NOVEMBER 1, 2011
AGENDA

ORDER OF BUSINESS: Regular meetings of the Finance Committee and the Ordinance Committee begin at 12:30 p.m. The regular City Council meeting begins at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber at City Hall.

REPORTS: Copies of the reports relating to agenda items are available for review in the City Clerk's Office, at the Central Library, and http://www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov. In accordance with state law requirements, this agenda generally contains only a brief general description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting. Should you wish more detailed information regarding any particular agenda item, you are encouraged to obtain a copy of the Council Agenda Report (a "CAR") for that item from either the Clerk's Office, the Reference Desk at the City's Main Library, or online at the City's website (http://www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov). Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the City Council after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office located at City Hall, 735 Anacapa Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101, during normal business hours.

PUBLIC COMMENT: At the beginning of the 2:00 p.m. session of each regular City Council meeting, and at the beginning of each special City Council meeting, any member of the public may address the City Council concerning any item not on the Council's agenda. Any person wishing to make such address should first complete and deliver a "Request to Speak" form prior to the time that public comment is taken up by the City Council. Should City Council business continue into the evening session of a regular City Council meeting at 6:00 p.m., the City Council will allow any member of the public who did not address them during the 2:00 p.m. session to do so. The total amount of time for public comments will be 15 minutes, and no individual speaker may speak for more than 1 minute. The City Council, upon majority vote, may decline to hear a speaker on the grounds that the subject matter is beyond their jurisdiction.

REQUEST TO SPEAK: A member of the public may address the Finance or Ordinance Committee or City Council regarding any scheduled agenda item. Any person wishing to make such address should first complete and deliver a "Request to Speak" form prior to the time that the item is taken up by the Finance or Ordinance Committee or City Council.

CONSENT CALENDAR: The Consent Calendar is comprised of items that will not usually require discussion by the City Council. A Consent Calendar item is open for discussion by the City Council upon request of a Councilmember, City staff, or member of the public. Items on the Consent Calendar may be approved by a single motion. Should you wish to comment on an item listed on the Consent Agenda, after turning in your "Request to Speak" form, you should come forward to speak at the time the Council considers the Consent Calendar.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to gain access to, comment at, or participate in this meeting, please contact the City Administrator's Office at 564-5305 or inquire at the City Clerk's Office on the day of the meeting. If possible, notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements in most cases.

TELEVISION COVERAGE: Each regular City Council meeting is broadcast live in English and Spanish on City TV Channel 18 and rebroadcast in English on Wednesdays and Thursdays at 7:00 p.m. and Saturdays at 9:00 a.m., and in Spanish on Sundays at 4:00 p.m. Each televised Council meeting is closed captioned for the hearing impaired. Check the City TV program guide at www.citytv18.com for rebroadcasts of Finance and Ordinance Committee meetings, and for any changes to the replay schedule.
ORDER OF BUSINESS

2:00 p.m. - City Council Meeting

REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING – 2:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

CEREMONIAL ITEMS

1. Subject: Employee Recognition - Service Award Pins (410.01)

   Recommendation: That Council authorize the City Administrator to express the City's appreciation to employees who are eligible to receive service award pins for their years of service through November 30, 2011.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. Subject: Cancellation Of Certain Council Meetings In 2012 And 2013 (120.09)

CONSENT CALENDAR (CONT’D)

3. **Subject: Contract For Construction Of The 800 Block Of East Carrillo Street Sidewalk Infill Project (530.04)**

   Recommendation: That Council:
   A. Award a contract with Lash Construction, Inc., in their low bid amount of $212,263.40 for construction of the 800 Block of East Carrillo Street Sidewalk Infill Project, Bid No. 3595; and
   B. Authorize the Public Works Director to execute the contract and approve expenditures up to $32,000 to cover any cost increases that may result from contract change orders for extra work and differences between estimated bid quantities and actual quantities measured for payment.

4. **Subject: Administrative Policy On Tickets And Passes (110.04)**

   Recommendation: That Council approve an administrative policy that governs the use and distribution of tickets and passes donated to or acquired by the City.

NOTICES

5. The City Clerk has on Thursday, October 27, 2011, posted this agenda in the Office of the City Clerk, on the City Hall Public Notice Board on the outside balcony of City Hall, and on the Internet.

6. Cancellation of the regular Redevelopment Agency meeting of November 1, 2011.

7. Cancellation of the regular City Council and Redevelopment Agency meetings of November 8, 2011.

This concludes the Consent Calendar.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL REPORTS

8. **Subject: Interviews For City Advisory Groups (140.05)**

   Recommendation: That Council:
   A. Hold interviews of applicants to various City Advisory Groups; and
   B. Continue interviews of applicants to November 15, and November 22, 2011.
PUBLIC HEARINGS

9. Subject: Appeal Of Single Family Design Board Approval For 1117 Las Alturas Road Residence (640.07)

   Recommendation: That Council deny the appeal of Penelope True and uphold the decision of the Single Family Design Board to grant Project Design Approval with findings and conditions for a proposed single family residence in the Hillside Design District.

COUNCIL AND STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

COUNCILMEMBER COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT REPORTS

ADJOURNMENT
AGENDA DATE: November 1, 2011
TO: Mayor and Councilmembers
FROM: City Administrator’s Office
SUBJECT: Employee Recognition – Service Award Pins

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council authorize the City Administrator to express the City’s appreciation to employees who are eligible to receive service award pins for their years of service through November 30, 2011.

DISCUSSION:

Since 1980, the City Employees’ Recognition program has recognized length of City Service. Service award pins are presented to employees for every five years of service. Those employees achieving 25 years of service or more are eligible to receive their pins in front of the City Council.

Attached is a list of those employees who will be awarded pins for their service through November 30, 2011.

ATTACHMENT: November 2011 Service Awards
SUBMITTED BY: Marcelo López, Assistant City Administrator
APPROVED BY: City Administrator’s Office
NOVEMBER 2011 SERVICE AWARDS
November 1, 2011, Council Meeting

5 YEARS

Phillip Faulding, Firefighter, Fire Department
Eric Lohela, Environmental Services Specialist I, Finance Department

10 YEARS

Todd Johnson, Police Sergeant, Police Department
Ruben Gutierrez, Custodian, Public Works

15 YEARS

Mabel Shatavsky, Executive Assistant, Airport Department
Marcelo López, Assistant City Administrator, City Administrator’s Office
Brenda Craig, Finance Supervisor, Finance Department

20 YEARS

Mark Howard, Risk Manager, Finance Department
Michael Johnson, Water Distribution Operations Emergency Services Worker, Public Works Department
Ralph Prieto, Streets Maintenance Crew Leader, Public Works Department

25 YEARS

Diana Palmer, Waterfront Parking Supervisor, Waterfront Department
CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

AGENDA DATE: November 1, 2011
TO: Mayor and Councilmembers
FROM: City Administrator’s Office
SUBJECT: Cancellation Of Certain Council Meetings In 2012 and 2013

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council cancel the regular Council Meetings on the following dates: January 3, January 17, February 21, April 3, May 29, July 10, August 28, September 4, November 27, and December 25, 2012, and January 1, 2013.

