requirement.**
- b. **Dennis Emery (Second Story Guideline 4.5) - Is the maximum size of the second story indeed limited to only 50 percent of the ground floor? If yes, then why can second stories for brand new homes be larger than 50 percent of the ground floor?**
- c. **Dennis Emery (Second Story Guideline 4.5) -In limiting the size of the second story, can the garage area be excluded from the ground floor area calculation?**
- d. **Dennis Emery (Second Story Guideline 4.5) -What about Board of Supervisors-approved CC&Rs out there that would be inconsistent with these Guidelines?**
- e. **Dennis Emery (Second Story Guideline 4.5) -The second story guidelines are too strict on many new families that need to build second stories to accommodate the growing size of their families.**
- f. **Dennis Emery (Second Story Guideline 4.5) -Recommend dropping Guideline 4.5.**
- g. **Fermina Murray (Second Story Guideline 4.5) – Please ensure that this guideline is consistent with the trigger language regarding additions. Are garages counted towards the ground floor area or not for Second Story Guideline 4.5? Are garages counted towards the existing square footage of the principal structure under the “additions trigger”?**

SBAR Comments:

- a. **Why is Second Story Guideline 4.5 stated passively rather than stating, “the second story shall be no greater than 50% of the ground floor living area?”**
- b. **Second Story Guideline 4.5 is meant to address areawide mass, bulk, and scale issues. It should be stated in this guideline, or in another, that the second stories of new houses shall also be restricted to less than or equal to 50% of the ground floor living area.**
- c. **Second Story Guideline 4.5 does not restrict the size of first floor additions. Therefore, this guideline is not a Floor Area Ratio (FAR).**
- d. **SBAR can make exceptions to these guidelines - these are only guidelines not development standards.**
- e. **Second Story Guideline 4.12 – What if the owner wants to change the overall style of the house? Recommend deleting “as the existing home” at the end of the sentence.**

Section 4 Elements of Design – Architectural Styles and Features

SBAR Comments:

- a. **What will the graphic be on page 24? Can the graphic show what it looks like when a ranch style house is located adjacent to a Mediterranean house as an example of what not to do?**
- b. **Can this section reference the *American Field Guide to Architectural Style*?**

Section 4 Elements of Design – Openings

Public Comments:

- a. **Fermina Murray - Can we add a guideline to “avoid inappropriate columns” (e.g., Tuscan columns)?**

SBAR Comments:

- a. **There is an issue with applicants showing “one-sided architecture” (e.g., an applicant only shows the style for one side of the house in plans). Can a guideline be added to require showing “four-sided architecture?”**
- b. **Graphics for this section will be very important. In the graphic, the front door should be able to be seen and should be inviting.**
- c. **Entries should be proportional to the house.**
- d. **Encourage the use of entry paths and reinforce the sense of entry. Discourage using driveways as the main entrance to the home.**

Section 4 Elements of Design – Garages

Public Comments:

- a. **Lauren Hansen (member of the Goleta Visioning Committee) – The Goleta Visioning Committee is very concerned with surface water runoff. Can this section recommend the use of permeable paving? Can the guidelines require the use of permeable paving if the footprint of a residence increases?**

Section 6 Residential Second Units (RSUs)

Public Comments:

- a. **Autumn Brook – The guidelines should discuss what level of review RSUs receive from the BAR?**

Section 7 Hillside Housing

SBAR Comments:

- a. **Although Figure 24 is a good example of hillside housing, it is not a good example of walls in front yard setbacks.**
- b. **In Guideline 7.11, ensure that the guideline does not imply that height limits can be exceeded.**
- c. **Remove finished grade from Figures 31 and 32 to avoid confusion with the current height calculation method.**
- d. **In Guideline 7.14, because some applicants count over excavation/compaction amounts in their grading calculations, caution should be given in using the statement that 250 cubic yards of grading should be sufficient for reasonably sized projects. Also, significant grading is often now required for other site improvements such as fire truck turnarounds.**
- e. **Guideline 7.16 should be changed to “Avoid visual scarring of the natural topography.”**
- f. **Guideline 7.17 should be changed to “Retaining walls should be incorporated within the structure of the house.”**

Section 8 Landscaping & Screening and Fences & Walls

Public Comments

- a. **Autumn Brook – Figures 36 and 37 are not the best examples. Are there better photos?**

