

ATTACHMENT 4

General Plan Consistency Analysis

**MARRIOTT RESIDENCE INN and HOLLISTER CENTER
GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS
07-007-OA, - DP,-TPM; 07-167-DP AM**

Land Use Element

Policy LU 1.4 Employment Centers. [GP] - Existing developed office and industrial areas shall be preserved and protected to continue their role of providing employment opportunities for the community. A mix of industries and economic activities is encouraged in order to provide a wide range of employment opportunities and wage levels and to avoid over reliance on any one economic sector.

Consistent. The proposed project would not remove nearby research and development and office uses, but would provide a differentiated land use compatible with Hollister Avenue corridor businesses. The hotel would also provide a range of economic activity to the City. Therefore, the proposed project is considered consistent with this policy.

Policy LU 1.8 New Development and Neighborhood Compatibility [GP/CP]—
Approvals of all new development shall require compatibility with the character of existing development in the immediate area, including size, bulk, scale, and height. New development shall not substantially impair or block important viewsheds and scenic vistas, as set forth in the Visual and Historical Resources Element.

Consistent. This policy is intended to ensure that new development is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The bulk, mass, and scale of the project would fit with the surrounding business park and office developments along Hollister Avenue, as opined by the Design Review Board following installation of story poles in June 2008. The height of the building would remain an average of 35 feet, but would include several roof peaks with heights from 39 – 40.4 feet. While the project would result in some viewshed interruption from Hollister Avenue, such aesthetic impacts would not be a continuous block of the viewshed, given roofline variations proposed. These factors, in addition to the discussion and recommendation for good cause findings provided in the discussion regarding Land Use Element Policy 4.2 and Table 2-3, and further DRB review, as well as conditions of approval, would make the proposed project consistent with this policy.

Policy LU 1.9 Quality Design in the Built Environment. [GP/CP] — The City shall encourage quality site, architectural, and landscape design in all new development proposals. Development proposals shall include coordinated site planning, circulation, and design. Public and/or common open spaces with quality

visual environments shall be included to create attractive community gathering areas with a sense of place and scale

Consistent. The design of the project includes architecturally innovative features and landscaping deemed appropriate by the DRB. Sidewalks along the project frontages on Hollister Avenue, and attractive landscaping along all three site frontages would provide quality development on this visible corner of the City. The revision of the project to create a landscape garden at the southeast corner of the hotel site will provide a quality visual open space area along Hollister Avenue. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with this policy.

LU 1.13 Adequate Infrastructure and Services. [GP/CP] — *For health, safety, and general welfare reasons, approvals of new development shall be subject to a finding that adequate infrastructure and services will be available to serve the proposed development in accordance with the Public Facilities and Transportation Elements.*

Consistent. The proposed project would add traffic to the Robin Hill Road/Hollister Avenue intersection that would be considered significant in the cumulative buildout scenario. However, restriping of this approach to provide for left and right turns onto Hollister Avenue, as conditioned by Community Services Department, as well as payment of traffic mitigation fees would offset this traffic impact. The project would also install a temporary sewer holding tank per direction of Goleta Sanitary District, until such time as the GSD relocates a sewer lift station to serve the project site (currently under design and anticipated to be on line in January 2009). All other utility service providers have provided letters indicating that such services are available for the development. Therefore, the proposed project as conditioned would be consistent with this policy.

LU 4.2 Business Park I-BP. [GP/CP] *This use designation is intended to identify lands for attractive, well-designed business parks that provide employment opportunities to the community and surrounding area. The intensity, design, and landscaping of development should be consistent with the character of existing development currently located in these areas. Uses in the Business Park designation may include a wide variety of research and development, light industrial, and office uses, as well as small-scale commercial uses that serve the needs of business park employees. In addition, lands designated with a Hotel Overlay may include transient lodging that emphasizes extended stays, as set forth in LU 1.12. The maximum recommended FAR set forth in Table 2-3 is increased from 0.4 to 0.5 for hotel uses. Activities in business park areas shall be conducted primarily indoors, and outdoor storage, processing, manufacturing, and vehicle repair are prohibited.*

Performance standards for Business Park uses shall ensure that:

- a. The scale and design of these uses are compatible with each other and with the existing character of the park and surrounding neighborhoods.
- b. Lighting from these uses will not interfere or conflict with adjacent nonindustrial properties.
- c. Signage will be controlled.
- d. Curb cuts will be minimized and sharing of access encouraged.
- e. Adequate and safe motorized and nonmotorized access to the site is provided, and transportation and circulation impacts, especially on residential areas, will be mitigated.
- f. Quality landscaping, including outdoor seating areas, will be provided to enhance the visual appeal of the area.

LAND USE ELEMENT, TABLE 2-3:

**TABLE 2-3
ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR OFFICE AND
INDUSTRIAL USE CATEGORIES**

Allowed Uses and Standards	Office and Industrial Use Categories			
	I-BP	I-OI	I-S	I-G
Industrial (Manufacturing)				
General Manufacturing – No Noxious Impacts	X	–	X	X
General Manufacturing – Potential Noxious Impacts	–	–	–	X
Research and Development	X	X	–	X
Scientific and Similar Instruments	X	X	–	X
Bio-Medical Technology	X	X	–	X
Other Advanced Technology	X	X	–	X
Transportation and Utilities				
Transportation (other than right-of-way)	–	–	X	X
Wireless Communications/Telecommunications	X	X	X	X
Utilities	X	X	–	–
Retail Trade				
Building/Landscape Materials and Equipment	–	X	–	X
Eating and Drinking Establishments	X	X	–	–
Other Retail Trade Establishments	X	X	–	–
Services (Including Offices)				
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	X	X	–	–
Personal Services	X	X	–	–
Business Services	X	X	–	–
Information Technology Services	X	X	–	–
Professional Services	–	X	–	–
Medical and Health-Related Services	–	X	–	–
Educational Services	–	X	–	–
Entertainment and Recreation Services	–	X	–	–
Building and Construction Services	–	–	X	X
Other Services	–	–	X	X
Auto-Related Uses				
Automotive Sales and Rentals	–	–	X	X
Auto Repair and Painting	–	–	X	X
Auto Wrecking Yard/Junk Yard	–	–	X	X
Auto Service (Gas) Station	–	–	–	X
Wholesale Trade and Storage				
General Wholesale Trade	–	–	X	X

Allowed Uses and Standards	Office and Industrial Use Categories			
	I-BP	I-OI	I-S	I-G
Warehousing – General	X *	–	X	X
Warehousing – Self-Storage	–	–	X	X
Outdoor Storage	–	–	X	X
Residential Uses				
Residential Units	–	X	–	–
One Caretaker Unit Per Parcel	X	X	X	X
Assisted-Living Residential Units	–	X	–	–
Other Uses				
Public and Quasi-public Uses	X	X	X	X
Religious Institutions	–	X	–	–
Standards for Density and Building Intensity				
Recommended Standards for Density				
Maximum Residential Density	N/A	20units/acre	N/A	N/A
Recommended Standards for Building Intensity				
Maximum FAR	0.40	0.40	0.60	0.30
Maximum FAR for Hotels (with Hotel Overlay)	0.50	0.50	N/A	N/A
Maximum Structure Heights	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	0.35	0.40	N/A	N/A
Minimum Open Space/Landscaping Ratio	0.30	0.10	0.10	0.10
Minimum Lot Size	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Notes:				
1. Use Categories: I-BP – Business Park; I-OI – Office and Institutional; I-S – Service Industrial; I-G – General Industrial.				
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; - indicates use not allowed.				
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.				
4. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.				
5. N/A = Not applicable.				
* “Warehousing is allowed on parcels designated Business Park (I-BP) if it’s in association with a permitted use.				

Consistent (Policy LU 4.2 and Table 2-3). The subject property has a hotel overlay designation in the City’s Land Use Element, making the Marriott Residence Inn project consistent as a provider for extended stay visitors. While the proposed project FAR of 0.61 is greater than that recommended Land Use Element Table 2-3, and certain roof gables are 39 – 40.4 feet at their highest point, beyond the recommended 35 feet, these exceptions are reasonable and consistent with the base zone district of M-RP. For such exceptions to be granted, a good cause finding must be made, per the GP/CLUP Glossary, if the exception is:

“defined as a better site or architectural design, will result in better resource protection, will provide a significant community benefit and/or does not create an adverse impact to the community character, aesthetics or public views.

This good cause finding can be made based on

- a. The supportive comments received from the City DRB for the overall building configuration and size, bulk and scale, and

- revisions that relocated a portion of the structure to the northwest corner;
- b. While the roof height will be higher than the 35 feet recommended in Table 2-3, the additional approximately 4-5.4 feet to the highest point of the 3 roof peaks would not cause the average roof height to exceed 35 feet, which is allowed by the zoning ordinance.
 - c. Because they are not continuous, the roof peaks do not create a uniform adverse impact to the community character, aesthetics, or public views.

The scale and design of the Marriott Residence Inn would be set back from Hollister Avenue consistently with nearby developments. It would also share one driveway from Hollister Avenue with the existing multi-tenant light industrial facility at 6300 Hollister Avenue. These project components and conditions of approval for the development would make the project consistent with this policy.

Open Space Element

OS 8.3 Preservation. [GP/CP] *The City shall protect and preserve cultural resources from destruction. The preferred method for preserving a recorded archeological site shall be by preservation in place to maintain the relationship between the artifacts and the archaeological context. Preservation in place may be accomplished by deed restriction as a permanent conservation easement, avoidance through site planning and design, or incorporation of sites into other open spaces to prevent any future development or use that might otherwise adversely impact these resources.*

OS 8.4 Evaluation of Significance. [GP/CP] *For any development proposal identified as being located in an area of archaeological sensitivity, a Phase I cultural resources inventory shall be conducted by a professional archaeologist or other qualified expert. All sites determined through a Phase 1 investigation to potentially include cultural resources must undergo subsurface investigation to determine the extent, integrity, and significance of the site. Where Native American artifacts have been found or where oral traditions indicate the site was used by Native Americans in the past, research shall be conducted to determine the extent of the archaeological significance of the site.*

Consistent (Policy OS 8.3 and 8.4). The project site had a Phase II analysis prepared for prior development of the site associated with the Burroughs plant expansion in 1979. A Supplemental Extended Phase 1 analysis was undertaken in June 2008 to address the project specific effects of the Marriott Residence Inn near the CA-SB- 58. Review of that analysis, as well as prior documentation of the CA-SBA-58 site extant near the proposed project, and inclusion of required conditions that call for extensive documentation and monitoring would make the project consistent with this policy.

OS 8.5 Mitigation. [GP/CP] *If research and surface reconnaissance shows that the project area contains a resource of cultural significance that would be adversely impacted by proposed development and avoidance is infeasible, mitigation measures sensitive to the cultural beliefs of the affected population shall be required. Reasonable efforts to leave these resources in an undisturbed state through capping or covering resources with a soil layer prior to development shall be required. If data recovery through excavation is the only feasible mitigation, the City shall confer with the affected Native American nation or most-likely descendants, as well as agencies charged with the responsibility of preserving these resources and organizations having a professional or cultural interest, prior to the removal and disposition of any artifacts.*

OS 8.6 Monitoring and Discovery. [GP/CP] *On-site monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and appropriate Native American observer shall be required for all grading, excavation, and site preparation that involves earth moving operations on sites identified as archaeologically sensitive. If cultural resources of potential importance are uncovered during construction, the following shall occur:*

- a. The grading or excavation shall cease and the City shall be notified.*
- b. A qualified archeologist shall prepare a report assessing the significance of the find and provide recommendations regarding appropriate disposition.*
- c. Disposition will be determined by the City in conjunction with the affected Native American nation.*

Consistent (Policy OS 8.5 – 8.6). As noted above, the prior documentation of CA-SBA-58 and the 1979 Burroughs Phase II analysis, and a June 2008 Supplemental Extended Phase 1 analysis was prepared by Dudek. Data recovery completed during the June 2008 study was discussed in advance at extensive meetings with interested members of the Native American Chumash community, as were the results of the study and suggested mitigation measures. Additionally, all work of the June 2008 Supplemental Extended Phase 1, including hand excavation of 20 shovel test pits, 6 backhoe trenches and 13 mechanical solid core borings, was monitored by a Chumash most likely descendent on site during the field work. Likewise, mitigation measures included for the project will require that Chumash MLD monitors be present during all excavation of pilings within the newly discovered extent of Locus 1, as well as other grading activity on site. As revised, construction of the project would affect approximately 12 percent of the intact CA-SBA-58 deposit, which is considered a worst case estimate as the Locus 1 soils identified were not continuous and have been previously disturbed. Therefore, this completion of investigative work, as well as the monitoring by MLD's during such work, and anticipated monitoring of future work as required in project conditions of approval, would provide consistency with these policies.

OS 8.7 Protection of Paleontological Resources. [GP/CP] *Should substantial paleontological resources be encountered during construction activities, all work that could further disturb the find shall be stopped and the City of Goleta shall be notified within 24 hours. The applicant shall retain a qualified consultant to prepare a report to the City that evaluates the significance of the find and, if warranted, identifies recovery measures. Upon review and approval of the report by the City, construction may continue after implementation of any identified recovery measures.*

Consistent. Geological formations underlying the project site have been evaluated during soils engineering testing. These formations indicate one-third of the soils are associated with the former Goleta Slough, and below these are located Quaternary age alluvial sediments. While small marine fossils such as clams or invertebrates (snails, worms, etc) can be found in such deposits, these are common and not potentially significant paleontological resources. Therefore, as conditioned, the project would be consistent with this policy.