DISCUSSION:

Each year we review the calendar for the regular City Council Meeting dates.

The Council meeting schedule has been established based on cancelling the Council meetings on the Tuesdays following a holiday and providing for a two-week summer break. Council canceled these same Council meetings in 2011.

We are now proposing the cancellation of meetings for the next year.

Using these criteria, the following meetings would be cancelled:

- Tuesday, December 20, 2011 (Furlough of City employees from Monday, December 19 through Friday, December 30);
- Tuesday, December 27, 2011 (Tuesday after Christmas Day Holiday and Furlough of City employees from Monday, December 19 through Friday, December 30);
- Tuesday, January 3, 2012 (Tuesday after New Year’s Day Holiday);
- Tuesday, January 17, 2012 (Tuesday after Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday);
- Tuesday, February 21, 2012 (Tuesday after Presidents Day Holiday);
- Tuesday, April 3, 2012 (Tuesday after Cesar Chavez Day Holiday);
- Tuesday, May 29, 2012 (Tuesday after Memorial Day Holiday);
- Tuesday, July 10, 2012 (Tuesday after 4th of July Holiday);
- Tuesday, August 28, 2012 (Two Week Break for Summer Holiday);
- Tuesday, September 4, 2012 (Tuesday after Labor Day Holiday);
- Tuesday, November 27, 2012 (Tuesday after Thanksgiving Holiday);
• Tuesday, December 25, 2012 (Christmas Day Holiday); and
• Tuesday, January 1, 2013 (New Year’s Day Holiday).

PREPARED BY: Linda Gunther, Administrator's Office Supervisor
SUBMITTED BY: Marcelo López, Assistant City Administrator
APPROVED BY: City Administrator's Office
AGENDA DATE: November 1, 2011

TO: Mayor and Councilmembers

FROM: Engineering Division, Public Works Department

SUBJECT: Contract For Construction For The 800 Block Of East Carrillo Street Sidewalk Infill Project

RECOMMENDATION: That Council:

A. Award a contract with Lash Construction, Inc., in their low bid amount of $212,263.40 for construction for the 800 Block of East Carrillo Street Sidewalk Infill Project, Bid No. 3595; and

B. Authorize the Public Works Director to execute the contract and approve expenditures up to $32,000 to cover any cost increases that may result from contract change orders for extra work and differences between estimated bid quantities and actual quantities measured for payment.

DISCUSSION:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 800 block of the East Carrillo Street Sidewalk Infill Project (Project) includes the construction of new sidewalk, curb and gutter, and access ramps along the 800 block of East Carrillo Street between Milpas and Nopal Streets. The installation of new planted parkways and street trees is also included in this Project. This Project was identified as a high priority corridor for sidewalk infill because it serves as a pedestrian route to local schools. Once constructed, this Project will provide an important pedestrian connection to Santa Barbara High School and the surrounding neighborhood.
CONTRACT BIDS

A total of five bids were received for the subject work, ranging as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIDDER</th>
<th>BID AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lash Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>$212,263.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Berry General Engineering</td>
<td>$259,615.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Toro Enterprises, Inc.</td>
<td>$282,301.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Medez Concrete, Inc.</td>
<td>$284,656.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Paula, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. D-Kal Engineering</td>
<td>$357,166.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*corrected bid total

The low bid of $212,263.40, submitted by Lash Construction, Inc., is an acceptable bid that is responsive to and meets the requirements of the bid specifications.

The change order funding recommendation of $32,000, or 15%, is typical for this type of work and size of project.

CONSTRUCTION PHASE CONTRACT SERVICES

As part of this Project, the Public Works Director will also execute a Professional Services Contract with Fugro West, Inc. in the amount of $3,850 for material testing services.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

During the Project’s design phase, extensive public outreach was done in order to coordinate with and solicit input from the property owners and residents immediately adjacent to the Project. The property owners and residents were most recently notified by mail when the Project went out to bid. A Construction Notification will be sent out to local residents and Santa Barbara High School once the construction contract has been awarded and the tentative construction timeline is known. The final notice will be a door hanger to be delivered 72 hours prior to construction.
FUNDING

This project is funded by Measure D and Transportation Development Act funds. There are sufficient funds in the Streets Fund to cover the cost of this Project. The following summarizes the expenditures recommended in this report:

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FUNDING SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basic Contract</th>
<th>Change Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lash Construction</td>
<td>$212,263.40</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$244,263.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugro West</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$3,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RECOMMENDED AUTHORIZATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$248,113.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following summarizes all Project design costs, construction contract funding, and other Project costs:

ESTIMATED TOTAL PROJECT COST

*Cenths have been rounded to the nearest dollar in this table.*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design (by City Staff)</td>
<td>$82,224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$82,224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract</td>
<td>$212,263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Change Order Allowance</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$244,263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Construction Costs (testing, etc.)</td>
<td>$3,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management/Inspection (by City Staff)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$43,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td>$370,337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT:

This Project will facilitate alternative and environmentally friendly modes of transportation by improving pedestrian access to and from Santa Barbara High School and the surrounding neighborhood.
PREPARED BY: John Ewasiuk, Principal Civil Engineer/AS/sk

SUBMITTED BY: Christine F. Andersen, Public Works Director

APPROVED BY: City Administrator’s Office
AGENDA DATE: November 1, 2011

TO: Mayor and Councilmembers

FROM: City Administrator’s Office
City Attorney’s Office

SUBJECT: Administrative Policy On Tickets And Passes

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council approve an administrative policy that governs the use and distribution of tickets and passes donated to or acquired by the City.

DISCUSSION:

According to recently adopted regulations of the state Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC), all California public agencies are required to adopt and post online agency policies applicable to the use of complimentary tickets and passes which are donated to or acquired by the public agency where the tickets or passes provide free admission to an “entertainment, amusement, recreational or other similar” event venue. Under these regulations, cities are required to identify the “public purposes” which might support providing free event tickets or passes to individuals employed by or associated with the city and to disclose the names of public officials, employees, or members of the public who receive these tickets or passes.

The proposed policy only applies to any tickets or passes to a facility or event for entertainment, recreation, sports, or a similar function. The policy outlines several public purposes whereby tickets or passes could be distributed, including the following:

- Relating to an official’s performance of a ceremonial role or function representing the City at an event;
- Required by job duties;
- Fostering positive intergovernmental relations;
- Supporting or showing appreciation for programs or services rendered to the community by non-profit organizations that have benefited residents;
- Encouraging or rewarding significant academic, athletic, or public service achievements by Santa Barbara students, residents, or businesses;
• Rewarding volunteer or meritorious public service by a City employee; or
• Serving as a prize for a City employee competition or drawing.

Under the City’s proposed policy, the City Administrator is named as the “Ticket Administrator” with the responsibility of approving the distribution of these types of free tickets and passes, all in a manner consistent with one of the public purposes described above and deemed acceptable by the FPPC regulations.

