



**UNAPPROVED
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, APRIL 13, 2009**

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

Members of the Planning Commission

*Brent Daniels, Chair
Julie Kessler Solomon, Vice Chair
Doris Kavanagh
Bill Shelor
Jonny Wallis*

*Patricia Miller, Secretary
Tim W. Giles, City Attorney
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk*

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Present: Planning Commissioners Daniels, Shelor, Solomon, and Wallis.
Absent: Planning Commissioner Kavanagh.

Staff present: Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase, Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller, Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz, Planning Technician Brian Hiefield, City Attorney Tim W. Giles, and Recording Clerk Linda Gregory.

PUBLIC FORUM

No speakers.

AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

**A-1 Planning Commission Minutes for the Planning Commission meeting of
March 23, 2009.**

Recommendation:

- A. Approve the Planning Commission minutes for the Planning Commission meeting of March 23, 2009.

Commissioner Shelor stated (with regard to Commissioner Wallis' comment in the minutes for additional discussion with staff at a later date regarding State Density Bonus Law requirements) that he hopes it will be provided at some point.

MOTION: Vice Chair Solomon moved/seconded by Commissioner Shelor to approve the Planning Commission minutes of March 23, 2009, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Daniels; Vice Chair Solomon; Commissioners Shelor, and Wallis. Absent: Commissioner Kavanagh. Noes: None.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

B-1 08-171-APP: Vandeman Appeal of the Design Review Board Preliminary Approval of 08-090-DRB, a Single Family Dwelling Remodel, located at 7837 Langlo Ranch Road: APN 079-600-030.

Recommendation:

1. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 09-__ (Attachment 1), entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Granting Appeal 08-171-APP of Design Review Board Approval of 08-090-DRB for 7837 Langlo Ranch Road".

Staff speakers:

Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician
Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager
Steve Chase, Director of Planning and Environmental Services

Site visits and ex-parte communications: Commissioner Shelor reported that he drove by the site once since the previous hearing. Chair Daniels reported that he drove by the site.

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller stated that the Planning Commission heard this item on January 12, 2009, and continued the item with direction to the applicant.

Document: Letter dated April 6, 2009, from Bernie Schaeffer, re: Vandeman Appeal; Case No. 08-171-APP, objecting to any remodel at 7838 Langlo Ranch Road that involves a first floor addition and a partial garage conversion.

Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician, presented the staff report and PowerPoint entitled "Planning Commission, Vandeman Appeal of the Design Review Board Preliminary Approval of 08-090-DRB 7837 Langlo Ranch Road, April 13, 2009". He stated that staff can no longer support this project taking into consideration the lack of revised

plans from the applicant, along with the issues raised at the January 12, 2009, hearing. Staff also feels that there is sufficient space within the existing floor plan to improve the bedroom to bathroom ratio as well as provide an accessible bathroom for the disabled. Therefore, staff recommends upholding the appeal.

Gary Vandeman, appellant, stated that he does not have additional information to add.

Vice Chair Solomon asked Gary Vandeman, appellant, if there have been any changes in the situation since the last hearing, including parking, or if there has been any outreach to the neighbors.

Gary Vandeman, appellant, stated that to his knowledge the applicant has not attempted to meet with the DRB representative or reach out to the neighbors.

Chair Daniels asked if the applicant or applicant's agent were present to speak.

No one responded.

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller stated that the applicant was provided notice of tonight's hearing and received the agenda materials.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 6:11 P.M.

Speakers:

Barbara Massey, Goleta, stated that she is not a neighbor of this project site but she lives in the area and she is well aware of the appearance of the project. She strongly supports the appeal and the staff recommendation to grant that appeal, and hopes that the appeal will be granted this evening.

Richard Jenkins spoke in opposition to any additions to this house, stating that it is overly impacted with cars and people. He would not support any additions that would be approved by the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 6:14 P.M.

Commissioner Wallis stated that the applicant was encouraged to work with staff and the DRB representative, and she is disappointed that an accommodation was not made.

