



# COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

---

**SOUTH  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
APPROVED MINUTES  
Meeting of July 24, 2009**

Santa Barbara County  
Planning Commission Hearing Room  
Engineering Building, Room 17  
123 East Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
(805) 568-2000

---

The regular meeting of the Santa Barbara County Board of Architectural Review Committee was called to order by the Chair, Will Rivera, at 9:15 A.M., in the Santa Barbara County Engineering Building, Room 17, 123 East Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, California.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Will Rivera	Chair
Laurie Romano	Vice Chair
Martha Gray	
Jeremy Roberts	
Glen Morris	
Steve Willson	
Anita Hodosy-McFaul	SBAR Secretary
Anne Almy	Supervising Planner

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Everyone present.**

**REPORTERS:** None in attendance

**NUMBER OF INTERESTED PERSONS:** Approximately 5±

**ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA:**

**I. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**II. AGENDA STATUS REPORT:** Roberts moved, seconded by Gray and carried by a vote of 4 to 0 (Morris absent) to:

- Continue Item #4 09BAR-00000-00112 to be heard later at 1:00 p.m.

**III. MINUTES:** Willson moved, seconded by Gray and carried by a vote of 4 to 0 (Morris absent) approve the Minutes of July 10, 2009.

**IV. CONSENT AGENDA:**

**V. SBAR MEMBERS INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS:** Very concerned about filing SBAR membership. Requested that Staff pursue.

**VI. STAFF UPDATE:** Brief update on changes in Planning and Development structure.

**VII. STANDARD AGENDA:**

**11. Discussion** Summerland Draft Design Guidelines Summerland  
(Derek Johnson, Director)

**Request of the office of Long Range Planning, that the South County Board of Architectural Review (SBAR) receive and review the Draft Residential Design Guidelines for Summerland.**

**COMMENTS:**

**Public speakers: Tom Evans, Patrick Nesbitt**

**SBAR COMMENTS:**

- a. Clarify whether partial basements are allowed.
- b. Guidelines need additional graphics.
- c. On pg 11-7, clarify use of scale; revise graphic for clarity.
- d. Could use examples of appropriate exterior lighting that conforms to different styles.
- e. Staff to distribute revised guidelines on 8/14 for further SBAR review on 8/28

**Discussion item only, no action is taken. Item continued to the August 24, 2009 SBAR meeting for further discussion.**

*There being no further business to come before the Board of Architectural Review Committee, Committee Member Steve Willson moved, seconded by Glen Morris, and carried by a vote of 5 to 0 that the meeting was adjourned until 9:00 A.M. on Friday, August 14, 2009 in the Santa Barbara County Engineering Building, Room 17, 123 Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101.*

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 P.M.



# COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

---

**SOUTH  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
APPROVED MINUTES  
Meeting of August 28, 2009**

Santa Barbara County  
Planning Commission Hearing Room  
Engineering Building, Room 17  
123 East Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
(805) 568-2000

---

The regular meeting of the Santa Barbara County Board of Architectural Review Committee was called to order by the Chair, Chris Roberts, at 9:28 A.M., in the Santa Barbara County Engineering Building, Room 17, 123 East Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, California.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Will Rivera	Chair
Jeremy Roberts	Vice Chair
Martha Gray	
Glen Morris	
Steve Willson	
David Villalobos	Hearing Support Supervisor
Anne Almy	Supervising Planner

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:** None.

**REPORTERS:** None in attendance

**NUMBER OF INTERESTED PERSONS:** Approximately 15±

**ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA:**

**I. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- II. AGENDA STATUS REPORT:** Rivera moved, seconded by Gray and carried by a vote of 5 to 0 to:
- Drop Item No. 4 09BAR-00000-00073 Schulz Residence Addition/Remodel from the agenda at the request of the applicant.
  - Continue Item No. 10 09BAR-00000-00031 Warzocha Residence Additions and New Garage to the meeting of September 11, 2009 at the request of the applicant.

**III. MINUTES:** Roberts moved, seconded by Rivera and carried by a vote of 4 to 0 (Willson abstained) to approve the Minutes of August 14, 2009.

**IV. CONSENT AGENDA:**

**V. SBAR MEMBERS INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS:** None.

**VI. STAFF UPDATE:** None.

**VII. STANDARD AGENDA:**

**Toro Canyon/Summerland/Carpinteria Areas**

**11. Discussion Summerland Draft Design Guidelines Summerland**

(Derek Johnson, Director)

**Request of the office of Long Range Planning, that the South County Board of Architectural Review (SBAR) receive and review the Draft Residential Design Guidelines for Summerland.** (Continued from 7/24/09)

**Project was a discussion item only.**

**Overall SBAR Comments:**

- a. SBAR voiced support for document.
- b. A mechanism needs to be in place to record problems and issues so that the draft document may be changed/final document amended as needed.
- c. Concerned over wording and flexibility in interpretation: standardize use of “shall not,” “should not” and “could.”
- d. Include in Preface: good architecture and design may exist in any form, the incorporation of architecture into the fabric Summerland is at the discretion the SBAR.
- e. Remove G’s from Guideline bullet points
- f. SBAR role is not to be an arbiter of private views, remove language pertaining to private views.
- g. Items which are included in Chapter 11 and other sections which duplicate the LUDC or any other SB county policy document (e.g., definitions and story pole guidelines) should reference the parent document only to avoid potential inconsistencies and procedurally difficult changes to Guidelines in future. Such items would be reference materials to be included in a “Summerland package” to avoid redundant changes to Guidelines.