Since the City does not generally host events, shows, or performances where tickets or passes are sold, this policy would primarily affect the City if tickets or free passes are donated to the City. For example, passes and tickets are donated to children enrolled in youth programs or charitable event tickets may be provided to the City as a result of a funding agreement.

ATTACHMENT: Draft Administrative Policy on Tickets and Passes

PREPARED BY: Nina Johnson, Assistant to the City Administrator

SUBMITTED BY: James L. Armstrong, City Administrator
Stephen Wiley, City Attorney

APPROVED BY: City Administrator’s Office
City Attorney’s Office
CITY OF SANTA BARBARA TICKET AND PASS POLICY ADOPTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION REGULATIONS - SECTION 18944.1. OF TITLE TWO OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS.

1.0 Application of Policy.

1.1 This City policy applies to tickets or passes which provide admission to a facility or event for an entertainment, amusement, recreational or similar purpose and which are acquired by the City under any of the following circumstances:

   a. gratuitously provided to the City by an outside source;
   b. acquired by the City through purchase;
   c. acquired by the City as consideration pursuant to the terms of a contract for the use of a city venue or as a result of a City grant agreement; or
   d. acquired and distributed by the City in any other manner.

1.2 This policy does not apply to any other item or thing of value provided to the City or and City Official regardless of whether received gratuitously or for which consideration is provided. This policy applies only to tickets or passes received by the City under Section 1.1.

2.0 Definitions: Unless otherwise expressly provided herein, words and terms used in this policy shall have the same meaning as that ascribed to such words and terms in the California Political Reform Act of 1974 (Government Code Sections 81000, et seq., as the same may from time to time be amended) and the Fair Political Practices Commission (“FPPC”) Regulations (Title 2, Division 6 of the California Code of Regulations, Sections 18110 et seq., as the same may from time to time be amended.

2.1 “City” or “City of Santa Barbara” The City of Santa Barbara, the Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency, any other affiliated agency created or activated by the Santa Barbara City Council, and any departments, boards, and commissions thereof.

2.2. “City Official” Every member, elected officer, appointed officer, employee or consultant of the City of Santa Barbara, as defined in Government Code Section 82048 and FPPC Regulation 18701. This term shall include, without limitation, any City board or commission member or other appointed official or employee required to file an annual Statement of Economic Interests (FPPC Form 700).

2.3 “City Venue” Any facility, building, or real property owned, controlled, or operated by the City of Santa Barbara at which events, shows, or performances are held, performed or conducted.
2.4 “Immediate family” The spouse (including the registered domestic partner) and dependent children of a City official.

2.5 “Ticket” or “Pass” Any form of admission privilege which allows an individual to gain admission to a facility, building, or real property where an event, show, or performance will occur.

3.0 General Provisions.

3.1 No Right to City Tickets: The use by a City Official of complimentary tickets which are received by the City is a privilege extended by the City and is not the right of any person to which the privilege may from time to time be extended.

3.2 Limitation on Transfer of City Tickets: Tickets distributed to a City Official pursuant to this Policy shall not be transferred to any other person except to a member of such City Official’s immediate family solely for their own personal use.

3.3 Prohibition Against Sale of or Receiving Reimbursement for City Tickets: No person who receives a ticket pursuant to this policy may sell or receive any form of reimbursement for the value of such ticket or tickets.

4.0 Ticket Administrator.

4.1 The City Administrator of the City shall be Ticket Administrator for purposes of implementing the provisions of this City Policy.

4.2 The Ticket Administrator has the sole authority, in his or her discretion, to establish procedures for the distribution of tickets supplemental to and in accordance with this Policy. All requests for tickets from City Officials which fall within the scope of this Policy shall be made in accordance with the procedures established by the Ticket Administrator.

4.3 The Ticket Administrator will determine the face value of tickets distributed by the City for purpose of Sections 5.1, 5.2 and 7.1, subparagraph (d), of this policy.

4.4 The Ticket Administrator, in his or her sole discretion, may revoke or suspend the ticket privileges of any City Official or person who violates any provision of this Policy or the procedures established by the Ticket Administrator for the distribution of City tickets in accordance with this Policy.

5.0 Conditions Under Which Tickets May Be Distributed: Subject to the provisions of this Policy, complimentary tickets may be distributed to City Officials by the Ticket Administrator under the following circumstances and conditions:
5.1 The City Official reimburses the City for the established face value of the ticket(s) as follows:

a. Reimbursement shall be made at the time the tickets are distributed to the City Official.

b. The Ticket Administrator shall, in his or her sole discretion, determine which event tickets, if any, shall be available under this section.

5.2 In accepting the ticket or tickets, the City Official acknowledges that the value of the tickets will be treated as income in a manner consistent with applicable federal and state income tax laws, or

5.3 The City Official expressly acknowledges to the Ticket Administrator that such ticket(s) will be used for one or more of the following public purposes:

a. in connection with the Official’s performance of a ceremonial role or function representing the City at the event - for which the City Official may receive enough tickets for the City Official and each member of his or her immediate family.

b. the job duties of the City Official require his or her attendance at an event which has been financially sponsored or supported by the City (whether in whole or in part) and the Official will provide a report to the City Administrator or City Council on whether the City’s goals in sponsoring the event appear to have been fulfilled - for which the City Official may receive enough tickets for the City Official and each member of his or her immediate family.

c. for the purposes of fostering positive intergovernmental relations, including but not limited to attendance at an event with or by elected or appointed public officials from other jurisdictions, their staff members, and their guests.

d. rewarding volunteer public service by a City employee.

e. supporting or showing appreciation for programs or services rendered to the community by non-profit organizations which programs or services have benefited Santa Barbara residents.

f. encouraging or rewarding significant academic, athletic, or public service achievements by Santa Barbara students, residents, or businesses.

g. as special recognition for meritorious service by a City employee - for which such employee may receive no more than four (4) tickets per event.
h. for use in connection with a City employee competition or drawing, for which there shall be made available no more than (4) tickets per event.

6.0 Tickets or Passes Received by a City Official or City Employee other than Through the City Ticket Administrator.

6.1 Only the City Administrator/Ticket Administrator shall have authority to receive and accept a gift of tickets given or donated to the City.

6.2 Any City employee who receives an offer to donate or an offer to give tickets to the City shall refer the donor making such an offer to the City Administrator’s Office.

7.0 Public Disclosure Requirements.

7.1 Tickets distributed by the Ticket Administrator to any City Official under either of the following circumstances:

a. which the City Official treats as income pursuant to Section 5.2 above and the City reports the distribution of the tickets or passes as income to the Official;

b. for a public purpose described in Section 5.3 above;

shall be posted on the disclosure form provided for this disclosure by the FPPC (FPPC Form 802) in a prominent fashion on the City’s website within thirty (30) days after distribution.

Such posting shall include the following information:

a. The name of the recipient, except that if the recipient is an organization, the City may post the name, address, description of the organization and number of tickets provided to the organization in lieu of posting the names of each recipient;

b. a description of the event;

c. the date of the event;

d. the face value of the ticket;

e. the number of tickets provided to each person;

f. if the tickets was distributed to another person at the request of a City Official, the name of the City official who made such request and;
g. a description of the public purpose(s) (as described in Section 5.3 above) under which the distribution was made, or, alternatively, that the City Official is treating the ticket as income.

