

3. 06BAR-00000-00316 Santa Barbara Botanic Garden Mission Canyon
06NEW-00000-00138 (Alex Tuttle, Planner) **Jurisdiction: DVP**

Request of B3 Architects, architect for the owner, Santa Barbara Botanic Garden, to consider Case No. 06BAR-00000-00316 for **conceptual review of an expansion of facilities that would result in a net increase of approximately 37,631 relative to existing development distributed among 22 new buildings. Existing development on the site includes 30 buildings totaling approximately 39,130 square feet.** The proposed project will require approximately 12,393 cubic yards of cut and approximately 8,210 cubic yards of fill. The property is a 78 acre parcel zoned AG-I-10 and 1-E-1 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 023-051-004, located at **1212 Mission Canyon Road** in the Mission Canyon area, Second Supervisorial District.

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

COMMENTS:

- a. **BAR endorses review of the project design by the Mission Canyon Architectural Review Committee. Plans should be widely available to the public.**
- b. **Presentation of the project was careful, however, due to the scope of the project, the BAR needs more time and input to provide truly cogent comments. To wit, a site visit, or a series of site visits will be necessary following erection of story poles. Planner to arrange. Site visit to include stops at sensitive public vistas.**
- c. **BAR requested additional clarification as to the following:**
 - **Statistics re., what is existing and what is proposed.**
 - **Information on public views into the site (specifically calling out which buildings and site areas are visible and from where).**
 - **Site context: applicant to provide aerial showing the entire area within approx. one mile of the garden site boundaries to get understanding of area density and relationship of other development to the Garden.**
 - **Extent of existing and proposed paving (roadways and paths).**
 - **Grading quantities involved.**
 - **Clarification of interrelationship between pedestrian circulation and landscaping.**
 - **Night lighting.**
- d. **BAR takes note of all of the comments on fencing. Fencing is the garden's immediate face to the community and its design needs to be complementary to the architectural style of the garden as a whole. Fencing must receive architectural consideration. Return with information and options for an architectural solution to the fencing issue.**
- e. **Initial design response:**
 - **Style and architectural direction are good – in keeping with the character.**
 - **Appreciate reuse of Gane House, however, building adjacent to Gane House may be too close. Reexamine relationship. Site visit with story poles will help to illuminate this issue.**
 - **Use of consistent materials is desirable; however, design must differentiate site walls from buildings. BAR is concerned about the apparent mass of the façade that has a three story appearance.**
 - **Concerned about the density of development. In order to address the density of the proposed development, BAR needs more information about the surrounding neighborhood to make neighborhood compatibility findings.**
 - **Residences must receive the same level of design consideration as the “public buildings” on the west side of the garden.**
- f. **BAR would like to start reviewing the landscaping now as well as the architecture.**
- g. **Planner not to take project to the PC prior to full scrutiny by the BAR and conceptual comments that the project is ready for preliminary approval.**