



# SUMMERLAND Planning Advisory Committee (SunPAC)

May 7, 2008 Meeting – Minutes

---

1. **Meeting Called to Order:** By Chair **Donaldson** at 6:06pm.
2. **SunPAC Committee Members Present:** Robert (Robin) Donaldson, David (Tom) Evans, Jennifer Fairbanks, Betty Franklin, Paul Franz, David Hill, Mary Holzhauser, Nancy Kimsey, Andy Neumann, Suzanne Perkins, and Wickson (Reeve) Woolpert.  
**Staff Present:** Amy Donnelly, Assistant Planner and Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner.
3. **Welcome:** Chair **Donaldson** welcomed participants, and provided opening comments.
4. **Public Comment for Non-Agendized Items:** None.
5. **Meeting Minutes:** SunPAC Member **Franz** moved to approve the SunPAC Meeting Minutes from April 30, 2008 with one correction to omit the basement definition voted on at the 4/30/08 SunPAC meeting which will be clarified and continued in the current meeting discussion. SunPAC Member **Woolpert** seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried 11-0.
6. **SunPAC Member Comments on “Working Draft” of the Commercial Design Guidelines:** SunPAC Members provided prepared comments on the “Working Draft” of the Draft Commercial Design Guidelines (April 2008). Staff noted that all comments, except those requiring further SunPAC deliberation and consensus, will be incorporated into an updated version of the document.

**David Hill:**

Page 18 – Add language about living or green roofs.

Page 31 – Felt that 12' plate height does not provide for a human scale.

Page 49 – Add language on lighting hours and protecting the night sky.

Page 51 – Add language on banner signs (see Betty Franklin's comment).

**Paul Franz:**

Page 5 – “Review Process” should include cosmetic changes (i.e. paint color).

Page 12 – Add language about the distinction between E/W of Valencia to Block Face Character.

Page 17 – Specify requirements of a Landscape Plan. (Shaunn Mendrin mentioned these reside in the County's LUDC).

Page 18 – Guideline 3.19 – Include sidewalk improvements (i.e. red brick in County R-O-W).

Page 25 – Guideline 3.38 – Placing building parallel with the street may not work on all sites it may further clarification for flexibility.

Page 52 – Clarify new paint versus repainting. New paint should require BAR review.

**Betty Franklin:**

Page 13 – SunPAC agreed to omit Ridgeline & Hillside Development Guidelines because all of Summerland is considered a Ridgeline & Hillside area.

Page 51 – Signage – Add language on banner signs “not permitted more than 30 days per 3 month period” as determined at the January 26, 2008 Workshop.

**Andy Neumann:**

None – gave his time to Tom Evans.

**Reeve Woolpert:**

Page 8 – “Design Phase” – insert “privacy and view” concerns.

Page 9 – Suggestion of Summerland BAR review should be enhanced/stronger.

Page 10 – Add Reeve’s description of Summerland Character here.

Page 11 – “Lot pattern” – Fix typo: tent lots are 25 x 60 feet not 25 x 50 feet.

Page 11 – “Lot pattern” – Add language on E/W Valencia block patterns. After “rhythm” add “mass, bulk and scale” along with proximity.

Block Face Character: Under “Develop common rhythms” add language on building upon positive elements (positive defined as elements consistent with these design guidelines).

Page 12 – Defined visual character – should encourage “appealing/desirable/preferred” elements (unified can still be ugly).

Page 12 – Doesn’t understand the figure. Both look mixed.

Neighborhood Character Guideline 2.1 – Add “streetscape photomontages” instead of photos. Add “desirable” after “compatible”.

Page 21 – “Privacy & Views” – add language about views from streets.

Page 23 – Bottom of page after “Gateways” add “...and protect and enhance the character of Summerland”.

**Tom Evans:**

Table of Contents: Add a placeholder for Story Poles and FAR Worksheet.

Page 12 – Sketch – Top row shows mixed but with correct scale, last residence is out of scale (Shaunn Mendrin noted this is just a placeholder).

Guideline 2.5 – Not sure if breaks every 25’ are appropriate. Not as important as gabled ends to retain small scale. No mention of gable proportioning. Robin Donaldson noted to encourage a break every 25’ is too vague for an architect. Term “gable” should appear in the Block Face Character section of the Design Guidelines. Traditional gable proportions are 15’ to 16’. (Shaunn Mendrin noted a more appropriate section for this may be the Architectural Features chapter.)

Page 13 – Add language: “Solutions that enhance the residential feel of Varley Street are encouraged”.

Page 15 – Guidelines should reference private views.