7.2 Tickets distributed by the City for which the City receives reimbursement from the City Official as provided under Section 5.1 above are not subject to the disclosure provisions of Section 7.1.
AGENDA DATE: November 1, 2011
TO: Mayor and Councilmembers
FROM: City Clerk’s Office, Administrative Services Department
SUBJECT: Interviews For City Advisory Groups

RECOMMENDATION: That Council:

A. Hold interviews of applicants to various City Advisory Groups; and
B. Continue interviews of applicants to November 15, and November 22, 2011.

DISCUSSION:

Interviews of applicants for various positions on City Advisory Groups are to be held on November 1, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. Applicants will also have the option to be interviewed on November 15, at 6:00 p.m. and November 22, 2011, at 2:00 p.m.

For the current vacancies, 66 individuals submitted 72 applications. A list of eligible applicants and pertinent information about the City Advisory Groups is attached to this report.

Applicants have been notified that to be considered for appointment they must be interviewed. Applicants have been requested to prepare a 2-3 minute verbal presentation in response to a set of questions specific to the group for which they are applying.

Appointments are scheduled to take place on December 13, 2011.

ATTACHMENT: List of Applicants
PREPARED BY: Cynthia M. Rodriguez, CMC, City Clerk Services Manager
SUBMITTED BY: Marcelo A. López, Assistant City Administrator/Administrative Services Director
APPROVED BY: City Administrator’s Office
ACCESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- Four vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2014.
- Residents of the City or a full-time employees of an entity doing business within the City who demonstrate an interest, experience, and commitment to issues pertaining to disability and access and who represent the public at large:
  - Two members from the Architectural/Engineering/Building Community; and
  - Two members from the Disability Community.
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural/Engineering/Building Communities (2)</td>
<td>Brian Barnwell</td>
<td>12/16/08 (3 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanette Chian</td>
<td>12/16/08 (3 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Community (2)</td>
<td>Mary Ellen Bangs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Burnham</td>
<td>6/28/11 (6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ken McLellan</td>
<td>12/15/09 (2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Smigel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW

- Two vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Qualified electors of the City or the County of Santa Barbara; any of the following:
  - Licensed architect;
  - Member who possess professional experience in related fields including, but not limited to, landscape architecture, building design, structural engineering or industrial design; or
  - Public at large.
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Architect/ Professional Qualifications/ Public at Large (2)</td>
<td>Travis B. Colburn</td>
<td>1) Architectural Board of Review; 2) Planning Commission</td>
<td>Architect; Qualified Elector - City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirk B. Gradin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architect; Qualified Elector - City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Kupiec</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Architect; Qualified Elector - County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architect; Qualified Elector - City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Poole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architect; Qualified Elector – City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barry Winick</td>
<td>1) Historic Landmarks Commission; 2) Architectural Board of Review</td>
<td>Architect; Qualified Elector - City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- Three vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Persons with acknowledged accomplishments in the arts and who demonstrate an interest in and commitment to cultural and arts activities.
- Qualified electors of the City.
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Electors (3)</td>
<td>Darian Bleecher</td>
<td>6/22/04 &amp; 12/18/07 (7 years, 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charmaine Curtis Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Historic Landmarks; 2) Parks and Recreation; &amp; 3) Arts Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Current Planning Commissioner; term expires 12/31/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Saccoccio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol M. Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thea Vandervoort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nathan Vonk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building and Fire Code Board of Appeals

- One vacancy.
- Open term.
- Resident of the City or adjoining unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County.
- Appointee shall demonstrate knowledge and expertise in specialty areas governed by the construction and fire codes of the City.
- Appointee may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident of the City or unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County (1)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CENTRAL COAST COMMISSION FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

- One vacancy.
- Term expires 6/30/2013.
- Resident of the City.
- Appointee may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference ($^{1st}$, $^{2nd}$, $^{3rd}$)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident of the City (1)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

- Two vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Qualified electors of the City.
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government and, for 1 year after ceasing to be a member, may not be eligible for any salaried office or employment with the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Electors (2)</td>
<td>Alan T. Kasehagen</td>
<td>11/25/03 &amp; 12/18/07 (8 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donna Lewis</td>
<td>6/28/05 &amp; 12/18/07 (8 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE

- Five vacancies.
- One term expires 12/31/2013; one term expires 12/31/2014; and three terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Residents or employees within the City but need not be qualified electors of the City.
- One representative from each:
  - Eastside Neighborhood
  - Housing Interests
  - Human Services Agencies
  - Senior Community
  - Youth Oriented Services
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastside Neighborhood (1)</td>
<td>Veronica Loza</td>
<td>7/3/07 &amp; 12/18/07 (4 years, 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Interests (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services Agencies (1)</td>
<td>Alejandra Gutierrez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also eligible for the Youth Oriented Services category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Community (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Oriented Services (1)</td>
<td>Daniel Ramirez</td>
<td>6/30/09 (2 years, 6 months)</td>
<td>1) Community Development &amp; Human Services Committee; 2) Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY EVENTS & FESTIVALS COMMITTEE

- Six vacancies.
- Two terms expire 12/31/2014; and four terms expire 12/31/2015.
  - Three representatives of the Business/Lodging/Retail Industry;
  - One representative of the Cultural Arts; and
  - Two residents of the City who represent the public at large (one of whom shall not represent any specific group).
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business/Lodging/Retail Industry (3)</td>
<td>Jason McCarthy</td>
<td>12/13/05 &amp; 12/18/07 (6 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laura McIver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts (1)</td>
<td>Laura Inks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public at Large (2)</td>
<td>Jacqueline Kronberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kate Schwab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CREEKS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- Four vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Residents of the City of Santa Barbara:
  - One representative from the Hotel/Lodging Industry; and
  - Three members with experience in ocean use (e.g., recreational user or commercial fisherman, etc.), business, environmental issues and/or provide community at large representation.
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant's Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging Industry (1)</td>
<td>Paul Bullock</td>
<td>6/30/09 (2 years, 6 months)</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in ocean use, business, or environmental issues, and/or represents the community at large (3)</td>
<td>Kirsten Castagnola</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremy Lyter</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen MacIntosh</td>
<td>6/28/11 (6 months)</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee Moldaver</td>
<td>7/11/06 &amp; 12/18/07 (5 years, 6 months)</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judy Sanregret</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen “Betsy” Weber</td>
<td>12/15/09 (2 years)</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOWNTOWN PARKING COMMITTEE

- Two vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Residents of the City or the County of Santa Barbara who demonstrate an interest and knowledge of downtown parking issues.
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident of the City or the County (2)</td>
<td>Ruth Ann Bowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William “Bill” Collyer</td>
<td>7/1/08 (3 years, 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom A. Williams</td>
<td>7/11/06 &amp; 12/18/07 (5 years, 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIRE AND POLICE COMMISSION