Conservation Element

CE 1.9 Standards Applicable to Development Projects. [GP/CP] *The following standards shall apply to consideration of developments within or adjacent to ESHAs:*

- d. All new development shall be sited and designed so as to minimize grading, alteration of natural landforms and physical features, and vegetation clearance in order to reduce or avoid soil erosion, creek siltation, increased runoff, and reduced infiltration of stormwater and to prevent net increases in baseline flows for any receiving water body.*
- j. In areas that are not adjacent to ESHAs, where grading may be allowed during the rainy season, erosion control measures such as sediment basins, silt fencing, sandbagging, and installation of geofabrics shall be implemented prior to and concurrent with all grading operations.*

Consistent. The proposed hotel project has been designed to minimize excavation (500 cubic yards) through use of a pile supported foundation system. While the proposed fill soil will total 17,300 cubic yards, conditions of approval require an erosion control plan that would ensure implementation of best management practices to minimize soil erosion, creek siltation and runoff. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.

CE 10.2 Siting and Design of New Development. [GP/CP] *New development shall be sited and designed to protect water quality and minimize impacts to coastal waters by incorporating measures designed to ensure the following:*

- a. *Protection of areas that provide important water quality benefits, areas necessary to maintain riparian and aquatic biota, and areas susceptible to erosion and sediment loss.*
- b. *Limiting increases in areas covered by impervious surfaces.*
- c. *Limiting the area where land disturbances occur, such as clearing of vegetation, cut-and-fill, and grading, to reduce erosion and sediment loss.*
- d. *Limiting disturbance of natural drainage features and vegetation.*

Consistent. Project design includes a series of bioswales, a detention basin in the southwest corner, and would use best management practices during construction to minimize runoff to offsite water resources such as Goleta Slough. Therefore, the project would be consistent with these policies.

CE 10.3 *Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management [GP/CP]:* New development shall be designed to minimize impacts to water quality from increased runoff volumes and discharges of pollutants from non-point sources to the maximum extent feasible consistent with the requirements and standards of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. Post construction structural BMPs shall be designed to treat, infiltrate, or filter stormwater runoff in accordance with the City's Stormwater Management Program. Examples of BMPs include the following:

- a. Retention and detention basins;
- b. Vegetated swales;
- c. Infiltration galleries or injection wells;
- d. Use of permeable paving materials;
- e. Mechanical devices such as oil-water separators and filters;
- f. Revegetation of graded or disturbed areas.
- g. Other measures that are promoted by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and those described in the BMP report of the Bay Area Association of Stormwater Management Agencies.

CE 10.6 *Stormwater Management Requirements. [GP/CP]* *The following requirements shall apply to specific types of development:*

- a. *Commercial and multiple-family development shall use BMPs to control polluted runoff from structures, parking, and loading areas.*

Consistent (Policy CE 10.3 and 10.6): The project design includes a series of bioswales for the project, as well as a retention basin in the southwest corner of the hotel site that would manage post construction site drainage. Based on an updated hydrology report prepared by Penfield & Smith (July 23, 2008), the volume of water to be discharged from the site would actually decrease from 42.48 cubic feet per second (cfs) for existing conditions to 39.60 cfs upon project completion. This reduction is attributable to the installation of a detention basin located at the southeast corner of Parcel 2, extensive bioswales and permeable paving solutions, and such use of best management practices to manage site runoff during construction would make the project consistent with this policy.

Safety Element

SE 1.3 Site-Specific Hazards Studies [GP/CP]—*Applications for new development shall consider exposure of the new development to coastal and other hazards. Where appropriate, an application for new development shall include a geologic/soils/geotechnical study and any other studies that identify geologic hazards affecting the proposed project site and any necessary mitigation measures. The study report shall contain a statement certifying that the project site is suitable for the proposed development and that the development will be safe from geologic hazards. The report shall be prepared and signed by a licensed certified engineering geologist or geotechnical engineer and shall be subject to review and acceptance by the City.*

Consistent. A geotechnical report, hazardous materials report and preliminary drainage report were submitted with the project application. Site soils were noted in this report to have a combination of soft clay, silty sand and peat underlying the site to a depth of approximately 23 feet and hard solid at a depth of 35 to 47 feet. The soil and geologic conditions onsite pose a risk with respect to lateral spreading, subsidence and liquefaction (Ronald J. Pike, Geotechnical Engineer, January 30, 2007). To address these conditions, the project includes a structural system supported by piles driven to a minimum depth of 60 feet below existing grade. The site is also currently undergoing remediation, with contaminant levels last evaluated in February 2008, when they were lower than prior assessments. Per its March 2008 letter, the County Fire Department, Hazardous Materials Unit, has required installation of a soil vapor barrier, and will review the need for any follow up monitoring as the project moves into construction. With incorporation of these conditions, the project is consistent with this policy.

SE 6.2 Areas Subject to Local Urban Flooding. [GP] *In addition to flood hazard areas shown on the FIRM maps, the City may require applications for new or expanded development in areas with known persistent local urban flooding to include measures that lessen the urban flooding hazard and/or that mitigate its effects on the proposed development. This requirement shall apply to*

flooding on any street or roadway that provides access to the proposed development.

SE 6.4 Avoidance of Flood Hazard Areas [GP/CP]—*The City shall discourage any new intensive development in any flood hazard area. Similarly, the City shall require appropriate flood mitigation for intensification of existing development in any flood-prone area. The City shall not approve development within areas designated as the 100-year floodplain that would obstruct flood flow (such as construction in the designated floodway), displace floodwaters onto other property, or be subject to flood damage. The City shall not allow development that will create or worsen drainage problems.*

Consistent (Policy SE 6.2 and 6.4): These policies are intended to reduce the risk of flooding and prevent the obstruction of any floodway. The proposed project is located entirely within the 100-year flood plain, and requires a finished floor level of 18.0 or greater above MSL (mean sea level), based on revised datum from the Flood Control District that show a base flood elevation (BFE) of 16.0 for the hotel site (corrected from prior plans noted in the environmental document). Revised project plans (March 2008) indicate the finished floor of the hotel would be at 18.3 feet MSL, consistent with the BFE requirements for the site. Additionally, the project design includes a series of bioswales, a detention basin in the southwest corner, and would use best management practices during construction to minimize runoff to offsite water resources such as Goleta Slough. Therefore, as conditioned, the proposed project would be consistent with these policies.

SE 7.2 Review of New Development. [GP/CP] *Applications for new or expanded development shall be reviewed by appropriate Santa Barbara County Fire Department personnel to ensure they are designed in a manner that reduces the risk of loss due to fire. Such review shall include consideration of the adequacy of “defensible space” around structures at risk; access for fire suppression equipment, water supplies, construction standards; and vegetation clearance. Secondary access may be required and shall be considered on a case-by-case basis. The City shall encourage built-in fire suppression systems such as sprinklers, particularly in high-risk or high-value areas.*

Consistent. This policy is intended to ensure adequate fire protection infrastructure is incorporated into the design of new development. Specifically, all such new development must have secondary emergency vehicle access. The project plans and circulation for emergency equipment through drive aisles has been reviewed and conceptually approved by the County Fire Department. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with this policy.

SE 9.2 Height Restrictions. [GP] *The City shall ensure that the heights of proposed buildings, other structures, and landscaping conform to airport*

operational requirements to minimize the risk of aircraft accidents. The City shall establish and maintain standards in its zoning ordinance for building and structure height restrictions for development in proximity to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. To ensure compliance with height restrictions, proposed development or uses that require Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review pursuant to the Airport Land Use Plan shall be referred to the ALUC for review.

Consistent. Parcel 1 is within the Clear and Approach Zones to the Airport, but proposed Parcel 2 is outside this zone, and this is the portion of the site proposed for new development. Therefore, the building height proposed with the Development Plan to allow the hotel to be 39 – 40.4 feet from the proposed grade to the top of the roof ridge lines, would be consistent with this policy.

SE 10.6 Responsibility for Cleanup by Responsible Party. [GP] *No new development or substantial redevelopment shall be permitted on land determined to contain actionable contamination until the party responsible for such contamination has been identified and has accepted financial responsibility for any required remediation. The posting of a bond or other appropriate surety in an amount and form acceptable to the City shall be required as a condition of development approval. In appropriate circumstances, the City may assist in attempting to obtain outside grants or other resources to address contamination issues and help fund remediation.*

Consistent: As confirmed by the Santa Barbara County Fire Prevention Division, the landowner is currently considered the responsible party for monitoring soils and groundwater remediation of the site. This effort will continue to be monitored per the County Fire Prevention Division letter of March 2008, which also calls for installation of a soil vapor barrier and protections to workers during construction. Therefore, with these conditions, the project would be consistent with this policy.

Visual & Historic Resources Element

VH 1.1 Scenic Resources [GP/CP]—*An essential aspect of Goleta’s character is derived from the various scenic resources within and around the city. Views of these resources from public and private areas contribute to the overall attractiveness of the city and the quality of life enjoyed by its residents, visitors, and workforce. The City shall support the protection and preservation of the following scenic resources:*

- a. *The open waters of the Pacific Ocean/Santa Barbara Channel, with the Channel Islands visible in the distance.*
- b. *Goleta’s Pacific shoreline, including beaches, dunes, lagoons, coastal bluffs, and open costal mesas.*
- c. *Goleta and Devereux Sloughs.*

- d. Creeks and the vegetation associated with their riparian corridors.
- e. Agricultural areas, including orchards, lands in vegetable or other crop production, and fallow agricultural lands.
- f. Lake Los Carneros and the surrounding woodlands.
- g. Prominent natural landforms, such as the foothills and the Santa Ynez Mountains.

VH 1.4 Protection of Mountain and Foothill Views [GP/CP]—Views of mountains and foothills from public areas shall be preserved. View preservation associated with development that may affect views of mountains or foothills should be accomplished first through site selection and then by use of design alternatives that enhance, rather than obstruct or degrade, such views. To minimize structural intrusion into the skyline, the following development practices shall be used where appropriate:

- a. Limitations on the height and size of structures.
- b. Limitations on the height of exterior walls (including retaining walls) and fences.
- c. Stepping of buildings so that the heights of building elements are lower near the street and increase with distance from the public viewing area. Increased setbacks along major roadways to preserve views and create an attractive visual corridor.
- d. Downcast, fully shielded, full cut off lighting of the minimum intensity needed for the purpose.
- e. Limitations on removal of native vegetation.
- f. Use of landscaping for screening purposes and/or minimizing view blockage as applicable.
- g. Revegetation of disturbed areas.
- h. Limitations on the use of reflective materials and colors for roofs, walls (including retaining walls), and fences.
- i. Selection of colors and materials that harmonize with the surrounding landscape.
- j. Clustering of building sites and structures.

Consistent (Policies VH 1.1 and 1.4). These policies are intended to protect the City's scenic resources as defined in Policy VH 1.1 of the General Plan, public views of the mountains and foothills, public views of open space, and natural landforms. The project would not affect views of the Goleta Slough, but would interrupt mountain views from Hollister Avenue for the majority of the project site. The project design has varied roof heights, but includes an average roof height of 35 feet with some roof peaks as high as 40.4 feet,

which could appear higher due to the required soil fill on site. As a result of DRB comments in 2007, the project design was modified to “stair step” the elevation of the southwest corner, use vertical tower and horizontal banding accents, and redesign the entry arches. At the June 10, 2008 DRB meeting, following the installation of story poles to demonstrate the proposed building height and mass, the Board expressed appreciation for the relocated corner of the building, away from Hollister Avenue, and noted that the height was still a concern, but overall the project would fit into the surrounding area. Therefore, with implementation of further DRB review and related conditions of approval requiring a surveyed building height, the proposed project would be considered consistent with these policies.

VH 2.3 Development Projects Along Scenic Corridors [GP]—Development adjacent to scenic corridors should not degrade or obstruct views of scenic areas. To ensure visual compatibility with the scenic qualities, the following practices shall be used, where appropriate:

- a. Incorporate natural features in design.
- b. Use landscaping for screening purposes and/or for minimizing view blockage as applicable.
- c. Minimize vegetation removal.
- d. Limit the height and size of structures.
- e. Cluster building sites and structures.
- f. Limit grading for development including structures, access roads, and driveways. Minimize the length of access roads and driveways and follow the natural contour of the land.
- g. Preserve historical structures or sites.
- h. Plant and preserve trees.
- i. Minimize use of signage.
- j. Provide site-specific visual assessments, including use of story poles.
- k. Provide a similar level of architectural detail on all elevations visible from scenic corridors.
- l. Place existing overhead utilities and all new utilities underground.
- m. Establish setbacks along major roadways to help protect views and create an attractive scenic corridor. On flat sites, step the heights of buildings so that the height of building elements is lower close to the street and increases with distance from the street.

Consistent. This policy is intended to ensure that new development adjacent to designated scenic corridors does not obstruct or degrade public views of scenic resources as seen from these view corridors. The project will continue DRB review prior to land use permits, and further refinement of the

building massing, landscape plan, articulation of façade walls and variable recesses and roof heights may result. The project revision that relocated a portion of the structure to the northwest corner improved the project's consistency with this policy. While the project site is directly visible from Hollister Avenue, a scenic corridor in the General Plan, it would not block a continuous view from Hollister Avenue as this area is already developed with lower structures over which mountain views remain. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with this policy with conditions of approval.