04LUP-00000-01194 (Peter Lawson, Planner) **Jurisdiction: Ridgeline - Rural**
Request of Greg Rabat, architect for the owner, Phillip Stephen to consider Case No. 04BAR-00000-00296 for **final approval of a new residence of approximately 4,500 square feet.** No structures currently exist on the parcel. The proposed project will require approximately 750 cubic yards of cut and approximately 750 cubic yards of fill. The property is a 9.7 acre parcel zoned AG-II-40 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 153-320-027, located at **1534 Twin Ridge Road** in the Goleta area, Second Supervisorial District. (Continued from 10/29/04, 3/11/05, 6/10/05 & 5/19/06 & 6/23/06)

ACTION: J. Roberts moved, seconded by C. Roberts and carried by a vote of 4 to 0 (Ferguson-Ettinger, Froscher and Donaldson absent) to continue 04BAR-00000-00296 for final approval on consent. The following comments were made by the Board of Architectural Review members present for this project:

COMMENTS:

- a. **This is a shining example of hillside development.**
- b. **Return with details on the rail for the pool. Planters, cable railing, or a combination of the two are preferred over glass railing.**
- c. **Return with color boards.**
- d. **Return with details on the lighting for the pool. Lights inside the pool are ok, but not on the infinity wall side. Lights not ok for the exterior of the pool.**

Motion: Return for final approval on consent.

4. 06BAR-00000-00143 Werner Residence Addition Isla Vista
(No Assigned Planner) **Jurisdiction: Design Overlay**

Request of Steve Wilson, agent for the owner, Tim Werner, to consider Case No. 06BAR-00000-00143 for **conceptual review of a residence addition of approximately 1,311 square feet and remodel of approximately 1,282 square feet.** The following structures currently exist on the parcel: a residence of approximately 1,311 square feet. The proposed project will not require grading. The property is a 5,000 square foot parcel zoned SR-M-1 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 075-212-004, located at **6593 Sabado Tarde** in the Isla Vista area, Third Supervisorial District.

Project received conceptual review only, no action was taken. Applicant to resubmit for preliminary approval. No further comments were made by the Board of Architectural Review members present for this project.

5. 06BAR-00000-00043 Smith Demolition/New Residence and Guesthouse Goleta
06LUP-000000-00155 (Holly Bradbury, Planner) **Jurisdiction: Permit Condition**

Request of Bill Wolf, architect for the owner, Ruth J. and James D. Smith, to consider Case No. 06BAR-00000-00043 for **preliminary/final approval of new residence of approximately 4,608 gross square feet, attached three car garage of approximately 939 gross square feet, new carport of approximately 265 square feet, covered veranda/porch of approximately 634 square feet, new trellis of approximately 314 square feet and detached guest house of approximately 747 gross square feet with trellis of approximately 314 square feet.** The following structures currently exist on the parcel: a single family residence to be demolished. The proposed project will require approximately 1,200 cubic yards of cut and fill. The property is a 51,081 square foot parcel zoned 1-E-1 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 067-110-027, located at **780 N. Patterson Avenue** in the Goleta area, Second Supervisorial District. (Continued from 3/31/06 & 6/23/06)

ACTION: J. Roberts moved, seconded by Froscher and carried by a vote of 5 to 0 (Ferguson-Ettinger absent, Dole steps down) to grant final approval of 06BAR-00000-00043.

**6. 06BAR-00000-00134 Watkins/Geisler Residence Addition/New Garage Hope Ranch
06LUP-00000-00505 (Nicole Mashore, Planner) Jurisdiction: Ridgeline - Urban**

Request of DD Watkins and Lee Giesler, owners, to consider Case No. 06BAR-00000-00134 for **preliminary approval of a residence addition of approximately 865 square feet, demolition of an existing garage of approximately 490 square feet, rebuild of a new garage of approximately 783 square feet with a second story workshop and bathroom of approximately 783 square feet, new driveway and landscaping.** The following structures currently exist on the parcel: a residence of approximately 1,807 square feet and garage of approximately 490 square feet. The proposed project will require approximately 250 cubic yards of cut and fill. The property is a .979 acre zoned 1.5-EX-1 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 061-301-009, located at **425 Via Hierba** in the Hope Ranch area, Second Supervisorial District.
(Continued from 7/14/06)

ACTION: C. Roberts moved, seconded by J. Roberts and carried by a vote of 6 to 0 (Ferguson-Ettinger absent) to grant preliminary approval of 06BAR-00000-00134. Applicant to return for final approval on consent. The following comments were made by the Board of Architectural Review members present for this project.