- Two vacancies
- Terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Qualified electors of the City.
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Electors (2)</td>
<td>Jennifer Christensen</td>
<td>12/15/09 (2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John J. Torell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul R. Zink</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Planning Commission; 2) Fire &amp; Police Commission</td>
<td>Current Architectural Board of Review Member; term expires 12/31/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIRE AND POLICE PENSION COMMISSION

- Three vacancies.
- One term expires 12/31/2012; one term expires 12/31/2013; and one term expires 12/31/2014.
  - One active retired police officer who need not be a resident or qualified elector of the City; and
  - Two qualified electors of the City who are not active firefighters or police officers for the City of Santa Barbara.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active/Retired Police Officer (1)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Electors (2)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HARBOR COMMISSION

- Two vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Qualified electors of the City.
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Electors (2)</td>
<td>Frank Kelly</td>
<td>12/17/02, 11/25/03 &amp; 12/18/07 (9 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helene Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

- Two vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Qualified electors of the City; any of the following:
  - Licensed Architect
  - Professional Architectural Historian
  - Licensed Landscape Architect
  - Public at large
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified elector of the City who is a licensed Architect, licensed Landscape Architect, Professional Architectural Historian, or public at large (2)</td>
<td>Michael Drury</td>
<td>7/1/08 (3 years, 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public at large – Qualified Elector - City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charmaine Curtis Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Historic Landmarks Commission; 2) Parks and Recreation Commission; 3) Arts Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Public at large – Qualified Elector - City (Current Planning Commissioner; Term expires 12/31/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ronald Sorgman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architect – Qualified Elector - City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barry Winick</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Historic Landmarks Commission; 2) Architectural Board of Review</td>
<td>Architect – Qualified Elector - City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HOUSING AUTHORITY COMMISSION

- One vacancy.
- Term expires 2/15/2014 (Appointment effective on 2/16/12).
- Resident of the City who is a senior tenant (age 62 or older and who is receiving housing assistance from the Housing Authority of the City of Santa Barbara)
- Appointee may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Tenant (1)</td>
<td>Victor Suhr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIBRARY BOARD

- Two vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Qualified electors of the City.
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Elector (2)</td>
<td>Christine Roberts</td>
<td>12/16/08 (3 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEASURE P COMMITTEE

- Six vacancies.
- Two terms expire 12/31/2012; One term expires 12/31/2013; two terms expire 12/31/2014; and one term expires 12/31/2015
- Two residents of the City; and one representative from each:
  - Civil Liberties Advocate
  - Criminal Defense Attorney
  - Drug abuse & treatment & prevention counselor
  - Medical Professional
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Liberties Advocate (1)</td>
<td>Luis Esparza</td>
<td>7/11/06 &amp; 12/18/07 (4 years, 9 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Defense Attorney</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse, treatment &amp; prevention counselor (1)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Professional (1)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of the City (2)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEIGHBORHOOD ADVISORY COUNCIL

- Three vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2015
- Residents of the City who need not be qualified electors of the City.
- Two representatives of the public at large; and one representative from any of the following neighborhoods:
  - Eastside
  - Lower Eastside
  - Laguna
  - Westside
  - Lower Westside
- One appointee may be a youth member (age 16 or older).
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Representative (1)</td>
<td>Teresa Peña</td>
<td>3/1/11 (9 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastside Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public at Large (2)</td>
<td>Sally Kingston</td>
<td>3/1/11 (9 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

- One vacancy.
- Term expires 12/31/2015.
- Qualified elector of the City, or a resident of the City and a citizen of the United States who is 16 years of age or older.
- Appointee may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Elector of the City, or a resident of the City and a citizen of the United States who is 16 years of age or older (1)</td>
<td>Megan Luciana Diaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified Elector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charmaine Curtis Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Historic Landmarks Commission; 2) Parks &amp; Recreation Commission; &amp; 3) Arts Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Qualified Elector (Current Planning Commissioner; term expires 12/31/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Trentacosti</td>
<td>6/28/11 (6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified Elector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING COMMISSION

- Two vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Qualified electors of the City.
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Electors (2)</td>
<td>William A. Anikouchine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Harbor Commissioner; term expires 12/31/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John P. Campanella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travis B. Colburn</td>
<td>1) Architectural Board of Review</td>
<td>2) Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen M. Cushman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June Pujo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Ramirez</td>
<td>1) Community Development &amp; Human Services Committee; 2) Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph A. Rution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Secord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addison S. Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul R. Zink</td>
<td>1) Planning Commission; 2) Fire &amp; Police Commission</td>
<td>Current Architectural Board of Review Member; term expires 12/31/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RENTAL HOUSING MEDIATION TASK FORCE

- Four vacancies.
- One term expires 12/31/2012; and three terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Residents of the City or the County of Santa Barbara:
  - One homeowner
  - Two landlords
  - One tenant

  **Note:** Non-resident members must be owners of residential rental property within the City limits or affiliated with organizations concerned with landlord-tenant issues within the City limits.

- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner (1)</td>
<td>David McDermott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlords (2)</td>
<td>Silvio DiLoreto</td>
<td>6/28/05 &amp; 12/18/07 (6 years, 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin B. Manzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant (1)</td>
<td>David M. Brainard</td>
<td>6/28/11 (6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Petretta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SINGLE FAMILY DESIGN BOARD

- One vacancy.
- Term expires 6/30/2015.
- Resident of the City or the County who is a licensed landscape architect.
- Appointee may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Landscape Architect (1)</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WATER COMMISSION

- Two vacancies.
- Terms expire 12/31/2015.
- Qualified electors of the City.
- Appointees may not hold any full-time paid office or employment in City government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Number of Vacancies)</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Incumbent Appt. Dates (Years Served)</th>
<th>Applicant’s Preference (1st, 2nd, 3rd)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Electors (2)</td>
<td>Barry Keller</td>
<td>7/1/08 (3 years, 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA DATE: November 1, 2011

TO: Mayor and Councilmembers

FROM: Planning Division, Community Development Department

SUBJECT: Appeal Of Single Family Design Board Approval For 1117 Las Alturas Road Residence

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council deny the appeal of Penelope True and uphold the decision of the Single Family Design Board to grant Project Design Approval with findings and conditions for a proposed single family residence in the Hillside Design District.

DISCUSSION:

Project Description

The project involves a proposal to construct a new 3,740 square foot two-story single-family residence and a 525 square foot attached two-car garage on a vacant lot located at 1117 Las Alturas Road. The appellant, Ms. Penelope True, filed an appeal of the Single Family Design Board (SFDB) approval with her letter dated September 15, 2011, citing several grounds including impacts to privacy, private views and increased fire hazard (see Attachment 1).