VH 3.1 Community Design Character [GP]—*The visual character of Goleta is derived from the natural landscape and the built environment. The City's agricultural heritage, open spaces, views of natural features, established low-density residential neighborhoods, and small-scale development with few visually prominent buildings contribute to this character. Residential, commercial, and industrial development should acknowledge and respect the desired aspects of Goleta's visual character and make a positive contribution to the city through exemplary design.*

VH 3.2 Neighborhood Identity [GP]—*The unique qualities and character of each neighborhood shall be preserved and strengthened. Neighborhood context and scale shall be maintained. New development shall be compatible with existing architectural styles of adjacent development, except where poor quality design exists.*

VH 3.3 Site Design [GP]—*The City's visual character shall be enhanced through appropriate site design. Site plans shall provide for buildings, structures, and uses that are subordinate to the natural topography, existing vegetation, and drainage courses; adequate landscaping; adequate vehicular circulation and parking; adequate pedestrian circulation; and provision and/or maintenance of solar access.*

VH 3.4 Building Design [GP]—*The City's visual character shall be enhanced through development of structures that are appropriate in scale and orientation and that use high quality, durable materials. Structures shall incorporate architectural styles, landscaping, and amenities that are compatible with and complement surrounding development.*

Consistent (Policy 3.1 through 3.4). The intent of these policies is to ensure that new development is designed in a manner to be consistent with the City's visual character provided through views of open spaces, natural features, low density neighborhoods, and few prominent buildings and structures. The Marriott Residence Inn project is located in a neighborhood of business park uses, and would add some variety to this section of Hollister Avenue with the building height, architectural style, and varied elevation recesses. Along with the generous landscaping proposed, these

design features would make the project consistent with these policies, as conditioned.

VH 3.5 Pedestrian-Oriented Design [GP]—*The city's visual character shall be enhanced through provision of aesthetically pleasing pedestrian connections within and between neighborhoods, recreational facilities, shopping, workplaces, and other modes of transportation, including bicycles and transit.*

Consistent. This policy is intended to promote pedestrian friendly design for aesthetic reasons purposes. The project includes generous and meandering 6-foot sidewalks and adjoining landscaped parkways along Hollister Avenue, as well as a new 6-foot sidewalk along Robin Hill Road (with no frontage improvements along La Patera Lane). These features are anticipated to enhance pedestrian access in the project vicinity as a result of the new hotel. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy subject to implementation of the required conditions of approval.

VH 4.6 Industrial Areas. [GP] *The following standards shall be applicable to industrial development (see related LU 4.2):*

- a. *All structures shall be designed to be compatible with adjacent development relative to size, bulk, and scale.*
- b. *Where residential or commercial uses exist adjacent to industrial properties, such areas shall be buffered from industrial uses by increased setbacks and heavily landscaped screens.*
- c. *Transfer of noise off-site shall be minimized by the use of screen walls, acoustical enclosures, or building placement. Noise generating activities shall be located as far as possible from nonindustrial uses.*
- d. *All outdoor storage or maintenance areas shall be screened. Landscaping may be used alone or in conjunction with fencing or walls.*
- e. *Loading areas and recycling and trash facilities shall be easily accessed and screened from view with landscaping and/or fencing or walls. Adjacent uses shall be considered when siting such areas.*
- f. *Roof-mounted equipment shall be screened and considered as part of the structure for height calculations.*
- g. *Architectural detailing shall be used to break up the box-like appearance of construction typically used for industrial buildings.*
- h. *Adequate lighting shall be provided for security and safety purposes but designed to prevent encroachment onto adjacent uses, wildlife habitats, or the night sky.*
- i. *Sufficient, secure, and protected bicycle parking shall be provided.*

- j. *Public transit shall be encouraged through effective placement of stops for local and regional transit services. Existing stops shall be upgraded as appropriate.*

Consistent. The proposed project would be located in a business park area and would share access with the existing business park Hollister Center multi-tenant building to the east. The project incorporates varied elevations and heights to help it blend into the surrounding area, along with generous landscaping, and a meandering sidewalk that would help tie the two sites together. Final design for details such as roof equipment and lighting plans by the DRB would further ensure project consistency with these policies.

VH 4.7 Office Buildings, Business Parks, Institutional, and Public/Quasi-Public Uses. [GP] *The following standards shall be applicable to office and business park development and institutional and public/quasi-public uses:*

- a. *Buildings and structures shall be designed to be compatible with adjacent development relative to size, bulk, and scale.*
- b. *Street elevations of buildings and structures should enhance the streetscape and should be pedestrian friendly. To create diversity and avoid monotonous façades, varied building setbacks should be provided and be proportionate to the scale of the building.*
- c. *Plazas, courtyards, and landscaped open space should be provided to create a campus-like setting and encourage pedestrian access.*
- d. *Parking lots should not be the dominant visual element and shall be located behind or beside buildings, where appropriate. Where buildings do not screen parking lots, landscaping, berms, and/or low walls shall be used to screen cars from adjacent roadways and other developments.*
- e. *Architectural elements such as arcades are encouraged to identify the main entrance and reinforce the pedestrian scale.*
- f. *Bicycle access shall be provided and encouraged via bike lanes. Sufficient, secure, and protected bicycle parking shall be provided.*
- g. *Public transit shall be encouraged through effective placement of stops for local and regional transit services. Existing stops shall be upgraded as appropriate.*
- h. *Loading areas and recycling and trash facilities shall be easily accessed and screened from view with landscaping and/or fencing or walls. Adjacent uses shall be considered when such areas are sited.*
- i. *Roof mounted equipment shall be screened and considered as part of the structure for height calculations.*

Consistent. The Marriott Residence Inn project would be a commercial use in a business park area, allowed through the application of a Hotel Overlay district on the project site, as included in the General Plan. Therefore, specific components below address the related standards above:

- a. The project's neighborhood context among other business park developments is complemented through a site specific design for a commercial hotel;
- b. The project has been revised to incorporate varied recesses in elevations and roof heights and incorporates a meandering sidewalk;
- c. As redesigned in June and July 2008, the project includes a landscape area at the southeast corner, and canopy trees and planting throughout the parking areas surrounding the building;
- d. The landscape garden at the southeast corner and another provided to the rear of the building would provide relief of proposed parking areas, along with extensive tree and landscaping elements around the perimeter of the proposed building.
- f. Sufficient room exists on site to provide bicycle parking and access from Hollister Avenue would be direct.
- g. The project would enhance the existing stop, including provision of a bus pullout, shelter, bench, and trash can, subject to final requirements of the City of Santa Barbara.
- i. Sufficient room is available to place roof mounted equipment and screen it using proposed parapets.

As such, the architecture, site planning and detailing of the site have been created to blend the two types of land uses and development styles. Therefore, the project as conditioned would be consistent with this policy.

VH 4.9 Landscape Design [GP]—*Landscaping shall be considered and designed as an integral part of development, not relegated to remaining portions of a site following placement of buildings, parking, or vehicular access. Landscaping shall conform to the following standards:*

- a. *Landscaping that conforms to the natural topography and protects existing specimen trees is encouraged.*
- b. *Any specimen trees removed shall be replaced with a similar size tree or with a tree deemed appropriate by the City.*
- c. *Landscaping shall emphasize the use of native and drought-tolerant vegetation and should include a range and density of plantings including trees, shrubs, groundcover, and vines of various heights and species.*
- d. *The use of invasive plants shall be prohibited.*
- e. *Landscaping shall be incorporated into the design to soften building masses, reinforce pedestrian scale, and provide screening along public streets and off-street parking areas.*

Consistent. This policy establishes architectural guidelines for project design and landscaping. The revised project includes a landscape garden at the southeast corner of the site, as well as entryway and canopy trees throughout the site. The use of a native and drought tolerant plant palette would also make the project consistent with these policies as conditioned.

VH 4.10 Streetscape and Frontage Design. [GP] *A unified streetscape shall be created to improve the interface between pedestrians and vehicles. The following design elements shall be incorporated where feasible:*

- a. *Abundant street trees and landscaped medians.*
- b. *Landscaping that buffers pedestrians and bicyclists from traffic without creating site distance conflicts.*
- c. *Coordination of landscaping within the public right-of-way and adjacent development to provide an integrated street frontage.*
- d. *Provision of street furniture including benches, planter seating, trash containers, and pedestrian scale light fixtures.*
- e. *Use of pavement treatments and decorative tree wells.*
- f. *Accent planting, textured paving, and specimen trees used to establish identities at building entries.*
- g. *Traffic control and utility hardware such as backflow devices, traffic control cabinets, cable television boxes, and air vacuum and release enclosures shall be screened from view and colored to blend in with the surroundings. Such hardware should be placed outside sidewalks and away from intersections to the extent feasible.*

Consistent: The project landscape plan includes extensive new landscaping elements including generous ground cover and trees with varied heights. A majority of this landscaped area is provided around the perimeter of the proposed hotel, and along the street frontages of Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. Along with the provision of new sidewalks, these areas will enhance the pedestrian experience along the hotel project frontage. Conditions of approval also require screening of utility hardware to maintain an attractive street frontage. Therefore, with implementation of conditions of approval, the project would be consistent with this policy.

VH 4.11 Parking Lots. [GP] *Parking lots shall be adequately designed and landscaped. The following standards shall apply (see related Policy TE 9):*

- a. *Adequate parking requirements shall be established for all zone districts and conditionally permitted uses.*
- b. *Adequate parking space dimensions and aisle widths shall be established.*

- c. *Angled parking spaces are encouraged in order to maximize visibility for drivers and pedestrians. Retail parking lot design that includes 90-degree parking spaces is discouraged.*
- d. *Pedestrian circulation shall be adequate, clearly delineated, and integrated with internal vehicle circulation to allow for safe and convenient pedestrian links from parking areas to building entrances. Planting strips should be used between traffic zones and sidewalks wherever possible.*
- e. *Retail parking lots shall provide for adequate shopping cart storage that is adequately screened.*
- f. *Parking lot landscaping shall provide for adequate visual relief, screening, and shade. Adequate tree density shall be established and shall include approximately one tree for every four parking spaces. Deciduous trees in parking lots are discouraged due to the visual effects of loss of canopy.*
- g. *Parking lot lighting shall be considered relative to the selection and location of parking lot trees and their height at maturity.*
- h. *Shared parking arrangements are encouraged where neighboring uses have different peak use periods.*
- i. *Permeable parking surfaces and grass-incorporated paving systems are encouraged to reduce stormwater runoff. Water quality protection measures such as storm drain filters should be used to minimize pollutants that would result in impacts to downstream water bodies or habitat.*

Consistent: The Marriott Residence Inn would provide 129 parking spaces on site, and provide shared parking for 30 spaces next door at the Hollister Center site, 6300 Hollister Avenue. Hotel site project plans include landscaping on the perimeter of the site adjoining Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road and landscape planters within the parking bays adjacent to the hotel. Parking areas would be required to provide approximately one tree for every four parking spaces. Such elements around the building provide visual relief, screening and shade. The project would record a reciprocal access and parking agreement to create a shared parking arrangement with the adjoining Hollister Center, taking advantage of complementary peak parking demands of adjoining properties. The hotel project site plan also includes bioswales to reduce stormwater runoff. The new entry way driveway would enhance the parking lot for the Hollister Center, and remaining deficiencies of this existing development would be addressed through its Development Plan Amendment. Therefore, with the conditions of approval, the project would be deemed consistent with this policy.

VH 4.12 Lighting. [GP] *Outdoor lighting fixtures shall be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent over-lighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow. The following standards shall apply:*

- a. *Outdoor lighting shall be the minimum number of fixtures and intensity needed for the intended purpose. Fixtures shall be fully shielded and have full cut off lights to minimize visibility from public viewing areas and prevent light pollution into residential areas or other sensitive uses such as wildlife habitats or migration routes.*
- b. *Direct upward light emission shall be avoided to protect views of the night sky.*
- c. *Light fixtures used in new development shall be appropriate to the architectural style and scale and compatible with the surrounding area.*

Consistent: The hotel site would continue to be reviewed by DRB for provision of appropriate lighting standards, fixtures, and styles to minimize night sky lighting and maintain consistency with the surrounding area. Therefore, with conditions of approval, the project would be considered consistent with this policy.

VH 4.14 Utilities [GP]—*New development projects shall be required to place new utility lines underground. Existing overhead utility lines should be placed underground when feasible. Undergrounding of utility hardware is encouraged. Any aboveground utility hardware, such as water meters, electrical transformers, or backflow devices, shall not inhibit line of sight or encroach into public walkways and, where feasible, should be screened from public view by methods including, but not limited to, appropriate paint color, landscaping, and/or walls.*

Consistent. This policy requires all utilities serving new development to be undergrounded. Conditions of approval for the project require all new utility service connections to proposed Parcel 2, as well as all utility connections along Hollister Avenue, to be undergrounded. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with this policy as conditioned.

Transportation Element

TE 3.3 Major Arterials. [GP/CP] *Roads designated as major arterials are shown in Figure 7-2. The following criteria and standards shall apply to roads designated as major arterials:*

- a. Definition/Function: *Major arterials are continuous routes that carry through traffic between various neighborhoods and communities, frequently providing access to major traffic generators such as shopping areas, employment centers, recreational areas, higher-density residential areas, and places of assembly. Driveway access, especially for residential uses, to a major arterial is generally discouraged or kept to a minimum in order to facilitate traffic flows.*

b. Access to Abutting Properties. Although established patterns of development in Goleta have created driveways along most arterial segments, access to abutting properties shall be managed to maximize safety and functionality for through traffic, including but not limited to the following characteristics:

- 1) Driveways shall have sufficient width to minimize conflicts between through traffic and turning movements.
- 2) Driveways shall adhere to safe sight-distance requirements to the extent feasible.
- 3) New development abutting major and minor arterials shall accommodate safe ingress and egress without necessitating backing movements into the arterial.
- 4) Where feasible, sharing driveways with adjoining properties is encouraged, with provision of reciprocal access easements.