COMMENT:

- **Made findings for the modification to parking standards. Return for final approval.**

Motion: Preliminary approval.

Toro Canyon/Summerland/Carpinteria Areas

**7. 05BAR-00000-00281 Adizes New Residence Carpinteria
06CDP-00000-00065(Selena Buoni, Planner) Jurisdiction: Ridgeline - Rural**

Request of Bill Wolf of Pacific Architects, architect for the owners, Ichak and Nurith Adizes, to consider Case No. 05BAR-00000-00281 for **further conceptual review of a new residence of approximately 7,131 square feet and garage of approximately 650 square feet and pool house of approximately 847 square feet.** No structures currently exist on the parcel. The proposed project will require approximately 1,300 cubic yards of cut and fill. The property is a 5.0 acre parcel zoned AG-I-10 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 001-190-042, located at **6404 Via Real** in the Carpinteria area, First Supervisorial District. (Continued from 12/16/05 & 4/21/06)

Project received conceptual review only, no action was taken. Applicant to return for further conceptual review and schedule a site visit at a later date. The following comments were made by the Board of Architectural Review members present for this project:

COMMENTS:

- The house as presented is not in compliance with the height standard using the current building height calculation methodology for the Coastal Zone. The possibility of an exemption to the height standard is subject to future review by BAR.**
- Site visit with story poles requested for the next BAR meeting.**
- Show style and massing on all four sides of the residence, rather than just one side.**
- The more glass, the more night lighting issues. Please address this issue.**
- SBAR wants to see the very rural character of the area preserved.**

**8. 06BAR-00000-00147 Summerland Inn Five Hotel Wall Signs Summerland
06SCC-00000-00007 (Amy Trester, Planner) Jurisdiction: Signs**

Request of Hwei Mey Lu Ko, owner, to consider Case No. 06BAR-00000-00147 for **conceptual review of four hotel signs of approximately 1) 10 square feet, 2) 4.5 square feet, 3) 15 square feet, 4)12.5 square feet and one freestanding sign of approximately 15 square feet.** The following structures currently exist on the parcel: a nine unit hotel with manager quarters. The proposed project will not require grading. The property is on two parcels: one .38 acre and another 0.18 acre parcel both zoned C-1 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Numbers 005-121-010 and 005-121-011, located at **2161 Ortega Hill Road** in the Summerland area, First Supervisorial District.

Project received conceptual review only, no action was taken. Applicant to resubmit for further conceptual review. The following comments were made by the Board of Architectural Review members present for this project:

COMMENTS:

- a. **Please submit plans for signs of a size that conforms to code, ideally from a sign company.**
- b. **Existing signs seem out of character with the area.**
- c. **Please have the Summerland Citizens Association Board of Architectural Review review the plans for the signs.**

9. 06BAR-00000-00148 Oberfield New Residence Toro Canyon
06LUP-00000-00559 (Holly Bradbury, Planner) Jurisdiction: Toro

Request of Bob Klammer, architect for the owners, Mauricio Oberfield, to consider Case No. 06BAR-00000-00148 for **conceptual review of a new residence of approximately 9,739 square feet**. No structures currently exist on the parcel. The proposed project will require approximately 900 cubic yards of cut and fill. The property is a 5.012 acre parcel zoned 10-E-1 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 155-250-011, located at **810 Cima Del Mundo** in the Toro Canyon area, First Supervisorial District.

Project received conceptual review only, no action was taken. The following comments were made by the Board of Architectural Review members present for this project:

COMMENTS:

- a. **Please clarify the height requirements for the Cima del Mundo area. There may be special height restrictions contained in the conditions for the tract map of the area.**
- b. **The residence appears to be top heavy and overmassed, especially given that this is in a rural area. A more traditional scale is preferred, rather than a contemporary scale. There are examples of this in adjacent houses as well a proposed new house (at 901 Cima del Mundo?). However, the basic footprint of the building is ok.**
- c. **The plate heights on the upper floor are too large. The west elevation is of most concern; the entry elevation looks ok. The windows along the west elevation should be smaller and broken up more. Narrowing the gables may also help on the west elevation.**
- d. **The plans should be reviewed by the Ladera Association.**
- e. **Given that the site was a soccer field and has had drainage issues in the past, a soils report is recommended to ensure adequate site drainage in the proposed location of the house.**

Motion: Return for further conceptual review.