The previous residence was located in a different building footprint closer to Las Alturas Road and was destroyed in the Tea Fire in 2008 (see site plan, Attachment 2). The proposed design involves moving the residence location down the slope, a square footage increase, and requires site improvements to include a new driveway, site retaining walls, and approximately 1,255 cubic yards of total site grading. Grading includes 610 cubic yards of grading (210 cy cut/400 cy fill) underneath the building footprint and 645 cubic yards (345 cy cut/300 cy fill) of grading elsewhere on the site. A total of 743 square feet of decks are proposed, which includes 335 square feet of covered decks and 475 square feet of uncovered decks. The proposed total of 4,265 square feet, located on a 46,303 square foot lot in the Hillside Design District, is 85% of the maximum guideline floor-to-lot area ratio (FAR). After several meetings and reviews, the SFDB made the required Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance (NPO) Findings and granted Project Design Approval on September 12, 2011, by a unanimous 4/0/0 vote.
Project History-SFDB Review

In order to expedite the rebuilding of homes lost in the Tea Fire, all fire rebuild projects are allowed to begin initial concept review and obtain potential approvals at the SFDB Consent Calendar. On April 18, 2011, the subject project followed this standard practice and was first placed on the SFDB Consent Calendar agenda for expedited review. At the discretion of the SFDB Consent members, this project was referred for review to the Full Board SFDB as the proposed project is a completely new design for the lot. The direction given to the applicants by the consent members included providing sections of the building and to study the west elevation for methods to reduce the mass and provide architectural relief.

Public comment from the neighbors was received at the various SFDB meetings. Over the course of the first few SFDB meetings, the Full Board worked on reducing the overall height, scale and roof forms. In addition, the SFDB concluded that it did not support the construction of the home over existing City and private sewer easements located on the lower portion of the lot. During these meetings the SFDB repeatedly asked that the size and FAR be reduced and that changes be made to lessen the impacts along the western elevation facing the appellants home (see Attachment 3).

Commencing in August of this year, the project returned for two additional SFDB review meetings, where the applicant presented a preliminary landscape plan and a new site plan concept proposal was introduced that incorporated a building footprint change to move the home up the lot closer to the street. As a result, the proposed structure’s footprint moved up the hill by approximately 20 feet. By moving the home up the lot, the resulting 1st floor finish elevation would be raised by 5 1/2 feet. The Board was in support of the revised site plan and began focusing on the height of the structure and methods to reduce the massing of the home. Additional refinements were made to the roof massing and bulk of the project.

On September 12, 2011, the project returned to the SFDB for additional review after the completion of a site visit by board members to view the installation of story poles. The SFDB appeared satisfied with the amount of design changes that had been made to the project design and voted 4/0/0 to grant Project Design Approval making the required findings consistent with Santa Barbara Municipal Code Section 22.69.050.

APPEAL ISSUES
Size, Bulk and Scale- Building Footprint Location

The appellant asserts that the proposed design presents privacy and view impact concerns regarding the location of the proposed home in close proximity to her home located next door to the east at 1121 Las Alturas Road. The appellant indicates the proposed two-story mass, which is 19 feet from her home, is too close and believes the house can be relocated up the hillside slope further away from her residence. Although the proposed residence at 1117 Las Alturas will comply with the minimum 15 foot setback distance, the closer proximity to the appellant’s existing house next door results because
the current setback distance for the 1121 Las Alturas Road home is non-conforming and is only approximately 4 to 6 feet away from the common property line (see Attachment 4).

Staff Position: The SFDB full board reviewed various design proposals at five separate meetings. The first two meetings where the project was reviewed, the SFDB was concerned about the proposed building footprint location that required a City sewer line relocation and asked for the design to be altered to reduce building heights, avoid easements and to consider other design alternatives including moving the home up the hill. Considerable changes were made to the project design as a result of SFDB reviews including FAR reductions (refer to FAR table below). The current design is a good compromise that considers various concerns of all neighbors, including neighbors above this parcel. Staff believes the applicant has already made several design concessions to satisfy the SFDB comments and the various concerns raised by neighbors. Staff does not support additional design changes such as further home size footprint reductions or relocation of the home further away from the appellant’s property up the hill that will necessitate zoning modifications for the project design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review date:</th>
<th>Size:</th>
<th>Guideline FAR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-18-11 – Consent</td>
<td>House: 4,159 s.f. Garage: 617 s.f. Total: 4,776 s.f.</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-25-11 – Full Board</td>
<td>Same as 4-18-11</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9-11 – Full Board</td>
<td>House: 4,012 s.f. Garage: 542 s.f. Total 4,554 s.f.</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-1-11 – Full Board</td>
<td>House: 4,003 s.f. Garage 475 s.f. Total: 4,478 s.f.</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-29-11 – Full Board</td>
<td>House: 3,945 s.f. Garage: 533 s.f. Total: 4,478</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12-11 – Full Board</td>
<td>House: 3,740 s.f. Garage: 525 s.f. Total: 4,265</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Good Neighbor Policies**
The appellant asserts that the “SFDB requested the applicant to meet with the neighbors and use the good neighbor policy to ensure a design that meets with the neighborhood compatibility and support”. In addition, the appellant states that the project did not consider blockage of morning sun access and loss of private mountain views. Therefore, the appellant believes the project should be further modified to address these neighbor concerns.

As a result of the Council appeal, Planning Staff met with the appellant, appellant’s architect and applicant to explore the possibility of moving the home an additional five feet closer to the street and narrowing the driveway widths. Staff was initially supportive of this direction even though it would require a zoning modification approval for building encroachment into the 35 foot front yard setback as required in the A-1 zone.
rationale for supporting the front yard modification was that the former residence building footprint did not meet the front yard setback and a similar reduction of setback is allowed in hillside lots in the E and R zones. The applicant studied alternative designs and rejected them because such site design changes would negatively impact the project’s driveway entrance safety and aesthetic design by increasing the height of retaining walls to over 8 feet located within 10 feet of the front property line and require additional zoning modification approvals.

Staff’s position: Staff is of the opinion that the SFDB worked to reduce the height and scale of the residence and was successful in pushing the home location up the hill and away from existing sewer easement on the lower portion of the lot. The adjustment to the building footprint benefitted the appellant and improved some private views. In addition, story poles were erected in response to neighbor requests, roof forms lowered and the orientation of windows on the west elevation were adjusted to increase privacy between neighbors. These project changes demonstrate that reasonable consideration was given to the neighbors. Staff is concerned that the appellant believes that the appropriate solution to achieve an increased separation is to insist that applicant either reduce the home size or pursue zoning modifications. Staff supports the current house design that the SFDB approved given that it is consistent with zoning standards and is compatible in size with the recent tea fire rebuild project on the adjacent lot approved at 1105 Las Alturas Road and other homes in the neighborhood (see Attachment 5).

CONCLUSION:

The proposed project has undergone a thorough review by the SFDB and by Planning Staff. It is staff’s position that appropriate consideration has been given to the appellant’s concerns as part of the Single Family Design Board review process, which resulted in a sufficient project design. Furthermore, the project will be compatible with the neighborhood, the project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, and the proposed building does not significantly impact the appellant’s privacy or private ocean views. Staff recommends that the Council deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the SFDB.