Where street standards cannot be fully met and access from the arterial must be approved due to the absence of any other feasible and practicable alternative, development intensity may be reduced on the site to lessen or avoid potential traffic safety hazards and vehicular conflicts.

c. Design Standards. The following standards shall apply:

- 1) A principal or major arterial may be a divided or an undivided multi-lane road, with or without center median.
- 2) The maximum number of through-travel lanes shall be two lanes in each direction except for street segments between US-101 and Hollister Avenue, where the maximum number of lanes shall be three lanes in each direction.
- 3) Lane widths and intersection geometrics shall be adequate to accommodate transit vehicles and large trucks.
- 4) Intersections of arterials with cross-routes are provided at grade, although partial control of access may occur at some locations. Intersection controls shall give priority to traffic flow on the arterial rather than the cross-route.
- 5) Major arterials shall include facilities to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles.
- 6) At a minimum, major arterials shall include curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Major arterials may include landscaped medians and/or landscaped strips between curb and sidewalk.
- 7) Parking may be provided in appropriate segments on either or both

Consistent. The project has been revised following preliminary reviews to combine one driveway along Hollister Avenue that will serve the proposed hotel and the existing Hollister Center. Additionally, frontage improvements would include curb, gutter, and sidewalk on both Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. Installation of a raised landscaped median

to allow left turns into the new driveway, but no left turns out, would be required to ensure driveway access control and the least interruption to Hollister Avenue through movements. With these improvements and based on conditions of approval, the project would be consistent with this policy.

TE 3.4 Minor Arterials. [GP] Routes designated as minor arterials are shown in Figure 7-2. The following criteria and standards apply to these roads:

- a. Definition/Function: Minor arterials serve as a secondary type of arterial facility carrying local through traffic within communities, frequently providing access to shopping areas, employment centers, recreational areas, residential areas, and places of assembly. A minor arterial may connect different neighborhood areas within the city.
- b. Design Standards: The following standards shall apply:
 - 1) A minor arterial may be a divided or an undivided multi-lane road, with or without center median.
 - 2) The number of through-travel lanes is usually one lane in each direction, although two lanes may be provided on particular segments, when warranted by traffic volumes.
 - 3) Lane widths and intersection geometrics shall be adequate to accommodate transit vehicles and large trucks.
 - 4) Intersections of arterials with cross-routes are provided at grade, although partial control of access may occur at some locations. Intersection controls shall give priority to traffic flow on the minor arterial rather than the cross-route, except where the cross-route is a major arterial.
 - 5) Minor arterials shall include facilities to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles.
 - 6) At a minimum, minor arterials shall include curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Minor arterials may include landscaped medians and/or landscaped strips between curb and sidewalk.
 - 7) Parking may be required in appropriate segments on either or both sides of the street.

Consistent. The Hollister Center portion of the project is located along La Patera, designated a minor arterial on Figure 7-2. The project is not expected to affect La Patera Lane as new development of the hotel would concentrate vehicular access at the new driveways on Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. La Patera Lane currently meets most of the standards in this policy, and so the project would be consistent with this policy.

TE 3.6 Local Streets and Roads. [GP/CP] All roads not specifically designated in another category shall be classified as local streets and rural roads as shown

in Figure 7-2. The following criteria and standards apply to local streets and roads:

- a. Definition/Function. A local street provides access to abutting individual properties and links such properties and their uses to a collector street. City street standards shall ensure that local streets provide access to abutting properties and should include a variety of designs and spacing, depending on access needs. Local streets are intended to serve only adjacent uses and are intended to protect residents from the impacts of through traffic.
- b. Design Standards. The following standards shall apply:
 - 1) Local streets and roads shall be designed in a manner consistent with the character of the adjacent neighborhood and uses and any physical and environmental constraints.
 - 2) In appropriate segments, full urban street standards shall be required, including curb, gutter, and sidewalks on both sides of the street. Bicycle lanes should be provided if the street is designated as a Class 2 bicycle route in the City's Bicycle Transportation Plan.
 - 3) City street standards should encourage residential access points to be located on the least traveled roadway wherever there is an option.
 - 4) Parking may be required in appropriate segments on either or both sides of the street.
- c. Other. New multi-family residential and commercial development should not have primary access on local streets, except where there is no feasible alternative.
- d. Traffic Calming. The City shall emphasize the use of local streets for local access and residential traffic in order to minimize traffic noise, congestion, and other hazards to residential uses and pedestrians. Through traffic may be discouraged by a variety of methods, such as installation of traffic calming devices, provided there is involvement and support from the immediate neighborhood.

Consistent: Robin Hill Road is designated a local road in the Transportation Element. As required by the Community Services Department, frontage improvements along Robin Hill Road would include a sidewalk, parkway, and curb and gutter, along with repaving and a street light. With these improvements, the project would be consistent with this policy.

TE 3.9 Right-of-Way Dedications and Improvements. [GP/CP] Existing and future rights-of-way may vary along different segments of individual streets within a single functional classification, based upon the existing patterns of development along the various segments. The appropriate street cross section, frontage improvements, and right-of-way dedications shall be established by the City Engineer when imposing conditions of approval for development applications

on abutting parcels. Dedications of right-of-way may be greater in locations where it is appropriate to secure space for utilities, street appurtenances, transit facilities, and landscaped areas.

Consistent. The project includes new sidewalks, parkways, curb, gutter and repaving along both Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. Additionally, the project will install a new center median that would allow only left turn in/no left turn out access from Hollister Avenue. The project has incorporated dedication of ROW for such improvements, and provided reciprocal access agreements for a shared driveway with 6300 Hollister Avenue, as required in the project conditions of approval. With these improvements, subject to final plan review by Community Services, the project would be consistent with this policy.

TE 4.1 General Level of Service Standard. [GP] *A traffic LOS standard C shall apply citywide to major arterials, minor arterials, and collector roadways and signalized and unsignalized intersections, except as provided in TE 4.2. The standard shall apply to daily traffic volumes and both AM and PM peak hours for intersections, and to average daily traffic volumes (ADT) for roadway segments. Table 7-3 provides descriptions of the LOS categories.*

Consistent. As discussed in the project environmental document, the contribution of traffic would not degrade existing levels of service for roadways or intersections, with the exception of Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. To address these impacts, the project will be installing a raised median along Hollister Avenue, and provide striping at the southbound approach of Robin Hill to Hollister Avenue to improve existing and proposed vehicular flow in this area. Therefore, as conditioned, the project would be consistent with this policy.

TE 4.6 LOS Effects of Future Land Use Plan Amendments. [GP] *Any amendment to the Land Use Element that would increase impacts on arterials and intersections at ultimate capacity shall include the development and implementation of transportation measures that would not reduce the LOS (increase the traffic volume to roadway capacity [v/c] ratio) of these facilities.*

Consistent. The construction of the Marriott Residence Inn project would be consistent with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan in terms of land use anticipated for the project site. Further, the project would be required to pay Development Impact Fees for Transportation (GTIP) fees, which would contribute to LOS maintenance of the existing roadway system. As conditioned, the project would be consistent with this policy.

TE 7.8 Hollister Avenue Transit Corridor. [GP] *Hollister Avenue from the eastern city boundary west to Pacific Oaks Road is designated as the Hollister Avenue Transit Corridor. The public transportation map in Figure 7-4 illustrates that the highest concentration of transit routes and greatest frequency of service*

occur in this area. The land areas along this corridor include existing and planned future retail commercial and employment centers as well as higher-density housing. These higher-intensity uses are transit oriented; the City supports efforts by MTD and other providers to expand express and local bus services along this corridor as ridership levels warrant.

TE 7.12 Transit Amenities in New Development. [GP/CP] The City shall require new or substantially renovated development to incorporate appropriate measures to facilitate transit use, such as integrating bus stop design with the design of the development. Bus turnouts, comfortable and attractive all-weather shelters, lighting, benches, secure bicycle parking, and other appropriate amenities shall be incorporated into development, when appropriate, along Hollister Avenue and along other bus routes within the city. Existing facilities that are inadequate or deteriorated shall be improved or upgraded where appropriate and feasible.

Consistent - Policies TE 7.8 and 7.12. The project would be required to improve the existing bus stop at Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. This improvement, which would include a new bus turnout and supporting amenities (shelter, bench and trash can), would make the project consistent with this policy.

TE 9.2 Adequacy of Parking Supply in Proposed Development. [GP/CP] The City shall require all proposed new development and changes/intensifications in use of existing nonresidential structures to provide a sufficient number of off-street parking spaces to accommodate the parking demand generated by the proposed use(s), and to avoid spillover of parking onto neighboring properties and streets.

Consistent. Zoning ordinance requirements would be 144 spaces for the Marriott Residence Inn and 213 spaces for the existing research park building (combined total of 357 spaces); actual peak demand is calculated at 144 spaces for the Marriott Residence Inn and 302 spaces for the existing research park building (combined total of 446 spaces); the site plan provides for 129 spaces for the Marriott Residence Inn and 350 spaces for the existing research park building (combined total of 479 spaces). A reciprocal parking agreement between the two properties is still proposed. With recordation of this agreement required through the conditions of approval, the project would be consistent with this policy.

TE 9.5 Parking Lot Design. [GP] Design standards applicable to retail, commercial, business parks, and parking lots are set forth in the Visual and Historic Resources Element Subpolicies VH 4.5, 4.7, and 4.11. In addition, the following standards and criteria shall apply to parking lots of three or more spaces:

- a. *Parking lot design shall provide that all individual spaces are clearly delineated and have easy ingress and egress by vehicles.*
- b. *Proposals that include compact parking spaces shall be subject to discretionary approval by the City, and the number of compact parking spaces shall not exceed 20 percent of the total; parking spaces for oversized vehicles shall be included when appropriate.*
- c. *Access driveways and aisles shall have adequate geometrics, and the layout shall be clear, functional, and well organized.*
- d. *Pedestrian walkways between the parking area and the street, main entrance, and transit stops should be protected by landscaped or other buffers to the extent feasible.*
- e. *The visual impact of large expanses of parking lots shall be reduced by appropriate response to the design standards set forth in the Visual and Historic Resources Element's Policy VH 4.*

Consistent. The project has been revised to address certain comments from the DRB, as well as staff review of the site plan during the project analysis and environmental review. As designed, the Marriott Residence Inn would provide appropriate parking circulation, driveway access, pedestrian amenities along the project frontages, and extensive landscaping compliant with Visual Resource policies. As revised, the project provides 27 compact parking spaces out of a total of 129 on site, thereby complying with the 20 percent standard called for in item b. However, the project does not comply with the required number of landscape planters per Policy VH 4, and this would be addressed through final site design. Such revisions are feasible given the ability to share parking with the Hollister Center. Therefore, as conditioned, and with these revisions, the project would be consistent with this policy.

TE 10.4 Pedestrian Facilities in New Development. [GP] Proposals for new development or substantial alterations of existing development shall be required to include pedestrian linkages and standard frontage improvements. These improvements may include construction of sidewalks and other pedestrian paths, provision of benches, public art, informational signage, appropriate landscaping, and lighting. In planning new subdivisions or large-scale development, pedestrian connections should be provided through subdivisions and cul-de-sacs to interconnect with adjacent areas. Dedications of public access easements shall be required where appropriate.

Consistent. The project would include a meandering sidewalk on both Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road, along with extensive landscaping and appropriate signage to provide a strong pedestrian component in the project. With these improvements, the project would be consistent with this policy.

TE 13.3 Maintenance of LOS Standards. [GP] New development shall only be allowed when and where such development can be adequately (as defined by the LOS standards in Policy TE 4) served by existing and/or planned transportation facilities. Transportation facilities are considered adequate if, at the time of development:

- a. Existing transportation facilities serving the development, including those to be constructed by the developer as part of the project, will result in meeting the adopted LOS standards set in Policy TE 4; or
- b. A binding financial commitment and agreement is in place to complete the necessary transportation system improvements (except for the planned new grade-separated freeway crossings), or to implement other strategies which will mitigate the project-specific impacts to an acceptable level, within 6 or fewer years; and
- c. Any additional offsite traffic mitigation measures are incorporated into the impact fee system for addressing cumulative transportation impacts of future development.

Consistent. Construction of a median in Hollister Avenue prohibiting left turns out of the project driveway would ensure appropriate operation of service levels on Hollister Avenue and payment of GTIP fees to offset area wide improvements would be required. With implementation of these required conditions, the project would be consistent with this policy.

Public Facilities Element

PF 3.9 Safety Considerations in New Development. [GP] All proposals for new or substantially remodeled development shall be reviewed for potential demand for and impacts on safety and demand for police services. The design of streets and buildings should reinforce secure, safe, and crime-free environments. Safety and crime reduction or prevention, as well as ease of policing, shall be a consideration in the siting and design of all new development within the city.

PF 9.1 Integration of Land Use and Public Facilities Planning [GP/CP]—The Land Use Plan and actions on individual development applications shall be consistent with the existing or planned capacities of necessary supporting public facilities and the fiscal capacity of the City to finance new facilities.