Commissioner Shelor stated that his comments with regard to the proposed project are the same as at the meeting on January 12, 2009. He noted that he has not received any new information since then from the applicant/property owner. He appreciates that the DRB representative (Tom Smith) met with the agent for the applicant.

Chair Daniels stated that the applicant, James Kirwan, just entered the Council Chambers. There being no objections, Chair Daniels requested that the applicant address the Planning Commission.

James Kirwan, applicant, provided copies of his letter re: 7837 Langlo Ranch Planning Commission Hearing 4-13-09 from James Kirwan applicant. He presented photographs of his home and an alcove in the back where he proposes to add 24 square feet. He explained the scope of the proposed project which was detailed in his letter. He stated that the purpose of the proposed project includes: a) create a 24-square foot bathroom addition at the back of the house; b) add a 57-square foot addition to the garage to make the size legally conforming, and create a bathroom in the existing garage that can be used by someone in a wheelchair; and c) install new sod on the lawn and a paver block driveway and pathways. He also stated that the letter he presented today addresses his concern that statements that are not true were made by a few people.

Commissioner Wallis requested a short break to read the letter presented by James Kirwan, applicant.

MOTION: Commissioner Wallis moved/seconded by Commissioner Shelor to hold a short recess.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Daniels; Vice Chair Solomon; Commissioners Shelor and Wallis. Absent: Commissioner Kavanagh. Noes: None.

RECESS HELD FROM 6:23 P.M. TO 6:30 P.M.

Commissioner Wallis asked staff if the applicant may file a project in the future that corresponds with some of the materials he has provided, if this appeal is upheld.

Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager, stated that if the appeal is upheld, the applicant would need to file an application for a substantially different project if the applicant wants a hearing before one year elapses. She clarified that the applicant may file an appeal to the Planning Commission decision.

MOTION: Commissioner Wallis moved/seconded by Commissioner Shelor to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 09-06 (Attachment 1) entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Upholding Appeal 08-171-APP of Design Review Board Approval of 08-090-DRB for 7837 Langlo Ranch Road: APN 079-600-030".

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Daniels; Vice Chair Solomon; Commissioners Shelor and Wallis. Absent: Commissioner Kavanagh. Noes: None.

Chair Daniels stated that the applicant may appeal the Planning Commission decision within ten calendar days.

Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager, stated that staff will answer the applicant's questions and explain the appeal process.

Steve Chase, Director of Planning and Environmental Services, explained that the action taken by the Planning Commission was to deny the Land Use Permit at this time and to uphold the appeal that had been filed to the Land Use Permit.

C. DISCUSSION ITEM

C-1 08-143-GPA: Westar Project: Hollister Avenue Northwest of Glen Annie Road; APN 073-030-020 and 073-030-021.

Recommendation

1. Take public input, provide comments, and complete Conceptual Review of the Westar Project.

Site visits and ex-parte conversations: Site visits reported by Commissioner Shelor, Commissioner Wallis and Vice Chair Solomon. Chair Daniels reported that he visited the site with Ken Marshall, Dudek, applicant's agent.

Document: Letter from Bonnie Muench, dated April 13, 2009, expressing three concerns with regard to the proposed project.

Steve Chase, Director of Planning and Environmental Services, presented an overview of the Conceptual Review process.

The staff report and PowerPoint were presented by Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner. He stated that the comments from this Conceptual Review will be advisory.

Peter Koetting, Westar Associates, property owner, presented the conceptual plans and PowerPoint regarding the proposed project.

RECESS HELD FROM 7:25 P.M. TO 7:32 P.M.