**Chapter 1:**

- SBAR always recommends good neighbor policies and supports projects which are sensitive to the needs of surrounding neighbors
- Annotate the permit flow chart to include consultation with the Summerland BAR and reflect recent noticing changes.

**Chapter 2:**

- SBAR wants picture/raking shot of existing street with desirable texture, good setback, and relationship; try Google maps street view. Avoid confusing users with this image.
- Page 2-4 Paragraph 6, sentence 3: remove “preferred” and define preferred scale earlier in chapter.
- Add different images that give the flavor of Summerland.

**Chapter 3**

- G3.2: make specific statement about urban vs. rural or highlight the section pertaining to applicability for urban versus rural in Chapter 1.
- For G3.17, include language to emphasize permeable pavers with acknowledgement of what is and what is not permeable.
- Drainage plans are not be reviewed and approved by the SBAR. 3.29 should reference a conceptual drainage plan for reference only.
- Page 3-7: Finding 1: “The applicant has designed a project which ~~limits impacts on his/her neighbors views~~ *is appropriate to the neighborhood context*”.
- G3.21 Proposed designs should consider views from public spaces, such as parks, roadways and open space, and should minimize impacts ~~where feasible to or enhance those public views and where feasible private views should also be protected or enhanced.~~

**Chapter 4**

- Fig. 4.2: More descriptive graphic needed, specify if a mezzanine would be included in FAR twice in such a situation.
- FAR calculations need to be simplified to allow use of formula by all (applicants, planners, BAR).
- Fig. 4.3 and Page 4-5: Basement methodology is confusing. How does this relate to the Building Code and required ventilation/access?
- Fig. 4.8: Simpler forms without articulation have worked well in Summerland. Consider removal of graphic.

- G4.13 and 4.14: See Goleta Design Guidelines discussion of “side loading” and provide language to describe how elements should be balanced and to allow SBAR discretion. Fig. 4.13: Should show decks, bay windows or balconies as described in G4.22. Replace 4.13 with another image (e.g., Fig. 2 from the existing Guidelines). Figure 5.1 would be an acceptable substitute.
- **Chapter 5**
  - Fig. 5.1: Can staff find an example of a California bungalow on a sloped site? Existing photograph is more typical of a flat site. Important to have examples of all recommended design styles on sloped sites. Examples all need to be of good architecture.
  - Drawings preferred over photos for examples of styles.
  - SBAR is conformable with flat roofs if done correctly.
  - Fig 5.7: would prefer a drawing. The selected photo is not a good example of a garage treatment.
  - Fig. 5.8: Lighten/brighten photo. Too dark.
  - G5.12: Sloped or pitched roof forms are preferred over flat roofs: ~~flat roofs or roof parapet tops are discouraged in the urban area, except for green roofs or roofs not visible by neighbors~~
  - G5.15: Replace should with “could.”
  - G5.16: Deleted.

#### Chapter 6

- Please include a preference for sustainable/recycled materials or reference green building resources.
- Page 6-2: skylights should have the same pitch and be parallel with roof, low profile.
- Fig. 6.4: Correct starter board position.
- Fig. 6.5: “~~Dark mirrored~~ reflective glazing.”
- Fig 6.6: Windows only represent Victorian, not contemporary.
- Would prefer different window in Fig. 6.5 and more examples in Fig. 6.7
- G6.15: Clarify that only pertains to urban area.
- G6.20: “All colors ~~shall~~ are encouraged to blend in with the surrounding soils, vegetations, and rock out cropping.”

#### Chapter 7

- No comments.

#### Chapter 8

- Remove chapter. RSUs are exempt from BAR review.

#### Chapter 9

- Support language that landscape plan *shall* be required.
- G9.8 Delete.
- Fig 9.3: Work in “should” language regarding Example C.
- Fig 9.4 and 9.5: Not actually permeable after 90% compaction. Use chipseal example.
- G9.27: Fences should be less than 6 feet. Mention 3.5-foot limit from text.
- G9.28: Change to a placeholder for when this issue is addressed as part of Phase III.
- Fig. 9.8: Include that opaque glass is acceptable.
- Want specification for lumens on outdoor lighting; research and reflect appropriate LZ standards.
- Page 9-7: Supports 3.5 foot fence height limitation in front yard setback.

#### Chapter 10 and 11

- Remove or reference content as appropriate (e.g., eliminate findings, checklist, noticing rules). Include as Summerland supplemental package with applications to avoid the need to amend the document every time the LUDC or other BOS-adopted documents are amended.
- FAR worksheet appears complicated.

#### Public Comment: Tom Evans

New document gives SBAR more discretion with plate height and understories, FAR limits higher than Montecito. Private Views are the #1 concern in Summerland and original SBAR Design Guidelines protected them. Does not like flat roofs and would prefer photos to drawings

in Chapter 5 as better representing typical Summerland architecture. Community, not SBAR, needs to decide on reflective roofs. Modular housing not successful. Outdoor lighting approval shouldn't be wattage dependent. Presents enforcement headache.

**SBAR Response:**

- Private views are not under the purview of the SBAR.

*There being no further business to come before the Board of Architectural Review Committee, Committee Member Steve Willson moved, seconded by Martha Gray, and carried by a vote of 4 to 0 (Glen Morris absent) that the meeting was adjourned until 9:00 A.M. on Friday, September 11, 2009 in the Santa Barbara County Engineering Building, Room 17, 123 Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101.*

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 P.M.