- a. The City shall integrate its land use and public works planning activities with an ongoing program of long-range financial planning to ensure that the City's Land Use Plan is supported by quality public facilities.
- b. Individual land use decisions, including but not limited to General Plan amendments, shall be based on a finding that any proposed development can be supported by adequate public facilities.

PF 9.2 Phasing of New Development [GP/CP]—Development shall be allowed only when and where it is demonstrated that all public facilities are adequate and only when and where such development can be adequately served by essential public services without reducing levels of service elsewhere.

PF 9.3 Responsibilities of Developers [GP/CP]—Construction permits shall not be granted until the developer provides for the installation and/or financing of needed public facilities. If adequate facilities are currently unavailable and public funds are not committed to provide such facilities, the burden shall be on the developer to arrange appropriate financing or provide such facilities in order to develop. Developers shall provide or pay for the costs of generating technical information as to impacts the proposed development will have on public facilities and services. The City shall require new development to finance the facilities needed to support the development wherever a direct connection or nexus of benefit or impact can be demonstrated.

PF 9.7 Essential Services for New Development [GP/CP]—Development shall be allowed only when and where all essential utility services are adequate in accord with the service standards of their providers and only when and where such development can be adequately served by essential utilities without reducing levels of service below the level of service guidelines elsewhere:

- a. Domestic water service, sanitary sewer service, stormwater management facilities, streets, fire services, schools, and parks shall be considered essential for supporting new development.
- b. A development shall not be approved if it causes the level of service of an essential utility service to decline below the standards referenced above unless improvements to mitigate the impacts are made concurrent with the development for the purposes of this policy. "Concurrent with the development" shall mean that improvements are in place at the time of the development or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements.
- c. If adequate essential utility services are currently unavailable and public funds are not committed to provide such facilities, developers must provide such facilities at their own expense in order to develop.

Consistent (Policies PF 3.9, 9.1 – 9.3, 9.7). These policies are intended to ensure that new development is coordinated with the availability and/or provision of adequate public facilities and infrastructure to adequately serve it. Adequate water, sewer, and utility services would be available from the Goleta Water and Sanitary Districts, local utility service providers, fire and police protection services, subject to the project obtaining can and will serve letters from the Goleta Water and Sanitary Districts. As such, the proposed project would be consistent with these policies, as conditioned.

Noise Element

NE 1.1 Land Use Compatibility Standards [GP]—The City shall use the standards and criteria of Table 9-2 to establish compatibility of land use and noise exposure. The City shall require appropriate mitigation, if feasible, or prohibit development that would subject proposed or existing land uses to noise levels that exceed acceptable levels as indicated in this table. Proposals for new development that would cause standards to be exceeded shall only be approved if the project would provide a substantial benefit to the City (including but not limited to provision of affordable housing units or as part of a redevelopment project), and if adequate mitigation measures are employed to reduce interior noise levels to acceptable levels.

Consistent. This policy is intended to ensure that new development is not exposed to unacceptable noise levels for the type and nature of the use involved. The project is outside of any airport noise contour of 65 dB or greater. Construction hours would be limited according to conditions of approval for the project. Therefore, as conditioned, the project would be consistent with these policies.

NE 3.3 Consultation with ALUC Staff and City of Santa Barbara Staff. [GP]
The City of Goleta shall continue to monitor and comment on airport-related projects and development proposed for the area surrounding the airport that is under the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Barbara. The City of Goleta shall consult with staff of the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) and the Santa Barbara Airport Department for development projects within the clear or approach zones as defined in the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP), as well as any development proposed within the 60 dBA CNEL noise exposure contour as depicted on the Noise contour map in the most recent ALUC-adopted Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan.

Consistent. The project and environmental document were reviewed by the City of Santa Barbara Community Development and Airport Department staff. Project revisions were made in response to these consultations, including design of the frontage improvements and median to be constructed along Hollister Avenue. While the project site is adjacent to the airport, it is not within the ALUC jurisdiction, and also not subject to the ALUP. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

NE 6.4 Restrictions on Construction Hours [GP]—The City shall require, as a condition of approval for any land use permit or other planning permit, restrictions on construction hours. Noise-generating construction activities for projects near or adjacent to residential buildings and neighborhoods or other sensitive receptors shall be limited to Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Construction in non-residential areas away from sensitive receivers shall be limited to Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Construction shall generally not be allowed

on weekends and State holidays. Exceptions to these restrictions may be made in extenuating circumstances (in the event of an emergency, for example) on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Environmental Services. All construction sites subject to such restrictions shall post the allowed hours of operation near the entrance to the site, so that workers on site are aware of this limitation. City staff shall closely monitor compliance with restrictions on construction hours, and shall promptly investigate and respond to all noncompliance complaints.

Consistent. Project construction hours would be limited according to conditions of approval, making the project is considered consistent with this policy.

NE 6.5 Other Measures to Reduce Construction Noise [GP]—The following measures shall be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications to reduce the impact of construction noise:

- a. All construction equipment shall have properly maintained sound-control devices, and no equipment shall have an unmuffled exhaust system.
- b. Contractors shall implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures including but not limited to changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, and installing acoustic barriers around significant sources of stationary construction noise.
- c. To the extent practicable, adequate buffers shall be maintained between noise-generating machinery or equipment and any sensitive receivers. The buffer should ensure that noise at the receiver site does not exceed 65 dBA CNEL. For equipment that produces a noise level of 95 dBA at 50 feet, a buffer of 1600 feet is required for attenuation of sound levels to 65 dBA.

Consistent. This policy is intended to protect sensitive noise receptors such as residential units from excessive levels of construction noise. The project site is not located near sensitive receptors, and would therefore be considered consistent with this policy.

Housing Element

HE 3.2 Mitigation of Employee Housing Impacts from Nonresidential Uses. [GP] Housing needs of local workers are an important factor for the City when reviewing nonresidential development proposals. The City shall require proposed new nonresidential development and proposed expansion or intensification of existing nonresidential development to contribute to the provision of affordable employee housing. The proposed amount of floor area and type of nonresidential use shall be factors in establishing the requirement for individual projects. Alternatives to satisfy this requirement may, at the discretion of the City, include payment of “in-lieu” housing impact fees, provision of housing

on-site, housing assistance as part of employee benefit packages, or other alternatives of similar value.

HE 12.3 Local Housing Impact Fees. [GP] *The City shall prepare an appropriate nexus study and consider the adoption of an ordinance that would impose affordable housing impact fees on new nonresidential development based upon the estimated number of jobs generated by the development and the estimated wage levels of those jobs.*

Consistency Determination to be made by City Council. At this time, the City has not yet developed a program for assessment of affordable housing impact fees on new nonresidential development. Therefore, applicability of this policy and any determination of consistency would be a policy decision of the City Council at the time of the hearing before the Council.

Goleta Old Town Revitalization Plan

The project site is located within the West Wing portion of the Old Town Project Area. While previously designated as an Industrial Park site in this Plan, the General Plan Land Use designation of I-BP (Industrial - Business Park) with a Hotel Overlay is the more applicable vision for this property. Additionally, the development of the Marriott Residence Inn would create hotel transient occupancy tax revenue which would further the goals of the Old Town Revitalization Plan.

ATTACHMENT 5

Zoning Ordinance Consistency Analysis

**HOLLISTER CENTER PROJECT; 07-167-DP AM (Parcel 1)
ZONING ORDINANCE CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS**

The following table identifies various applicable zoning requirements of the M-RP zone district and the project's compliance with each of these requirements:

	Required	Proposed	Consistent Y/N
Front Yard Setback (Parcel 1 is a corner lot and has two front yard setbacks)	80 Feet from centerline and 50 feet from ROW line of any street (on both project frontages)	Hollister Avenue: 80' from centerline ; 35'- 50' from ROW line (parking) La Patera Lane: 80' from Centerline; 50' from ROW	Yes, subject to modification Yes
Side Yard Setback	10 feet	14' – 19'	Yes
Rear Yard Setback	10 feet	10 feet (parking is allowed in rear yard)	
Building Coverage	≤ 35%	35%	Yes
Building Height (parcel 2 only)	35 feet average	35 feet average	Yes
Parking spaces: Parcel 1	230 spaces	350 parking space	Yes
Landscaping/ Open Space	30% minimum	approx. 10%	Yes, subject to modification
Other:			
Minimum Lot Size	1 acre minimum	7.16 acres gross/6.99 net	Yes

**MARRIOTT RESIDENCE INN; 07-007-DP (Parcel 2)
ZONING ORDINANCE CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS**

The following table identifies various applicable zoning requirements of the M-RP zone district and the project's compliance with each of these requirements:

	Required	Proposed	Consistent Y/N
Front Yard Setback (Parcel 2 is a corner lot and has two front yard setbacks)	80 Feet from centerline and 50 feet from ROW line of any street (on both project frontages)	Hollister Avenue: <80' from centerline; 30' from ROW to porte cochere parking Robin Hill Road: 18' from ROW (existing), and 14' from proposed new ROW at corner of Robin Hill Road/Hollister Avenue to parking and trash enclosure	Yes, subject to modification Yes, subject to modification
Side Yard Setback	10 feet	13 feet (from new eastern property line)	Yes
Rear Yard Setback	10 feet	10 feet (parking is allowed in the rear yard)	Yes
Building Coverage	≤ 35% net lot area	23% (38,175 + 152)	Yes
Building Height	35 feet average	35 feet average	Yes
Parking spaces:	144 spaces	129 spaces	Yes, subject to modification and reciprocal parking agreement
Landscaping/Open Space	30% minimum	32.5%	Yes
Other: Minimum Lot Size	1 acre minimum	3.79 acres gross/ 3.72 acres net	Yes

ATTACHMENT 6

**Planning Commission Minutes
April 28, 2008 and May 12, 2008**



**PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, APRIL 28, 2008**

6:00 P.M.
City Hall
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California

Members of the Planning Commission

*Kenneth Knight, Chair
Brent Daniels, Vice Chair
Edward Easton
Doris Kavanagh
Julie Kessler Solomon*

*Patricia Miller, Secretary
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk
Scott Porter, Legal Counsel*

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Knight followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Present: Planning Commissioners Daniels, Easton, Kavanagh, Knight, and Solomon.
Absent: None.

Staff present: Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase, Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller, Legal Counsel Scott Porter, Associate Planner Laura Vlk, Contract Planner Laura Bridley, Principal Civil Engineer Marti Schultz, and Recording Clerk Linda Gregory.

PUBLIC FORUM

No speakers.

AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A.1 Planning Commission Minutes for April 14, 2008.

Recommendation:

Approve the Planning Commission minutes for the meeting of April 14, 2008.

MOTION: Commissioner Kavanagh moved/Vice Chair Daniels seconded to approve the Special Planning Commission meeting minutes for April 14, 2008, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

B.1 07-117-GPA, -RZ, -DP RV01: Winchester Union 76 Land Uses and Sale of Alcoholic Beverages Project.

Recommendation:

Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 08-__ (Attachment 1), thereby recommending to the City Council approval of Case No. 07-117-GPA, -RZ, -DP RV01.

Site visits: Made by all Commissioners.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Staff speakers:

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller

Associate Planner Laura Vlk

Associate Planner Laura Vlk made a presentation regarding the staff report. She stated for the record that staff recommends that the following amendments be added to the staff recommended action in the staff report: a) the revision of condition #6 of Exhibit 2 to delete the phrase "for double transfer of license no. 443314", as it is not the City's purview to condition how an ABC license is obtained by the applicant; and b) any references to the CH zone district within the Development Plan's project description and conditions of approval be corrected to encompass the C-2 zoning designation.

Documents: a) Supplemental Information (including the landscape plan): Winchester Union 76 Land Uses and Sale of Alcoholic Beverages Project, City Case No. 07-117-GPA, -RZ, -DP RV01. b) Letter from nearby neighbor (signature is illegible), dated April 24, 2008, submitted at the hearing on April 28, 2008, in support of the application to allow the sale of beer and wine.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 6:23 P.M.

Jay Higgins, representing John Price, property owner, stated that after the property owner purchased the service station in 2001 he discovered that most of the service stations similarly located on the South Coast are allowed to sell beer and wine. Mr. Higgins noted that since 1984 when the CH zoning designation was amended to prohibit the sale of alcohol in the CH zone district, there has been a sixty percent growth of residential parcels within one mile of the site, but there is a lack of neighborhood shopping opportunities. He said that the applicant has worked with staff

and the Sheriff's Department to implement mitigations to address any potential impacts. He noted that the property owner met with the neighbors and City staff regarding complaints when the convenience store reopened in 2002. Mr. Higgins stated that the complaints were addressed as evidenced by records from the Sheriff's Department which show a dramatic decline in complaints since 2005. He stated that the property will conform to the existing, approved landscape plan, and also that the property owner plans to transfer an Alcoholic Beverage Permit from another service station owned by his family.

Speakers:

Stephen Edson, President of the Winchester Commons Homeowners Association, stated for the record that the homeowners association is opposed to the sale of alcoholic beverages at this convenience store which is located directly across the street from their development. He expressed concern that the sale of alcohol would attract an undesirable element and threaten the overall way of life in the development. He noted that when the service station owner applied to establish the convenience store several years ago, the homeowners were assured no alcoholic beverages would be sold. He also expressed concern that it would be easier for those traveling on the highway to purchase alcohol at the store, thereby increasing the likelihood for the potential for drunk driving and accidents.