10. 06BAR-00000-00078 Calderon Residence Additions and New Garage Toro Canyon
06CDP-00000-00031 (Selena Buoni, Planner) Jurisdiction: Toro Canyon

Request of Tom Jacobs, architect for the owners, Ricardo and Dinah Calderon, to consider Case No. 06BAR-00000-00078 for **preliminary approval of a residential 1st floor addition of approximately 1,188 square feet, 2nd floor addition of approximately 1,418 square feet and new attached garage of approximately 575 square feet**. The following structures currently exist on the parcel: a residence of approximately 1,561 square feet, a shed of approximately 75 square feet and uncovered parking. The proposed project will not require grading. The property is a .59 acre parcel zoned 20-R-1 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 005-320-010, located at **1765 Ocean Oaks Road** in the Toro Canyon area, First Supervisorial District. (Continued from 5/12/06)

ACTION: Froscher moved, seconded by C. Roberts and carried by a vote of 6 to 0 (Ferguson-Ettinger absent) to grant preliminary approval of 06BAR-00000-00078. Applicant to return for final approval. No further comments were made by the Board of Architectural Review members present for this project:

- 11. 06BAR-00000-00068**
Chow Trust New Residence and Agriculture Building **Toro Canyon**

06CDP-00000-00022 (Lisa Martin, Planner) **Jurisdiction: Toro**
Request of Syndi Souter, agent for the owners, Chow Trust, Rodney H. Chow Trustee, to consider Case No. 06BAR-00000-00068 for **preliminary/final approval of new residence (manufactured home) of approximately 1,200 square feet and steel agricultural building of approximately 800 square feet.** The following structures currently exist on the parcel: a mobile home of approximately 500 square feet. The proposed project will require approximately 10 cubic yards of cut and fill. The property is a 5.06 acre parcel zoned A-I-10 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 005-280-031, located at **3500 Foothill Road** in the Carpinteria/Toro Canyon area, First Supervisorial District. (Continued from 4/21/06)
- ACTION: Donaldson moved, seconded by Gray and carried by a vote of 4 to 2 (Ferguson-Ettinger absent) to grant final approval of 06BAR-00000-00068. The following comments were made by the Board of Architectural Review members present for this project:**
- COMMENTS:**
- **Chris Roberts and Valerie Froscher still believe that the modular home should have an exterior deck added to improve the aesthetics of the building. They voted no on the project.**
- Motion: Final approval granted by a vote of 4 to 2.**
- 12. 05BAR-00000-00235** **Roulet Residence Additions** **Toro Canyon**

02CDP-00000-00156 (Amy Trester, Planner) **Jurisdiction: Toro**
Request of Jeanne Roulet, owner, to consider Case No. 05BAR-00000-00235 for **conceptual/preliminary approval of a first floor addition of approximately 1,586.7 square feet and second story loft addition of approximately 829.9 square feet.** The following structures currently exist on the parcel: a single family residence of approximately 634 square feet, a detached garage of approximately 630 square feet. Also Existing is a detached two story structure consisting of a garage of approximately 1,000 square feet with a second story unit above of approximately 800 square feet. The proposed project will not require grading. The property is a 33,105 square foot parcel zoned 20-R-1 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 005-363-017, located at **3134 Via Real** in the Toro Canyon area, First Supervisorial District. (Continued from 10/14/05)
- Project received conceptual review only, no action was taken. Applicant to return for preliminary/final approval. The following comments were made by the Board of Architectural Review members present for this project:**
- COMMENTS:**
- a. **Existing main residence is a legal non-conforming structure. Appears that the proposed second story structure still encroaches within the front yard setback. Second story must meet the setback requirements.**
 - b. **Architecture looks good.**
 - c. **Return with a landscape plan that shows existing trees onsite.**
 - d. **Consider adding street trees along Via Real.**
 - e. **Return with colors, materials, and details on plans**
- Motion: Return for preliminary/final approval.**
- 13. 06BAR-00000-00009**
Siegal New Residence and Detached Garage/Accessory Space **Toro Canyon**