Speakers:

Barbara Massey, Goleta, commented that she believes a good project can be designed for this location but this design needs some changes. She presented written comments entitled "Westar Project Comments for the Planning Commission for April 13, 2009". Her comments included: 1) A good project can be designed for this location but this design needs some changes. 2) A better approach would be to cluster the residential units and open up the middle of the project by placing all the amenities in the middle to create a view corridor. The pool and clubhouse should be at the rear because of the clubhouse height. 3) The height of the building is a serious concern, stating that this is a valuable view corridor that should be preserved. 4) The story poles need to be properly placed on this property to assess this project. 5) The idea of placing a water fountain is not appropriate when there are water problems. 6) Any parking placed on Glen Annie should be done without encroaching into the right-of-way or property line setbacks. All parking should be angled according to TE 9.4.f. 7) The pedestrian and traffic circulation needs to be improved in both the retail and residential areas. (further details are provided in her written comments). 8) She

proposed extending the driveway along the back of the project all the way to Glen Annie which would provide free traffic flow out of the project without going through the other adjacent property.

Gary Coombs, Goleta, Director of South Coast Railroad Museum at the Goleta Depot, commented specifically on the historical railroad cut feature that is located on the northeast corner of the property. He hopes that this feature will be preserved in any eventual project that is developed, and if possible, incorporated in such a way that it would be better interpreted and more fully shared with the people of the community for their benefit. He stated that the railroad cut was designated by the County of Santa Barbara as a Place of Historical Merit. He provided an explanation of the history of the railroad cut as follows: The coming of the railroad was one of the most important, significant, life-changing events in the history of this area. In 1887, the Southern Pacific Railroad completed the southern portion of this coast route which would eventually go on to San Francisco. The original track, which meandered throughout the Goleta area, ended at Ellwood and stayed that way for fourteen years. When the coast route was completed in 1901, track was realigned, made much straighter, and the old route abandoned. The Goleta Depot was dismantled and taken to Sunnyvale. Bridges and all other buildings were removed. Just a handful of cuts and fills were left along the entire South Coast, including this cut on the proposed project site.

Leslie A. Lund, Goleta, neighbor, stated that the renderings provided by the developer are beautiful and she hopes that a win-win and compromise can be found. She noted that she works for the City of Santa Barbara Parks and Recreation Department and is familiar with open spaces and land use. She is also the president of The Foundation for Girsh Park this year. She expressed the following concerns: 1) There will be headlights and car lights in her living room and bedroom at night from the entrance road behind the commercial area. 2) From her experience living across the street from this site, at least two parking spaces are needed for every household; and parking needs increase as children become old enough to drive. 3) Parking issues will need further discussion, including the use of the garages. 4) The proposed food court at the southeast corner of the commercial section will be located across from several existing residences and would have disruptive noises from outdoor dining such as amplified music, paging systems and late night dining; and also from late night cleaning and early morning commercial trash pickup. 5) There does not seem to be a need for more than two stories. 6) The 300 units could be reduced by approximately thirty-three percent. 7) Medium to low density, and owner-occupied housing are preferred. 8) Peak traffic issues will need to be addressed, along with the utilization of Glen Annie Road. 9) Suggested the developer talk with the Fire Department regarding safety accessibility on the proposed site.

Bonnie Muench, Goleta, representing a property owner on Santa Felicia Drive, stated that her main concern is that a very good traffic study will be needed to control the traffic along Hollister Avenue which is already problematic. She requested more of a "green zone", with a few trees or landscaping, interfacing the buildings along Santa Felicia Road with the proposed commercial development. She expressed concern that the property site for the proposed project is approximately twelve feet higher than the back driveway on Santa Felicia Road, and hopes there will be drainage studies to prevent any problems.

Chair Daniels noted that this is the first time that the public has had an opportunity to review this project at a public hearing and that there will be more opportunities in the future to comment on the project.

Commissioner Wallis commented in general:

1. With regard to the Conceptual Review process, the material being presented is very limited, may change, and will be augmented.
2. Typically applicants work with staff and the DRB regarding project design work. Some input by the Planning Commission may be appropriate.
3. In general, even with a property this size, trying to overbuild is a concern.

Vice Chair Solomon requested that the applicant comment with regard to the nature of the size of the proposed retail area and the kinds of tenants envisioned for the project.

Peter Koetting, property owner, stated that the project is designed for small businesses for neighborhood use such as small shops and services. He noted that these kinds of uses are needed by the daytime working population as well as people returning home in the evening after work.