Helen Smart, Winchester Commons resident, spoke in opposition to the sale of alcoholic beverages at the convenience store, stating that her home is separated from the business by one street. She expressed concern that alcohol sales will cause problems and attract young people to the neighborhood who will likely create more graffiti which is a constant problem. She also expressed concern that she observes trucks parked along Calle Real that leave their motors running after they have pulled out of the service station. She stated that another convenience store is located approximately one mile away for those who wish to purchase alcoholic beverages. She noted that motorists who exit the highway to purchase alcoholic beverages are not supposed to drink while driving.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 6:34 P.M.

Chair Knight noted the residents' concerns with regard to potential problems with the sale of alcohol, stating that he believes the issues relate to enforcement.

MOTION: Commissioner Easton moved/Commissioner Kavanagh seconded to approve and adopt Planning Commission Resolution No 08-04 (Attachment 1), entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta Recommending to the City Council Approval of Various Actions Related to the Winchester Union 76 Land Uses and Sale of Alcoholic Beverages Request, Case No. 07-117-GPA, -RZ, -DP RV01, at 20 Winchester Canyon / 7798 Calle Real: Assessor Parcel Number 073-020-025", as amended at the Planning Commission public hearing on April 28, 2008.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

RECESS HELD FROM 6:45 P.M. TO 6:52 P.M.

B.2 07-007-GPA, -OA, -DP –TMP; 07-165-DP AM: Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Center.

Recommendation:

Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 08-__ (Attachment 1), thereby recommending to the City Council approval of Case No. 07-007-GPA, -OA, -DP, -TPM; 07-167-DP-AM.

Staff speakers:

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase
Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller
Contract Planner Laura Bridley
Principal Civil Engineer Marti Schultz

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller presented an overview of the staff report. Contract Planner Laura Bridley presented the details with regard to the proposed structural development and site plan of the proposed project, an overview of the environmental review process, and PowerPoint presentation. Patricia Miller stated that, parallel to this permit process, staff is following the procedures for the SB 18 Local and Tribal Intergovernmental Consultation process with the intent to encourage collaborative and comprehensive land use planning at the local level with regard to archaeological and cultural resources.

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller stated for the record that the staff recommendation should include a specific recommendation in the resolution to approve the Vesting Tentative Parcel Map.

Documents: Letter from the Santa Ynez Band of Indians Tribal Elders Council, dated April 18, 2008; letter from Morris Jurkowitz and Richard Sanders, owners of Pacifica Suites Hotel, Goleta, dated April 25, 2008; letter from Frank Arredondo, dated April 25, 2008; letter from Frank Arredondo, dated April 28, 2008, received April 28, 2008; and letter from Tom Blabey, Goleta Valley Chamber of Commerce, received April 28, 2008.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase provided an overview of the findings for consideration by the Planning Commission with regard to the proposed project.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 7:20 P.M.

Robert Olson, president of R.D. Olson Development Company, applicant, stated that the Marriott Residence Inn is considered high quality and will address the accommodation needs in the community that include UCSB, business travelers, leisure travelers, temporary stays, and families displaced from their homes. He said that the benefits for the community would include tax revenue for the City, employment opportunities, and additional meeting room facilities. He stated that the applicant attended meetings with the DRB regarding architecture and also noted that

the landscape plan will improve the appearance of the Hollister corridor. He stated that the corporate owners of the Marriott Residence Inn are known to be involved in community events, fundraising and philanthropy. He presented a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Marriott Residence Inn, 6300 Hollister Avenue, Goleta, CA, Applicant R.D. Olson".

David Stone, project archaeologist, in the area for over thirty years, provided a brief archaeological background based on his work on the project for the past two years. He stated that the whole hotel site is on a SBA 58 archaeological site in the area, and that the proposed hotel site contains both previously undisturbed and previously disturbed areas which were evaluated in 1980 as follows: a) the Locus 1 site contains previously undisturbed portions that are found eighteen inches below the surface which are of archaeological research value, noting that the top eighteen inches have been disturbed; and b) the Locus 2 site includes archaeological remains that have been previously disturbed, which still have important significance in terms of heritage value to contemporary Native Americans, but less archaeological research value. He stated that the direct grading proposed for the project site is limited to the top twenty inches which will result in an impact of only two inches on the Locus 1 site and impact on the Locus 2 site. He clarified that utilities including gas, electricity and water would remain outside the Locus 1 boundary and deep landscaping would be minimized. He provided an overview of the Phase 3 Data Recovery procedures that comprise mitigation measures for the project. He pointed out from his experience that the design to preserve over sixty percent of this archaeological site is very consistent with guidance identified in CEQA and in General Plan open space policies. He stated that a portion of the archaeological site would be impacted but the vast majority of the site would be capped and preserved for future generations.

Gene Fong, Gene Fong Architects, project architect, made a slide presentation regarding the project architecture. He stated that two reviews and two subcommittee meetings were held with the DRB which were informative and that many of the comments and concerns were adapted with regard to massing, building materials, colors and textures.

Katie O'Reilly Rogers, project landscape architect, provided an overview of the proposed landscape plans. The plans include standard drought-tolerant native, or native in character, Mediterranean landscaping, with a low water-usage irrigation system and low-intensity lights. She pointed out that the plans include stormwater cleansing with the use of bioswales and a large detention basin. She commented with regard to the General Plan policy related to providing trees in parking lots every four spaces that it would seem reasonable to designate the number of trees that would be required within an area, on an average basis.

RECESS HELD FROM 8:08 P.M. TO 8:17 P.M.

Speakers:

Barbara Massey, Goleta, spoke in opposition to the project, limiting her comments to the request for General Plan amendments, stating that she believes the applicant should be required to meet General Plan standards. She expressed the following

concerns: 1) eliminating the FAR requirement would provide a tremendous advantage to this hotel and other in the planning process and eliminates important standards; 2) the height of the building is important because the project is located at the edge of the airport clear zone and across the street from the airport; 3) the 35-foot height limit should not be eliminated, rather the applicant can design the hotel with necessary changes to meet the standards; 4) requested that the applicant be required to design a more appropriate project that fits better with Goleta; and 5) she hopes the City will not be sold for the transient occupancy tax.

Quin Tan Shup, representing Native Chumash archaeological resources, expressed concerns regarding the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, stating that he believes the cultural resources mitigation measures should be conducted in a Phase 2 context which is testing, not Phase 3 which is a system of recovery. His comments included the following: 1) the archaeological remains that have been disturbed are still important to Native Americans; 2) the ultimate preference of the Native Americans would be for the remains to be left in the ground and undisturbed because the sites contain the memory and legends of their people; 3) he believes that the archaeological information from 1980 is outdated; 4) he observed the site today and noticed evidence of some disturbance on top; and 5) his interest in this matter is to educate and provide alternatives.

Sam Cohen, representing Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, expressed appreciation to City staff for cooperating with the tribe with regard to SB-18 consultations. He made the following six points: 1) there should be additional EIR study, under CEQA, if there is any question with regard to significant archaeological sites, not Phase 3 recovery; 2) in 1979, a study by Albert Bixler and Pandora Snethkamp found that the site was one of the most significant remaining undisturbed sites in the Goleta Slough and recommended against development, which was followed by the Burroughs Corporation; 3) letters from two experts in the agenda packet recommended that an EIR be prepared and one letter from an UCSB professor states that CA-SBA-58 stands a good chance of containing prehistoric human remains; 4) destruction is not mitigation which will result from pile driving that will destroy approximately forty percent of the site; 5) the project is not ready because CEQA requires mitigation; and 6) Phase 3 is not an alternative for the last remaining historic Goleta village because he believes it involves excavating the site, sifting through and placing items in a museum.

Freddie Romero, representing Santa Ynez Band Chumash Indian Elders Council, reviewed some of the statements made in a letter sent to contract planner Laura Bridley, as follows: 1) the Santa Ynez Chumash people recognize this site as a significant area; 2) he regards this particular area in its context as a full community; 3) expressed concern that cultural resources are constantly being lost with the amount of development taking place today; 4) he noted that two prehistoric cemeteries were mapped as being nearby the site; 5) as a representative of the Elders Council, he was not consulted with regard to the excavation of the holes and placement of the pilings; 6) he believes that Phase 3 is a destruction and not mitigation; and 7) requested consideration of how the role of the Chumash and Native people can be shared with regard to the history of California

Frank Arredondo stated that he is a Chumash, descending from the prehistoric village of Tipu and would be speaking on behalf of his ancestors with regard to arguing the merits of the cultural resources section of the Mitigated Negative Declaration. He presented a letter dated April 28, 2008, which included a list of twenty points of concern. His verbal comments included: 1) the timing of public comment notice is not in compliance (#1); 2) there is no adherence to PRC 21083.2(b) by making a reasonable effort to preserve or leave in an undisturbed state the resource (#5); 3) avoidance and open space in the General Plan is not being followed in the project design (#13); 4) recommended that a phase 2 survey be redone every 5 years (#15); and 5) requested an explanation regarding why the fill is being removed (#17). He stated that this site is one of the oldest sites and its remaining portion is considered to be the last intact site. He believes the proposed mitigation method will not work for this project.

Russell Goodman, property owner, Sares-Regis Group, stated that they believe the project will be an important addition to the community, will satisfy long-term hotel needs that have been expressed by tenants in the business community, and will be consistent with other projects in the area. He said that the property owners have worked closely with the developer and City staff for 2-1/2 years to bring this project forward and he noted that the prior City Council approved a hotel overlay in the General Plan. He expressed respect for the prior speakers and their points. He stated that he understands from historical records that the site was planned for a three-phase development and that Burroughs had approved plans from the County for a third building but their business demands did not reach a level of capacity to commence forward on a third building before selling the property to Applied Magnetics.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 8:43 P.M.

David Stone clarified that Phase 2 archaeological investigation work was done in 1979 and 1980 with everyone agreeing that the archaeological site was significant. He stated that nothing has changed since then with regard to the significance of the site and that a Phase 2 study at this time would be duplicative information.

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller said that staff believes that the comments that were raised with regard to the deficiencies in the Draft MND have been resolved in the Final MND. She stated that all persons who commented on the Draft MND were provided notice of the availability of the Final MND as well as this hearing, and that written comments were also provided with a copy of the proposed Final MND. A response was not received from any of them prior to this hearing. She stated the Planning Commission will need to determine whether the Final MND environmental document is adequate and appropriate to forward to the City Council.

In response to a question from the Planning Commission, Sam Cohen stated that the Elders Council would prefer that the remaining archaeological significance of this site be respected and that no project be placed on the site and it be left as an open space. If that is not possible, he said they would ask that this area be avoided and that additional testing and study be done if foundational elements will be installed. He said he believes that extra care is justified in a significant area.

Vice Chair Daniels stated that from the information presented, there seems to be agreement that the site is a significant archaeological resource and that the issue that needs to be considered is whether the mitigation is appropriate.

Commissioner Solomon suggested that a meet and confer process would be useful at this point in the process.

MOTION: Commissioner Solomon moved/Commissioner Easton seconded that a meet and confer process be conducted with regard to the mitigation measures for the proposed project, and that as a part of the process there shall be an outreach to contact people who commented on the Draft MND; with the process to begin immediately, and that the results of the process shall be reported by staff at the Planning Commission meeting on May 12, 2008; and further that Commissioner Easton and Commissioner Kavanagh shall serve as liaisons to the meet and confer process.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

Commissioner Easton stated that he believes the size of the proposed building is too big for the site and that the project should conform to the development rules that exist today and not require changes to the General Plan. He expressed concern that the size of the project may impact General Plan policies with regard to protection of mountain and foothill views and with regard to development projects along scenic corridors. He said that he appreciates that the proposed project incorporates meandering sidewalks which was a directive from the DRB review and hopes the applicant follows all of the DRB comments. He suggested that the exterior lighting needs to be protected from airplanes landing at the airport.

Vice Chair Daniels commented that a FAR is one of many different tools for design review.

Commissioner Kavanagh stated that her concern is with regard to the height of the hotel because of its proximity to the airport and landing path for small aircraft. She commented that conceptually the design is a beautiful addition to the corner. From her experience staying at different hotels, she believes the concept of shared parking is useful and creative.

Commissioner Solomon suggested that the applicant join in a discussion with the Planning Commission at the next meeting with regard to items of interest that include concerns with regard to the possibility that the building is under-parked, the height of the building, and other issues.

MOTION: Commissioner Kavanagh moved/Commissioner Easton seconded to continue Item B-2, 07-007-GPA, -OC, -DP -TMP; 07-165-DP AM: Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Center, to May 12, 2008, noting that the public hearing was closed.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

C. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase reported that the following two items of interest to the Planning Commission are scheduled for the City Council meeting on May 6, 2008: a) Fairview Gardens; and b) the final reading of the ordinance to update the Building and Safety Codes.

D. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

None.

E. ADJOURNMENT: 10:17 P.M.

Prepared by Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk



**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, MAY 12, 2008**

6:00 P.M.
City Hall
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California

Members of the Planning Commission

*Kenneth Knight, Chair
Brent Daniels, Vice Chair
Edward Easton
Doris Kavanagh
Julie Kessler Solomon*

*Patricia Miller, Secretary
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk
Brian Pierik, Legal Counsel*

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Knight followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Present: Planning Commissioners Daniels, Easton, Kavanagh, Knight, and Solomon.
Absent: None.

Staff present: Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase, Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller, Interim Advance Planning Manager Pat Saley, Legal Counsel Brian Pierik, Director of Community Services Steve Wagner; Environmental Consultant Charles Smith of Jones & Stokes, and Recording Clerk Linda Gregory.

PUBLIC FORUM

No speakers.

AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE

A.1 Planning Commission Minutes for April 21, 2008, and April 28, 2008.