Page 16 – Guideline 3.11 – Should corner buildings be close to intersections? They should be setback to create an open feel. A varied offset has a nicer feel.

Page 21 – Privacy – figure is poor (Shaunn noted this is a placeholder).

Page 23 – Guideline 3.35 – add language regarding views from roadways.

Page 26 – “Abandoned E/W R-O-W” – clarify owner gets 50% FAR credit.

Page 27 – Height – need to add language on understories.

Page 33 – Seaside example is good but too large for Summerland (Robin Donaldson noted it looks too Craftsman).

Page 33 – Victorian example is too ornate for the simpler style found in Summerland.

Page 34 – Colonial Revival example is poor.

Page 35 – Contemporary needs to be removed. It’s “contemporary interpretation” of allowed styles that is acceptable and encouraged.

Page 42 – Should say “acceptable and encouraged”.  
Materials: Float sand finish should be for additions only.  
Figure of wooden siding is also a good example of window relief.  
Guidelines 6.4 – Some non-factory finishes can also have glare.  
Page 48 – Fixtures with shields are encouraged but should be required. Robin Donaldson said it should read “Fixtures with solid, opaque shields should be required”.  
Should we address good design for tree lighting?  
Page 58 – SBAR Review Checklist is not as complete as current checklist. See current checklist for reference to spot elevation, etc.

**Mary Holzauer:**

Page 14 – Third Bullet refers to Toro Canyon (strike).

**Nancy Kimsey:**

Page 11 & 16 – Difference between E/W Valencia is not described. David Hill noted east is more rural, west is denser. Nancy Kimsey disagreed. Robin Donaldson asked we agendize to clarify.  
Page 15 – Last sentence is not correct in her recollection (setbacks west of Valencia = 5-15', east of Valencia = more than 15'? (Paul Franz, Suzanne Perkins and Nancy Kimsey recall differently than the rest of the group). Agendize to clarify.  
Landscape Plan required for all except SF dwelling. Don't we want to require for any development on Lillie? Shouldn't this be required for the entire C-1 zone?  
Page 21 – Privacy & Views – There is minimal description of the definition of a view (add “existing” views).  
Page 41 – Guideline 5.27 – Add language on hours of operation for garage doors, or reference LUDC.  
Page 9 – Asks “neighbor concerns” be respected. Noted all SunPAC members should also respect other member's concerns.

**Suzanne Perkins:**

Page 15 – Is unclear on setbacks for east of Valencia.  
Page 17 – Philosophical question: Add language on landscaping *maintenance*? (Shaunn Mendrin noted this would reside in LUDC as a requirement. We can add to list of LUDC amendments.)  
Page 23 – Privacy and Views – Need to tread lightly. Public versus private requires involvement of County Counsel and Board of Supervisors. Problem with definitions and enforcement. Robin Donaldson asked the item be agendized again.  
Gateways: Need a roundabout at Padaro Lane and Via Real. Will discuss more during Circulation Element update (Phase III).  
Page 25 – “Primary mass of building” should not be parallel to the street. Needs to be broken up on some blocks otherwise will appear too boxy and won't promote the desired village quality.  
Page 35 – Need a better “Contemporary” style example. (Shaunn Mendrin noted this is just a placeholder.)  
Remodels should require curb, gutter, sidewalk and utility undergrounding (need to come up with a monetary figure to trigger this work).

**Robin Donaldson:**

Page 32 – Architectural Styles – concerned about interpretation. It should be okay to make a distinction between new and historical, and reference to Secretary of the Interior's guidelines here (refer to Chapter 8).  
Design Review Process: Add language that non-architects are not legally permitted to present plans to SBAR. CA law states plans must be brought forward by a licensed architect.

Landscape Architect: Should be required for projects in C-1.

**Jennifer Fairbanks:**

Page 25 – Primary mass of building should not be parallel with the street (see Suzanne Perkins' comment above).

Architectural Styles: Is Spanish creeping into the residential? It's not encouraged.