Vice Chair Solomon commented:

1. Suggested the applicant contact employers in the area, including Raytheon, to discuss the needs of the employers and employees with regard to small businesses.
2. The recreation that is proposed seems to be oriented towards very young children. There is a need for recreation for older children from upper elementary to high school age.
3. Consider other options that are available, for example, Sports Court where children can skate, to provide different kinds of recreation for the tenants on the site.

Commissioner Shelor commented:

1. Overall, there is a kind of nexus between the RHNA requirements and SB 375, where this is an outstanding opportunity to create sustainable, pedestrian-oriented, walkable neighborhoods within short distances of goods and services. There will not be many opportunities left in the City. The proposed project is located along the Hollister transportation corridor so it fits in with SB 375.
2. An outstanding outcome with regard to the number of units would maximize the opportunity to produce workforce housing and still make the project economically feasible. This is important to consider with regard to any General Plan and attendant zoning changes.
3. There are concerns with regard to the level of service traffic requirements with this project and with the new projects including Cabrillo Business Park and two hotels. At some point, conceptual information with regard to improvements being considered to the Storke/Hollister intersection would be useful to help understand what changes are proposed with regard to these projects in the long term.
4. The railroad engineered-cut needs to be looked at both ways: a) Is it possible to preserve this cut and utilize it as project open space?; and b) How many rental units would not be able to be built if this cut were preserved? The provision of affordable workforce housing would trump over the railroad cut.

5. He has some concern regarding making General Plan Amendment changes without knowing what the ripple effect would be elsewhere throughout the City. He is not entirely sure whether it would be appropriate to increase the Recommended Standards for Building Intensity from 25 feet to 35 feet.
6. Effort should be made to maintain the scenic views, vistas and panoramas that can be seen when driving along Hollister Avenue, and not create an enclosed corridor.
7. Regarding maximum residential building heights, consider items such as view corridors, stepping back the project (shorter in front and somewhat higher towards the back), and parapet, flat roofs. The current height of the grade already adds to the height of the project. He noted that a recent project was reviewed (Citrus Village) that incorporated three stories that were contained within 35 feet.
8. The 20+ foot front yard setback proposed from the Hollister Avenue right-of-way is going in the right direction to reduce the enclosed corridor effect along Hollister Avenue and complements what is across the street at the Camino Real Marketplace.
9. In his opinion, scenic vistas should trump creative building elevation facades, and these items do not need to be mutually exclusive
10. Adequate story poles and other kinds of visual simulations should be used to show the results of the proposed project and the remaining views from Hollister Avenue.
11. The applicant should follow-up with the Goleta Water District to find out if the reclaimed water system that runs along Hollister Avenue can be used for non-potable water needs.
12. The use of swales and plans for capturing runoff are appreciated.
13. Obtaining a LEED or other green building certification needs to be a requirement.
14. Consider providing some way for the residents of the existing development to the east to access the proposed new traffic signal, possibly through the back of the proposed site rather than forced to go through the proposed project.
15. The affordable housing component really makes this project. Rental housing by definition is what many people in the workforce can afford. This sounds like a nexus to explore an agreement with the Mariposa assisted living project to provide rental housing so the employees have the opportunity to live close to work.
16. The possibility of locating residential uses over the commercial component sounds like a good idea in terms of providing more workforce housing. It is important to try and maximize the amount of housing that can be produced on this property and make sure that the commercial portion in that area is acceptable under the Airport Approach Overlay.

Chair Daniels commented in general:

1. Suggested possible consideration with regard to whether it may be appropriate to change the R-MD designation on the northern portion of the site.
2. All aspects should be taken into consideration with regard to the future use of the Union Pacific Railroad engineered-cut, including the designation as a Place of Historic Merit.
3. The parking requirements will need further exploration when more details are presented regarding the proposed uses.
4. From a design standpoint, consider how the project will complement, but not match, the Marketplace, the back of which is turned to the south side of Hollister Avenue.
5. From his perspective, it is difficult to understand the need for modifications at the Conceptual Review level for a site this large that will have a clean slate.