Recommendation:

Approve the Planning Commission minutes for the Special Meetings of April 21, 2008, and April 28, 2008.

MOTION: Commissioner Easton moved/Commissioner Solomon seconded to approve the Special Planning Commission Meeting minutes of April 21, 2008, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

MOTION: Commissioner Easton moved/Commissioner Kavanagh seconded to approve the Special Planning Commission Meeting minutes of April 28, 2008, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

B.1 07-201-GPA: City-Initiated Track 2 Minor Revisions to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.

Recommendation:

Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 08-____ (Attachment 1), Recommending to the City Council Acceptance of a CEQA Addendum, dated March 17, 2008, to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Adoption of CEQA Findings, Adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Adoption of Track 2 Revisions to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. (continued from April 14, 2008).

Staff Speakers:

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller

Interim Advance Planning Manager Pat Saley

Director of Community Services Steven Wagner

Legal Counsel Brian Pierik

Environmental Consultant Charles Smith of Jones & Stokes

Documents:

PowerPoint entitled "Continued Public Hearing, City Initiated General Plan Amendments (Track 2), May 12, 2008".

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase provided an overview of the staff report dated May 5, 2008, briefly summarizing the Planning Commission's progress to date on proposed Track 2 General Plan Amendments, along with a PowerPoint presentation. He stated that the following items were deferred by the

Planning Commission to May 12, 2008, for deliberation and action: a) revisions to Land Use Tables 2-1 through 2-4; and b) revisions to Policy OS 2.4 Mitigation of Impacts to vertical Coastal Access.

At the request of Chair Knight, Director of Community Services Steven Wagner provided additional information regarding staff's Final Recommended Amendment for Transportation Element Policy TE 6.5 Limitation on Expansion of Intersections, which was considered by the Planning Commission on April 21, 2008.

Chair Knight stated that he had thought that he may want to reconsider his vote on the motion on April 21, 2008, regarding TE 6.5 Limitation on Expansion of Intersections, which recommended capping the number of lanes at the Storke/Hollister intersection at the existing eight lanes, but he still has questions regarding whether more lanes would be appropriate in the City. He believes that the impacts of the UCSB Long Range Development Plan and the Isla Vista Master Plan will need to be taken into consideration, and that this item will deserve more attention from the City Council.

Legal Counsel Brian Pierik summarized and discussed his memorandum dated May 7, 2008, with the Subject "General Plan and Building Intensity", which he prepared in response to the Planning Commission's request for an analysis with regard to building intensity standards. He said that he concluded in the memorandum that building intensity standards should be included in the General Plan. He also concluded that the standards should be recommended standards. He recommended consideration to include a statement in the General Plan that may allow for revisions with regard to building intensity standards by the decision-making body based upon a finding of good cause.

In response to a request from Commissioner Solomon, Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller provided two examples to help understand the Floor Area Ratio of 0.30 in the Planned Residential category. She stated that the 0.30 FAR is difficult to meet and that some other treatment may need to be considered after additional discussion and deliberations, such as the possibility of setting a range.

Legal Counsel Brian Pierik clarified that under the Brown Act the Planning Commission would have flexibility to allow the public to make comments if an interest was expressed.

Speakers:

Lisa Plowman, Peikert Group Architects, recommended not adding building intensity standards, which she believes are complicated, to the General Plan and then creating a section to modify the policies. From her experience as a planner, she stated that typically General Plan policies are non-modifiable and that intensity standards are usually included in the zoning ordinance which is intended to implement the General Plan. She believes the process should be kept simple and that standards should be in the zoning code where there may be some flexibility and unexpected circumstances would be addressed. She does not believe that building intensity standards are required in the General Plan based on her reading of Court cases and the law. She noted that the County zoning standards, which were adopted when the City was

incorporated, would be in effect until the City's zoning ordinance is adopted. She recommended consideration of Form Base Code planning which she believes is a useful tool that provides clear guidance to the development community regarding the type of product the City wants and helps get the product on the ground.

Detlev Peikert, Peikert Group Architects, recommended that it would be more appropriate to locate the building intensity standards in the zoning ordinance rather in the General Plan, stating that the General Plan is more specific and does not allow the flexibility needed to review and approve projects in a wide range of circumstances. As an example, he commented on a proposed eleven-unit residential project that has been in the process for four years in the City, which would be unworkable if the standards that are set out here would be applied.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, commented that the General Plan should keep the current Land Use Tables, stating that the General Plan is a solid, long-term plan for the community and only after years of experience should any changes be considered. She believes that these tables need to be within the General Plan and not just in the zoning code.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase stated the staff recommendation with regard to building intensity standards as follows: a) building intensity standards should be included in the General Plan (Option 3) ; b) the building intensity standards shall be recommended standards and shown on the tables as recommended standards; c) a statement such as the following recommended by legal counsel shall be included in the LU Tables 2-1 through 2-4: "The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause."; and d) the Planning Commission shall recommend that the City Council direct staff to recalculate the building intensity standards (Option 4).

MOTION: Vice Chair Daniels moved/Commissioner Kavanagh seconded to approve the staff recommended amendments with regard to Land Use Tables 2-1 through 2-4 as follows: a) approve Option 3 with regard to Building Intensity Standards to clarify that building intensity standards are recommended and shall be retained in LU Tables 2-1 through 2-4 in the General Plan; b) the building intensity standards shall be recommended standards and shown on the Land Use Tables as recommended standards; c) a statement such as the following recommended by Legal Counsel shall be included in the LU Tables 2-1 through 2-4: "The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause."; and d) approve Option 4, that the Planning Commission shall recommend that the City Council direct staff to recalculate the building intensity standards; for recommendation to the City Council.

VOTE: Motion approved by the following voice vote. Ayes: Chair Knight, Vice Chair Daniels, Commissioners Kavanagh and Solomon. No: Commissioner Easton.

Prior to the vote on the above motion, Commissioner Easton requested that the motion be amended to require that any decision to exempt a project from the provisions of the General Plan as stated in Option 3 require full review by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Vice Chair Daniels and Commissioner Kavanagh did not accept Commissioner Easton's recommended amendment to the above motion.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase clarified that the eight dependent policies (LU 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 6.1 and 7.1) would be amended for consistency with the changes made to LU Tables 2-1 through 2-4 in accordance with the approval of the above motion.

RECESS HELD FROM 7:23 P.M. TO 7:33 P.M.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase stated that staff recommends that the language be retained in Policy OS 2.4 Mitigation of Impacts to Vertical Access, and that Policy LU 9.1.g be amended to add language, which is shown on Page 5 of the PowerPoint presentation, to allow for more flexibility with regard to precedents for relocation of vertical accessways. He clarified that Policy OS 2.4 is city-wide and that Policy LU 9.1 is specific to Bacara.

MOTION: Vice Chair Daniels moved/Commissioner Solomon seconded to approve the language recommended by staff for incorporation into Policy LU 9.1g, Site #1 Coastal Resort Parcels (Visitor Commercial), with regard to the precedent for relocation of vertical accessways, to include Items #1 through #3, as shown on Page 5 the PowerPoint entitled "Continued Public Hearing, City Initiated General Plan Amendments (Track 2) May 12, 2008," for recommendation to the City Council.

VOTE: Motion failed by the following voice vote. Ayes: Chair Knight and Vice Chair Daniels. Noes: Commissioners Easton, Kavanagh and Solomon.

By consensus, the Planning Commission clarified that the intent of the outcome of the above motion was to retain the current language in General Plan Policy LU 9.1.g.

Commissioner Kavanagh noted that during the process, the public was outspoken and concerned with regard to vertical access. She said that she is not comfortable with the language recommended by staff for Policy LU 9.1.g, stating that it seems vague.

Commissioner Easton stated that he believes the recommended change by staff for Policy LU 9.1.g should be processed along with an application from Bacara, and not as a general change.

Vice Chair Daniels stated that he believes that staff's recommendation for Policy LU 9.1.g is much broader and would provide the Coastal Commission with language with regard to relocation precedents, which he sees as positive for the community.

Chair Knight stated that he believe the language recommended by staff for Policy LU 9.1.g was intended to provide for the improvement of coastal access.

MOTION: Commissioner Solomon moved/Commissioner Easton seconded to retain the current language in General Policy OS 2.4 Mitigation of Impacts to Vertical Coastal Access, for recommendation to the City Council.

VOTE: Motion approved by the following voice vote. Ayes: Chair Knight, Commissioners Easton, Kavanagh and Solomon. No: Vice Chair Daniels.

MOTION: Commissioner Solomon moved/Commissioner Kavanagh seconded to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 08-05, entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta Recommending to the City Council Acceptance of a CEQA Addendum, Dated March 17, 2008, to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR, Adoption of CEQA Findings, Adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Adoption of the Track 2 Amendments to the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (Case No. 07-201-GPA)" (Attachment 1).

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

B.2. 07-007-GPA, -OA, -DP, -TPM; 07-167-DP AM: Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Center. (continued from April 28, 2008)

Recommendation:

Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 08-____ (Attachment 1), thereby recommending to the City Council approval of Case No. 07-007-GPA, -OA, -DP, -TPM; 07-167-DP AM. (continued from April 28, 2008).

Staff Speakers:

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase
Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller
Contract Planner Laura Bridley
Legal Counsel Brian Pierik

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase provided an overview of the staff report. He stated that this item was continued from the meeting on April 28, 2008, to address concerns raised by members of the Native American community and to provide more time to allow for a meet and confer, non-binding process, which was conducted on May 5, 2008. He stated that no decision was reached at the meet and confer but that staff, the Native American community representatives, and the applicant would like to speak to the discussion points. He suggested that the Planning Commission discuss whether to reopen a portion of the hearing to take testimony. He stated that another meet and confer session was scheduled for May 19, 2008.

By consensus, the Planning Commission requested that the applicant provide testimony at this point in the hearing.

Scott McChesney, Vice President, R. D. Olson Development, representing the applicant, provided background information regarding the history of the project. In retrospect, he said that it was unfortunate that the applicant did not consult with the Native American community earlier in the process. As a result of the meeting with the Native American representatives, he said that the applicant tried to redesign the building to avoid any sensitive areas and plans to continue with the meet and confer process. The building changes, which are conceptual, include moving a portion of the building to the northwest corner, leaving an open space on the southeast corner, which the applicant believes will address some concerns with regard to the mass and height of the building, and views along the corridor. Additional conceptual plans to help mitigate disturbance to the site include reducing the amount of grading upon the top of the archaeological site and utilizing lateral drilling on the site to avoid the midden area. Scott McChesney stressed that the applicant believes the hotel will provide a good amenity in the community and that there are other benefits from the project, for example, undergrounding utility lines in front of the site which will make the view corridor more pleasant and renovating the adjacent bus stop, as well as providing for the City funds toward road improvements and transit occupancy tax fees. He stated that the applicant is willing to work with the community to address concerns and design a building that has less impact on the site.

Legal Counsel Brian Pierik stated that the Planning Commission would have the discretion to allow public comment.

There being no objections, Chair Knight allowed public comment.

Quin Tan Shup, representing Native Chumash (Owl Clan), provided a packet with pictures of the site that show shells and other midden on the surface throughout the area, stating that the presence of shells is a big indicator on most sites of a large village. He stated that his purpose for showing the photographs is to emphasize that the data from previous studies is not correct because the site boundaries are bigger; therefore, he believes there are some details that need to be updated. He stated that he does not want more testing for artifacts but he wants to know if there is human burial. He requested additional time in order to conduct another meet and confer and hopefully find a solution that is workable for all parties.

Sam Cohen, representing Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, commended the developer for working with the tribe and attending the meet and confer session. He requested a time extension in order to conduct another meet and confer on May 19, 2008, which he believes will be of great benefit to this project. He made the following four points for consideration: 1) The City has an established open space in the General Plan, Policy OS 8.3 Preservation, which states that the City shall protect and preserve cultural resources from destruction; and also states that the preferred method for preserving a recorded archaeological site shall be by preservation in place to maintain the relationship between the artifacts and the archaeological context. 2) There needs to be a better way of vetting projects with regard to the presence of an

archaeological site to protect both the developer and the Native American community. 3) Past mistakes should not be repeated; for example, there were two known cemetery sites near CA-SBA-58 that are destroyed or covered up. 4) He read the fourth paragraph from a letter to the Planning Commission from Professor Michael A. Glassow, dated May 4, 2008, which referred to the concern of the Chumash people that boring the holes for the piles would disturb human burials and which indicated although investigations in the 1920s revealed that cemeteries were present in portions of CA-SBA-58 already destroyed, it is possible that isolated human burials may exist within the portion of the site that would be impacted by the proposed development, and further indicated that it is typical that prehistoric deposits at sites in this region contain isolated human burials, consequently the concerns of the Chumash people are justified. Sam Cohen commented that the real resolution is avoidance, if possible, and that the best solution would be for everyone to hopefully reach a consensus.

Frank Arredondo, Chumash native, stated that he attended the meet and confer on May 5, 2008, and requested more time for continued talks with the applicant. He expressed concern that he does not believe that a Mitigated Negative Declaration can be justified, stating that both a scientific assessment and a cultural assessment are required. He submitted a letter with his comments dated May 12, 2008, with the Subject: Draft MND For the Marriott Residence Inn Project. He also stated that the proposed stacked stone design is a Navajo architectural design, which he does not believe is appropriate for the Chumash site, although the design is beautiful.