ATTACHMENTS: 1. Appellant Letter, received August 11, 2011
2. Site Plan- Building Footprint Comparison
3. Summary of SFDB Minutes
4. Site Photos
5. Proposed Site Plan and Building Elevations

PREPARED BY: Jaime Limon, Senior Planner II

SUBMITTED BY: Paul Casey, Assistant City Administrator

APPROVED BY: City Administrator’s Office
September 15, 2011
City Council of Santa Barbara
Council Chambers (2nd Floor)
735 Anacapa Street Santa Barbara, CA. 93101
Phone: (805) 564-5318

RE: SINGLE FAMILY DESIGN BOARD (SFDB) DECISION. MST2011-00142

To Whom It May Concern:

On Monday September 12th the Single Family Design Board rendered a decision to grant Conceptual approval for the property located at 1117 Las Alturas Road.

The SFDB board granted conceptual approval for a new 5,118 sq. ft. two story building on a 1.06 acre lot. The parcel has an average slope of 25% and they project a balance cut and fill.

Grounds claimed for the appeal and identifying in particular all significant issues, facts and affected parties

The following are my grounds for appeal of conceptual approval:

1. Increased fire hazard due to the proposed building proximity to the existing building located at 1121 Las Alturas. The close proximity increases the danger of fire spreading from the proposed building to the existing.
2. The SFDB guidelines require sensitivity to privacy and preservation of existing views. The proposed building has a 20'-4" vertical wall of the building approximately 19'-0" from the existing building located at 1121 Las Alturas. Completely blocking the mountain views and morning sun.
3. SFDB required the applicant to submit a story pole plan to the board for approval prior to constructing the story poles. The story poles were erected without an approved plan. I discovered that one of the poles was not located correctly.
4. SFDB requested the applicant to meet with the neighbors and use the good neighbor policy to ensure a design that meets with neighborhood compatibility and support. This was not done. The applicant would only meet with neighbors after the drawings were submitted for review and without proper notice.
5. SFDB only reviewed this project two times prior to approval. Even though the record show six times. The prior 4 submittals the applicant submitted a project that did not work because the design was built on a public and private easement.
6. SFDB requested that the grading calculations be reviewed and certified by a civil engineer. The soils report information was not included in the calculations. How can the calculations be correct without that information?
7. The FAR guidelines require a minimum of 20 properties to determine FAR’s. Only 7 properties are shown for this project.

Regards,

Penelope True
1121 Las Alturas Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93103
Cell 805-886-7787
Home 805 962-8420
drpennytrue@gmail.com
SINGLE FAMILY DESIGN BOARD
CASE SUMMARY

1117 LAS ALTURAS RD

MST2011-00142

R- TEA FIRE REBUILD

Project Description:

Proposal to construct a new 4,265 square foot two-story single-family residence and an attached two-car garage. The previous residence was destroyed in the Tea Fire. Site improvements include a new driveway, site retaining walls, and approximately 1,255 cubic yards of total site grading, which includes 610 cubic yards of grading underneath the building footprint and 645 cubic yards of grading elsewhere on the site. A total of 743 square feet of decks are proposed, which includes 335 square feet of covered decks and 475 square feet of uncovered decks. The proposed total of 4,265 square feet, located on a 46,303 square foot lot in the Hillside Design District, is 85% of the maximum guideline floor-to-lot area ratio (FAR).

Activities:

11/1/2011

CC-SFDB Appeal Filed

9/12/2011

SFDB-Project Design Approval

9/12/2011

SFDB-Concept Review (Cont.)

(5th Concept Review. Project Design Approval is requested. Compliance with Tier 3 Stormwater Management Program (SWMP) is required prior to granting Final Approval. The project was last reviewed on August 29, 2011.)

(4:45)

Present: Edward Herrera, Designer/Project Manager; Brad Vernon, Contractor/Agent for Owner; and Chris Gilliland, Landscape Architect.

Staff announced that the applicant submitted their story pole plan and certification, which has been approved by the Senior Planner, Jaime Limon.

The applicant announced that they had just met this afternoon with interested neighbors to report project updates and to address neighborhood concerns.
Public comment opened at 4:59 p.m.

1) Laura Milburn, opposition; expressed concerns regarding massing.
2) Everett Woody opposition; expressed concerns regarding good neighbor policies, style of architecture, proximity property line.
3) Penny True (adj. neighbor) opposition; expressed concerns regarding proximity to her property line.
4) Ed Gastaldo, opposition; expressed concerns regarding proximity to the property line.
5) Don Vogt support; appreciated reduction of roof heights, however expressed empathy regarding the proximity to the adjacent neighbor.

Public comment closed at 5:09 p.m.

Motion 1: Project Design Approval with the finding that the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance criteria have been met as stated in Subsection 22.69.050 of the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code and continued indefinitely to the Full Board with conditions:
1) The Board had positive comments regarding the project's consistency and appearance, in keeping with the good character and quality of the neighborhood, neighborhood compatibility, quality of architecture and materials, and the reductions of floor-to-lot area ratio.
2) Return with a revised landscape plan, specifically with attention to providing plant screening on the southwest corner for the adjacent westerly neighbor.
3) Study the color of the proposed stucco materials and consider using a color other than white colors. Action: Sweeney/Miller, 4/0/0. Motion carried. (Detsler/Zimmerman absent).

The ten-day appeal period was announced.

9/9/2011 SFDB-Resubmittal Received

8/29/2011 SFDB-Concept Review (Cont.)

(Fourth concept review. Project Design Approval is requested. Project requires compliance with Tier 3 Stormwater Management Program (SWMP) prior to Final Approval. The project was last reviewed on August 1, 2011.)

(5:56)

Present: Edward Herrera, Designer/Project Manager; Brad Vernon, Contractor/Agent for Owner; and Chris Gilliland, Landscape Architect.

Public comment opened at 6:21 p.m.

1) Gil Garcia, (also for Edward Gastaldo) opposition; expressed concerns regarding building mass, incompatible design, story poles, and roof form; made architectural suggestions.
2) Everett Woody, (submitted documentation) opposition; expressed concerns regarding accuracy of
Activities:

on-site story poles, building height, location, cross slope, and size.
3) Penny True, (submitted photographs) opposition; expressed concerns regarding private view impacts.
4) Don Vogt, (submitted documentation) opposition; expressed concerns regarding accuracy of story poles on site and scale of project.
5) Carolyn Vogt, opposition; expressed concerns regarding scale on a narrow sloping site, FAR percentage, and neighborhood compatibility.

Public comment closed at 6:31 p.m.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to Full Board with comments:
1) Provide an accurate and surveyed story pole plan and install new story poles onsite prior to returning to the Board.
2) Reduce the square footage to achieve a maximum 85% floor-to-lot area ratio (FAR).
3) Study the proposed window orientations of the proposed residence in relation to the westerly neighbor, in regards of privacy concerns.

Action: Sweeney/Bernstein, 4/0/0. Motion carried. (Miller/Zimmerman absent).

8/23/2011 SFDB-Correspondence/Contact

FYI, Advised Eddie Herrera, applicant, (on 8-23-2011) that the applicant team is strongly encouraged to hold a meeting with the adjacent & concerned neighbors to give the neighbors an opportunity to review the plans and ask questions directly to the applicant team - prior to the Monday (8-29-11) SFDB full board hearing.