06CDH-00000-000001 (Holly Bradbury, Planner) **Jurisdiction: Toro**
Request of Wayne LaBrie, architect for the owner, Robert Siegal, to consider Case No. 06BAR-00000-00009 for **preliminary approval of a new residence of approximately 3,675 square feet, and detached garage/accessory space of 875 approximately square feet.** The following structures currently exist on the parcel: a residence of approximately 1,450 square feet and garage of approximately 605 square feet. The proposed project will not require grading. The property is a 18,700 square foot parcel zoned 8-R-1 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 005-420-001, located at **3527 Padaro Lane** in the Carpinteria/Toro Canyon area, First Supervisorial District. (Continued from 3/10/06, 5/12/06 & 6/23/06)

ACTION: C. Roberts moved, seconded by Froscher and carried by a vote of 6 to 0 (Ferguson-Ettinger absent) to grant preliminary approval of 06BAR-00000-00009. Applicant to return for final approval. No further comments were made by the Board of Architectural Review members present for this project.

14. 05BAR-00000-00282 Claus LLC Mixed-Use Toro Canyon
(Dan Nemechek, Planner) **Jurisdiction: Coastal/Toro Canyon**

Request of Valerie Froscher, architect for the owners, Claus LLC, to consider Case No. 05BAR-00000-00282 for **further conceptual review of a mixed-use building consisting of commercial use of approximately 4,718 square feet with 2,260 square feet of commercial porch/deck and 400 square feet of commercial covered parking and residential use of approximately 5,140 square feet with 695 square feet of residential balcony and 1,009 square feet of residential covered parking.** The following structures currently exist on the parcel: an industrial building used as a retail showroom of approximately 1,100 square feet to be demolished. Project also included the demolition of existing paving. The proposed project will require approximately 100 cubic yards of cut and no fill. The property is a 17,127 square foot parcel zoned C-1 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Numbers 005-450-002 and 005-450-001, located at **3717 Santa Claus Lane** in the Carpinteria area, First Supervisorial District. (Continued from 12/02/05 5/19/06)

Project received further conceptual review only, no action was taken. Applicant to return for further conceptual review. The following comments were made by the Board of Architectural Review members present for this project:

Public Comments:

- **Paul Franz is very supportive of the project, especially the retail portion of the project.**
- **Carl Perry, representing Robert McColoumb and Patricia Perry, was concerned with private views of the project, but has been working closely with the project team. He is supportive of the project now that his issues have been worked out.**

SBAR Comments:

- a. **The new design is a huge improvement; the perpendicular views of the ocean have been opened up quite a bit with removal of 30 percent of the previously proposed building area. This is much appreciated.**
- b. **Refer to Planning and Development for their environmental impact analysis, especially regarding impacts on the View Corridor from Highway 101 looking diagonally at the project.**
- c. **Please provide comparable statistics for Paul Franz' recently approved project and the proposed project.**
- d. **The Board would appreciate a comparison of the impact of a one-story 16-foot height limit design with the current two-story design to better understand the visual impact of the proposed design in comparison with a design the meets the ordinance height limits.**
- e. **Chris was opposed to the proposed kiosk because it partially blocks views of the ocean from Santa Claus Lane. He also wanted to ensure that landscaping protects views of the ocean.**
- f. **Chris also recommended extending the boardwalk for the development out along the beach side of the development to make it more inviting to the public.**

The Board would appreciate a comparison of the impact of a one-story 16-foot height limit design with the current two-story design to better understand the visual impact of the proposed design in comparison with a design the meets the ordinance height limits.

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

Meeting of July 21, 2006

Page 12

There being no further business to come before the Board of Architectural Review Committee, Committee Member Robin Donaldson moved, seconded by Jeremy Roberts, and carried by a vote of 6 to 0 (Pamela Ferguson-Ettinger absent) that the meeting was adjourned until 9:00 A.M. on Friday, August 11, 2006 in the Santa Barbara County Engineering Building, Room 17, 123 Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 P.M.

G:\GROUP\PC_STAFF\WP\BAR\SBAR\MINUTES\MINUTES.2006\07-21-06 SBAR MINUTES.DOC