David Stone, project archaeologist, briefly reported on the outcome of the meet and confer session on May 5, 2008. He stated that all of the participants are concerned regarding preservation and that the applicant has made two important changes to address preservation which will be further discussed at the next meet and confer: 1) a reduction in the amount of grading upon the top of the archaeological site; and 2) a reduction in the number of pilings by redesigning a portion of the footprint in the southeast corner away from the archaeological site.

Gene Fong, project architect, presented sketches of a redesign of the project that was developed by the applicant, based on the meet and confer discussions, which removed the southeast mass of the building and relocated it to the northwest corner of the structure. He said that as a result, 15 rooms were moved from the southeast corner, at the front of the building, to the northwest corner in the rear, which is less desirable than in front. The proposed landscaped park area in the rear was moved to the front to provide more open space. Mr. Fong stated that the redesign is a work in progress which will be presented for continued dialogue at the next meet and confer.

Commissioner Solomon made a suggestion, if agreeable by all parties, that consideration be given to the creation of some kind of an interpretive space for the southeast corner open space area where visitors who stay at the Marriott Residence Inn can understand the historical significance of the site and where community residents and others can learn about this significance.

Commissioner Kavanagh stated that she attended the meet and confer which included representatives from the Native American community and the applicant, and reported that that progress is being made. She commented that the dialogue and the

applicant's interest in listening to the concerns of the Native American community were very encouraging with regard to this project.

Commissioner Easton, who also attended the meet and confer, reported that he was educated to a significant degree about the project and he also learned more from the varied points of view that were presented by the participants. He presented a document with his comments for review entitled "Comments on the Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Center – Edward Easton". He summarized two of his concerns which relate to the floor area ratio and aesthetics, noting that some of his concerns may be resolved with the new design.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase discussed potential timeframes with regard to the review process. He suggested that it may be of benefit, if story poles are erected, for the Planning Commission to convene at the site for a brief tour as part of the hearing process. Steve Chase commented that the City of Goleta will establish and maintain a good relationship with the Native American community as is relates to all projects coming forward.

MOTION: Commissioner Easton moved/Vice Chair Daniels seconded to continue Item B-2, 07-007-GPA, -OA, -DP, -TPM; 07-167-DP AM: Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Center, to July 14, 2008; and direct staff to re-notice the item as a new public hearing.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

C. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

No report.

D. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Commissioner Easton commented that he is working on an essay with regard to flexibility, which is not project specific.

Chair Knight commented that from the Planning Commission's review of its first major project, he believes that the process can operate more effectively and efficiently if there is some sort of conceptual review at an earlier stage in the process which would also provide a clearer understanding for the applicants. He suggested that the Planning Commission authorize him to attend the City Council's strategic planning workshop to discuss how the Planning Commission can provide input earlier in the review process.

Commissioner Solomon spoke in support for Chair Knight's comments and suggested that staff provide information to the Planning Commission with regard to the review processes in other jurisdictions that are more established, and also possibly provide some guidance.

Commissioner Easton stated that from his experience as a member of the Design Review Board, the comments from conceptual review are very useful; however, he expressed concern that an applicant may have the idea that once conceptual review is completed they have a project that is ready. He requested an opportunity to join Chair Knight in discussions with regard to providing input earlier in the review process.

There being no objections, Chair Knight stated that by consensus of the Planning Commission, he and Commissioner Easton will move forward in the direction to attend the City Council's strategic planning workshop to discuss how the Planning Commission can provide input earlier in the review process.

E. ADJOURNMENT: 9:15 P.M.

Prepared by Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

GOLETA PLANNING COMMISSION

ATTACHMENT 7

DRB Minutes, June 10, 2008



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

Planning and Environmental Services
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, CA 93117
(805) 961-7500

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, June 10, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

**GOLETA CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

Members:

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair
Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair
Scott Branch (Architect)
Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)
Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Carl Schneider (Architect)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Wignot at 3:00 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Bob Wignot, Chair; Thomas Smith, Vice Chair; Scott Branch; Cecilia Brown; *Chris Messner; and Carl Schneider. *Member Messner entered the meeting at 3:07 p.m.

Board Members absent: Simon Herrera.

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 5 of 13

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera), to continue Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 37-SB-DRB, Cabrillo Business Park, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to July 22, 2008, per the applicant's request.

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-007-DRB

6300 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-050-020)

This is a request for further *Conceptual* review of a Marriott Residence Inn proposed to be located on a vacant portion of a parcel located at 6300 Hollister Avenue, between La Patera Lane and Robin Hill Road and is in the M-RP zone district. The project site occupies the westerly 3.79 acres of this larger 10.95-acre parcel, currently developed with the Hollister Center structure, and would be split to create the separate parcel for the hotel development.

The proposed building is an approximately 98,800-square foot, 140-room, extended stay hotel. The proposed hotel is designed in a U-shape configuration around a pool, framed by three building wings, each three stories in height. The main entrance is oriented toward Hollister Avenue with access served from both Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. The proposed architecture is characterized as contemporary Mediterranean with emphasis on smooth stucco finish, accent awnings, wood trellis, cornice moldings and concrete roof tile. The proposed hotel would have an average height of 35 feet, but include certain roof elements that extend to 38.72 feet at the top of certain roof ridges.

A total of 144 parking spaces are required to serve the hotel. A total of 129 surface parking spaces are provided around the building perimeter, with 30 additional spaces that would be provided through the reciprocal parking agreement. The applicant would provide a 6-foot wide sidewalk and 4-foot wide parkway with street trees along Robin Hill Road. Improvements along Hollister Avenue are largely governed by the City of Santa Barbara and have been designed following multiple discussions between the Cities of Santa Barbara and Goleta. The current plans include a meandering 6-foot wide sidewalk and parkway and a landscaped median along the Hollister Avenue frontage that would allow left turns into the proposed site driveway on Hollister Avenue, but prohibit left turns from this new access point. Additionally, the existing transit stop along Hollister Avenue would be improved and possibly relocated.

The applicant seeks an ordinance amendment to create a Hotel Overlay District, and General Plan amendments that would allow the project to have portions in excess of 35 feet high, and an FAR of .59.

The project was filed by agent Kenneth Marshall of Dudek & Associates on behalf of 6300 Hollister Associates, property owners and RD Olson. Related cases: 07-007-

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 6 of 13

GPA, 07-007-RZ, 07-007-DP, 07-007-TPM (Continued from 6-19-07, 5-01-07) (Laura Bridley)

Laura Bridley, Contract Planner, provided an overview of the staff report. She provided photographs of the story poles which were installed by the applicant.

The plans were presented Tony Wrozek, R.D. Olson Development, and members of the project team including Gene Fong, project architect; Robert Schmidt, Penfield & Smith, project civil engineer; Jane Gray, Dudek and Associates; and Katie O'Reilly Rogers, project landscape architect; on behalf of 6300 Hollister Avenue, property owners and R.D. Olson. Tony Wrozek stated that the major revision to the project as a result of the last Planning Commission review was the relocation of the front southeast wing from the Locus 1 area to the rear of the project at the northwest corner of the site. He stated that the room count remains the same and the square footage is slightly reduced. Gene Fong, project architect, stated that the story poles were installed to reflect the finished grade. In response to a question from Member Brown, he clarified that the building was not designed to support the sign that is shown on the front elevation of the plans. Robert Schmidt, Penfield & Smith, stated that a can and will serve letter has been received from the Goleta Sanitary District on the basis of whether a lift station will be modified and moved. Katie O'Reilly Rogers, stated that the proposed landscaping palette has not changed since the previous review. She pointed out that the projects' archaeological consultant, David Stone, requested that no landscaping that has roots greater than two feet be planted in the southeast corner. She clarified that the proposed sidewalk material is the standard for the City of Santa Barbara, although it may be possible to add some color.

SPEAKER:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, commented: a) the dumpster space should be somewhat larger with regard to the number of rooms; b) the dumpster and the transformer along Robin Hill Road need to be shown in the west elevations; c) requested clarification regarding whether the heights of the story poles are above finished floor or finished grade; d) suggested that the proposed signs be considered with anticipation of future activity; e) the project looks better with the movement of the mass from the southeast corner to the northwest corner; f) the size of the building is marginally bigger when compared with the building size in April, 2008; g) there are procedures that need to be followed if an American flag is flown on the flagpole, noting that there are certain circumstances when is required; h) the front elevation looks fine and the other three elevations appear industrial and fairly plain but are acceptable considering the building is located in an industrial area; and i) he believes there needs to be consideration that the size of the building is too big for the neighborhood and community, and needs to be somewhat scaled back.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) the removal of the southeast portion of the building is a good change and it addressed some concerns at the previous review; b) the overall mass, bulk and scale is fine, noting that when he visited the story poles today he observed that the three-story portions are set quite a ways back

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 7 of 13

- from Hollister Avenue; c) expressed concern that there are some landscaping restrictions at the southeast corner, suggesting consideration of the use of vines, and also the possibility of planting bigger entry trees near Hollister Avenue, to help soften the southeast corner; d) suggested consideration of adding some type of Chumash cultural and/or educational element, noting that the lobby area may open up to the open space area; e) for an example of a cultural element, there is a strip along a building at UCSB that he recently viewed while riding his bike; f) screening plans for the dumpster will need to be provided at some point; g) suggested consideration of the use of some enhanced materials for the sidewalks; and h) overall, the project is fine.
2. Member Brown commented: a) expressed appreciation that the applicant installed story poles that are very detailed and which give a good indication of the size, bulk, scale and height of the building; b) the new site plan is much better, and the changes are appreciated, but she believes that the building seems large amongst its neighbor buildings and needs to fit in a little better, particularly with the building to the east; c) with regard to the building height, she would like to see some of the height of the highest gable taken out; d) requested consideration of incorporating some design elements from the Chumash culture; e) expressed her support with regard to the eastern wall of the lobby looking out into a landscaped area; f) the dumpster area may need to be bigger if there is a need to incorporate recycle bins; g) the utility and backflow devices will need to be restudied and shown on the site plan; and h) it appears that the awnings are a design element rather than for shading purposes, particularly for the northern elevation.
 3. Member Branch commented: a) pushing back the southeast corner of the building helps the project although its unfortunate that trees can't be planted there; b) encouraged the applicant to explore incorporating some form of cultural homage with regard to the archaeological site; c) there is a better articulation of the architectural forms as viewed when passing by the site, and the courtyard with the pool provides for some articulation; d) the building is big; however, it is located in an area that affords the size; e) when looking at the south elevation, the proposed building is higher than the adjacent building, but it is a different style and there is a fair amount of space between the buildings; f) the gable at the porte cochere and where the sign is located seem somewhat bare, and suggested consideration of a treatment to help the roofline not be so bare, such as a rake that throws a shadow, although it is not consistent with the architectural style; and g) with regard to the southeast corner, the renderings do not show that a roof is probably the same pitch as the rest of the building, and suggested studying that this roof pitch be steeper which would show more roof tile.
 4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) moving the front wing from the southeast corner to the northwest corner is appreciated; b) the size, bulk and scale of the project is fine; c) agreed with Member Branch's comments with regard to the roof on the southeast corner; d) agreed with Member Schneider's comments with regard to the lobby opening up to the open space area, and suggested mirroring the locations of the sales and administration offices with the meeting rooms; e) he has not heard that the Chumash have used stone materials but possibly sandstone walls would be appropriate; and g) agreed with comments made by Member Schneider and Member Branch.

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 8 of 13

5. Member Messner commented: a) the irrigation backflows as well as the main backflows and other equipment need to be screened, located out of the way, and shown on the plans; b) suggested consideration of solar power, noting that there are rebates especially for commercial projects; c) the pull-out for the bus stop is important to facilitate the flow of traffic; and d) observed that moving the sign from the front top of the building to the porte cochere area would have the illusion of the building being smaller instead of the sign being up high and bringing attention upward, although the signs are shown for informational purposes only at this review.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) suggested possible consideration that the building sign could potentially be relocated to the third floor of the eastern portion of the south elevation under a gable, and possibly that gable roof could be eliminated entirely and just have a hipped roof in that location; therefore, all of the projected roofing would be hipped; b) the east elevation, wrapping around to the south, seems very bland with the present color scheme, and suggested that some kind of color change be made to make the building appear less institutional; for example, adding a darker color in the recessed areas; c) the west elevation, wrapping around to the south, is much more interesting because of the use of different colors and stone; d) suggested that the porte cochere be extended southward to provide protection from rain and more shade on the south edge; e) suggested that the height of the porte cochere be lowered, stating that the height seems higher than needed; and f) the building sign seems very prominent and could be understated or relocated, although the signs are shown for informational purposes only at this review.

ACTION: There being no objections, Chair Wignot stated that Conceptual review of Item M-1, No. 07-007-DRB, has been concluded and that the item will be taken off calendar to continue through the process.

RECESS HELD: 4:17 P.M. TO 4:25 P.M.

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-102-DRB

Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road (APN 079-210-049)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is a vacant 14.46-acre property in the DR-8 zone district, located in western Goleta on a parcel extending west of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection.

Proposed structural development includes 102 single family residences and townhouses, including 20 affordable units. Individual units would range in size between 566 and 2,872 square feet. The single-family residences would have a maximum height of 24 feet. The townhouses would have a maximum height of 22 feet. The proposed architecture proposed for both detached and attached units is described as a mix of Spanish, Ranch, and Monterey styles. All units would have private outdoor areas. A total of 258 parking spaces would be provided.

Common open space would total approximately 302,282 square feet (48%) exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated to the City of Goleta, and includes a children's play area and trail, with benches throughout the proposed Devereux Creek restoration