**Public Comment:**

1. Mr. Blair **Whitney** commented that story poles are important, and they should be altered to reflect any approved modifications to pending projects. He noted any changes made to floor area ratio (FAR) calculations or allowances may affect the 50% allowance on the east/west portions of abandoned rights-of-way on purchased property and suggested this be kept as is. He commented the SunPAC should take a field trip and walk down Lillie Avenue and Varley Street to visually assess the dozen or so properties with development potential. He said a landscape architect should be involved with any landscaping on Lillie, which should be enforced by the County. He further stated there should not be differentiation between east/west of Valencia Street as all of the area is in the C-1 Zone and thus should be treated the same. On the subject of views, Mr. Whitney stated a project applicant should be required to take photos of the project site prior to performing any demolition in order for the BAR to assess "existing" views. Lastly, he noted it would be useful for the County to establish an email listserv to automatically notify interested parties of upcoming BAR hearings.
2. Mr. Chris **Roberts** commented that while views need to be protected, some balance is important. He noted the City of Valencia has handled the protection of views by stipulating if a certain percentage of a view is obstructed, landscape removal is required. He explained the bike trail in Summerland is important, and bicycle access to the community should be retained and enhanced. He suggested the need to address the historic character of Summerland, proper landscaping for hillside areas that have unstable plastic soil, and guidelines for enhancing the natural environment like the creek by Greenwell Avenue. He noted he would forward these notes to Chair Robin **Donaldson**.
3. A Summerland resident commented there should be an ordinance for stop signs or traffic calming along Lillie and Padaro because of excessive speeding in these areas.

Chair **Donaldson** identified the following comments on the "Working Draft" require further discussion and consensus by the SunPAC:

- Private versus Public Views.
- Descriptive language of the difference between east versus west of Valencia Street to add to the Draft Commercial Design Guidelines.
- Clarification on setbacks for areas east versus west of Valencia Street previously voted on by the SunPAC at the March 19, 2008 and March 31, 2008 SunPAC meetings.
- Floor area ratio (FAR), plate height, basements and building height discussion will continue through this meeting and the next on June 4, 2008. (The outcome will be incorporated into the Draft Commercial Design Guidelines.)

7. Staff Member Mendrin led a PowerPoint presentation on the discussion items continued from the prior SunPAC meeting concerning basements, plate height, building height and floor area ratio (FAR).

**Action:** SunPAC Member **Franz** made a motion to approve a new definition for floor area ratio (FAR) and a new definition and exclusions for basements for Summerland, as amended below. SunPAC Member **Perkins** seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried 11-0.

- Floor Area Ratio – Summerland: A measurement of development intensity represented by the quotient of net floor area divided by net lot area.
  - o Exclusions:
    - Parking located within, or portion thereof, a basement (see Figure X-Basement Illustration),
    - 100% of a true basement with no more than 18 inches above the finished grade of the building footprint to be used for storage-accessory and/or mechanical for a one story structure, OR
    - 50% of a true basement with no more than 18 inches above the finished grade of the building footprint to be used for storage-accessory and/or mechanical for a two story structure.
- Basement – Summerland: A basement shall be counted as a story if its floor-to-ceiling height is 6.5 feet or more, and the finished floor directly above is no more than 4 feet above the finished grade.
  - o Additional Building Height Guideline:
    - 4.3 – “Basements should be cut or dug into the existing grade. The use of excessive fill to qualify a portion of a structure is discouraged.”

**Action:** Chair **Donaldson** moved to remove the current 9 foot plate height requirement (which results in an incremental FAR penalty if exceeded) and accept Staff's recommendation to make plate height a guideline since the mass, bulk and scale of the building is already controlled through floor area ratio (FAR) and building height requirements. Further, the Design Guideline #4.4 will be amended as follows and reference to 12 foot plates being “encouraged” will be struck:

“Commercial first floor space should provide a taller plate height. The second floor plate should generally be less than the first floor.”

SunPAC Member **Woolpert** seconded. The motion carried 10-1 with SunPAC Member **Evans** opposed.

**Action:** SunPAC Member **Franz** made a motion to maintain the existing floor area ratio (FAR) allowances but with the provision that a formula be applied to adjust the existing FAR percentages to retain the current development envelopes, ensuring the existing character of Summerland is retained. The FAR modification would be recalculated based on the new methodology for calculating the floor area and other adopted changes such as plate height. SunPAC Member **Woolpert** seconded. All voted in favor with the exception of SunPAC members **Perkins** and **Kimsey**. Motion

carried 9-2. Chair **Donaldson** noted the floor area ratio (FAR) and height discussion would continue to the next SunPAC meeting on June 4, 2008.

8. **Adjournment:** Chair **Donaldson** moved to adjourn the meeting. SunPAC Member **Perkins** seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried 11-0. Meeting adjourned at 9:36pm.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, June 4, 2008, 6:00pm  
123 East Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara  
Board of Supervisors Hearing Room, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor

**Topic:** Finalize Discussion of Commercial Design Guidelines

**Minutes Approved:**

---

Robin Donaldson III, Chair

G:\GROUP\COMP\Planning Areas\Summerland\2007 Summerland LRP Effort\Summerland PAC\SunPAC Meeting Information\1-Meetings & Agenda's for Commercial Design Guidelines\8-Meeting 8\Minutes\5-7-08 Draft Minutes.doc