8/22/2011 SFDB-Resubmittal Received

8/1/2011 SFDB-Concept Review (Cont.)

(Third concept review. Project Design Approval is requested. Project was last reviewed on May 9, 2011. Project requires compliance with Tier 3 Stormwater Management Program (SWMP) prior to Final Approval.)

(3:13)

Present: Leonard Grant, Principal Architect; and Eddie Herrera, Designer.

Public comment opened at 3:30 p.m.

The following public comment spoke either in support or in opposition of the proposed project:
1) Everett Woody and Gil Garcia, (submitted a subsection of the elevation and slope) in opposition; expressed concerns regarding the location of the patio, easement and sewer line.
2) Penny True, adjacent neighbor (submitted photos) in opposition; expressed concerns regarding proposed size of the project, and obstruction of her private views.
Activities:

3) Carolyn Vogt, adjacent neighbor (submitted letter) in opposition; expressed concerns regarding the proposed "substantially" large size of the home and high roof line next to the road.
4) Don Vogt, adjacent neighbor (submitted letter) in opposition; expressed concerns regarding the proposed elevation and large façade next to road (Las Alturas) which is not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Letters expressing concerns from Don and Carolyn Vogt, and Penny True were acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 3:44 p.m.

Motion:  Continued indefinitely to Full Board with comments:
1) Lower the plate heights on the north elevation.
2) Remove development and the cantilevered portion of the building over the sewer easement. Or prior to returning to the Board provide written verification from Public Works staff to verify that the proposal proposed design is allowed by Public Works.
3) Given the site constraints of the lot the Board recommends the study of a further overall reduction of the guideline floor-to-lot area ratio (FAR), 85% FAR was recommended.
4) Study using Santa Barbara stone instead of the proposed cultured stone.
5) Provide an Arborist Report and verify protection of the existing oak tree canopy and critical root zone.
6) The Board suggests the applicant meet with surrounding neighbors as suggested in the Single Family Residential Design Guidelines to discuss the project prior to returning to the Board.
Action: Bernstein/Miller, 4/1/0. Motion carried. [Sweeney opposed (proposed size), Zimmerman absent].

7/27/2011 SFDB-FYI/Research

Note - advise SFDB to review and make grading findings.

7/13/2011 SFDB-Resubmittal Received

Three sets plans and three sets of drainage reports for Tier 3 SWMP compliance. Also submitted three sets of reduced color drawings.

3/9/2011 SFDB-Concept Review (Cont.)

(Project Design Approval is requested. Project was last reviewed on April 25, 2011.)

(3:55)

Present: Leonard Grant, Architect; Eddie Herrera, Designer; and Brad Vernon, General Contractor (Representative for Owner).

Public comment opened at 4:15 p.m.
Activities:

The following public comment spoke either in support or in opposition of the proposed project:
1) Don Vogt, support; commented regarding the proposed façade, roof line, and entry; which no longer pose concerns to him.
2) Everett Woody (representing neighbor Penny True at 1121 Las Alturas Rd), opposition; with concerns regarding the easement, building location, and the proposed cut and fill on-site.
3) Gil Garcia, opposition; with concerns regarding the proposed easement on the sewer line with regard to the oak trees on-site, and proposed on-site grading.

Public comment closed at 4:23 p.m.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to Full Board with comments:
1) Resolve the easement issues with the adjacent neighbor.
2) Reduce the square footage at the west elevation (increasing the space between the proposed house and the adjacent neighbor); provide revised FAR calculations for square footage.
3) Provide additional driveway details including the materials, grading, width, dimensions.
4) Provide an arborist report regarding the existing on-site oak trees and canopy details, specifically in relation to the proposed grading and relocation of the sewer easement.
5) Provide engineering calculations on the grading quantities; and separate excavation calculations.
6) Provide Tier 3 Storm Water Management Program (SWMP) requirements.
7) Study and provide alternatives to the proposed sewer relocation.
8) Provide a conceptual landscape plan.
Action: Bernstein/Zimmerman, 6/1/0. Motion carried. (Zink opposed).

5/9/2011 SFDB-Resubmittal Received

Plan Substitution received from Brad Vernon.

4/26/2011 SFDB-FYL/Research

EASEMENTS not shown on plans
All existing trees not shown
Building footprint being moved.
Recheck solar. Do not place on schedule on SFDB until these issues resolved.

Discuss with Manuel Romero to discuss feasibility of relocation of sewer. Submit engineering design to allow.

4/25/2011 SFDB-Resubmittal Received

4/25/2011 SFDB-Concept Review (Cont.)

(Project was last reviewed at Consent on April 18, 2011, and referred to Full Board. Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided.)
Activities:

(4:13)

Present:  Eddie Herrera and Brad Vernon, Architects.

Public comment opened at 4:25 p.m.

The following public comment spoke either in support or in opposition of the proposed project:
1) Penny True, neighbor, expressed concerns regarding the FAR of the proposed project, the site layout, grade, solar access, and trees.
2) Don Vogt, neighbor, expressed concerns regarding the lack of break up on the façade, the straight roof line, and the proposed entry. He requested story poles be installed on the project site.

Public comment closed at 4:33 p.m.

Motion:  Continued two weeks to Full Board with comments:
1) Study reducing the overall size and height of the proposed project; particularly the south elevation.
2) Provide site and building sections, and plate height details; reduce the plate heights; study the proportion of the front entry.
3) Provide additional information of the proposed pool including a section through the pool.
4) Provide a landscape plan.
Action: Bernstein/Woolery, 7/0/0. Motion carried.

4/20/2011  SFDB-FYI/Research

Project requires compliance with Tier 3 Storm Water Management Program (SWMP) prior to submitting for Final Design Review at SFDB.

4/18/2011  SFDB-Consent (New)

(Comments only; project requires Environmental Assessment.)

Don Vogt expressed concern regarding the public views and proposed landscaping.

Doug Crawford commented on the beautiful design of proposed projec and expressed concern regarding the sewer easement.

Penny True expressed opposition to the proposed project regarding the new location of the house.

Continued one week to the April 25, 2011, Full Board meeting, with comments:
1) Provide site sections on plans through the west elevations.
2) Study the west elevation for methods to break up the mass.

4/18/2011  SFDB-Consnt Mail Notice Prep'd
Activities:

3/29/2011  SFDB-Posting Sign Issued
View from Las Alturas Road looking East towards 1105 Las Alturas Road residence.
View from the middle of 1117 property looking North.
View from Las Alturas Road looking West towards neighboring property.
View from 1117 lot looking South towards 1121 residence.
View from 1117 lot looking Southeast towards 1105 residence.
COLORS AND MATERIALS

Stucco: Navajo White

Iron Lantern at Entry

Wood: Amarele Hickory

Weathered

Roman Pavers

2-Piece Spanish Tile

Roofing:

Bronze

Rubble Stone Wall and Cap

Santa Barbara