6. Further information will be needed about the mix of the units with regard to the number of bedrooms, and the applicant's thought process related to the model.
7. Overall, local preference would be a broader concept to consider when determining the number of housing units that will be provided. (with regard to Commission Shelor's comment regarding exploring an agreement with the Mariposa project to provide an opportunity for rental housing for its employees).

Commissioner Wallis commented on specific points:

1. She is glad to see the style of the project and the rental concept for affordable housing.
2. When there is a maximum density designation for a site, consider the design features and mitigation of impacts. She noted that there are some maps regarding airport parameters in the General Plan appendix.
3. Special care should be taken with regard to the Airport Approach Overlay zone. Consider what can be done to minimize airport impacts on the property. Certain uses are fine in the Airport Approach Overlay; other uses relating more to the residential qualities are not appropriate for this zone.
4. This is an opportunity to define the nature of this kind of commercial enterprise development as the project moves forward.
5. Expressed concern regarding the building height for a number of reasons. The proposed General Plan changes would affect the entire City. The Marketplace property is recessed and not level with Hollister Avenue which rises above the Marketplace, and would result in an uneven match with the proposed project even if the building heights were the same on both properties. There is a special view consideration with regard to the site.
6. The architectural style should be reflective of Goleta, its history and examples of the best of its architecture; and not reflective of other areas such as Santa Barbara.
7. This project needs to carefully accommodate parking impacts on its site because there is no other place for residents to park.
8. The proposed project is located very close to the Storke/Hollister intersection which is the most congested intersection in the City. Careful attention needs to be paid to the cumulative traffic impacts from other projects in the area.
9. Information so far suggests that size, bulk and scale of the proposed project will be issues both from the community viewpoint as well as the inter-relationship of the residential and commercial components on this property.
10. Expressed concern that modifications are already envisioned for this project which has a clean slate. Consider design alternatives that may avoid the need for modifications.
11. On-going outreach to the community is important.

Peter Koetting, applicant, expressed appreciation for the Conceptual Review comments.

Steve Chase, Director of Planning and Environmental Services, stated that comments were received with regard to a variety of issues regarding the proposed project.

Leslie A. Lund, Goleta, neighbor, stated she has not heard any comments with regard to the power lines. From her experience as a resident across the street from the site, her front yard was reduced because of issues related to setbacks regarding power

lines, which happened prior to the City's incorporation. She hopes that a project will be built that people will want to rent, stating that there is nothing worse than too many apartments, than a high apartment vacancy rate.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the public may contact him with regard to the proposed Westar Project.

Chair Daniels thanked everyone for participating in this Conceptual Review.

D. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager, reported that the regular Planning Commission meeting for April 27, 2009, has been cancelled. She also reported that an appeal was filed to the Planning Commission approval of the Citrus Village project.

Steve Chase, Director of Planning and Environmental Services, reported: 1) The deadline for comments to be received regarding the Bacara Resort & Spa Completion Phase Project Environmental Impact Report, Notice of Preparation Scoping Hearing is April 16, 2009. 2) The City Council will consider Track 2.5 General Plan Amendment Work Program on April 21, 2009. 3) On May 5, 2009, at 1:30 p.m., the City Council will conduct a Study Session on Housing Element keynote issues. 4) The City Council will consider the Haskell's Landing Project on May 5, 2009. 5) Three member of the Planning Commission recently attended the League of California Cities Planners Institute in Anaheim.

Steve Chase, Director of Planning and Environmental Services, reported that staff is in the process of scheduling a set of dates tentatively in the July/August 2009 timeframe for Planning Commission meetings to consider the proposed Track 3 General Plan Amendments. He requested that the Commissioners advise whether a lengthy Saturday session may be possible followed by an evening session if it cannot be avoided to facilitate setting these dates. Staff will follow-up with the Commissioners to schedule the meetings.

E. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

No comments.

F. ADJOURNMENT: 8:40 P.M.

Prepared by Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

GOLETA PLANNING COMMISSION