City of Santa Barbara
Planning Division

HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

DISCUSSION / WORKSHOP

MINUTES

Wednesday, December 7, 2011 David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street 4:30 P.M.

COMMISSION MEMBERS: PHILIP SUDING, *Chair* – Present
DONALD SHARPE, *Vice-Chair* – Present
LOUISE BOUCHER – Present
MICHAEL DRURY – Present
WILLIAM LA VOIE – Present
FERMINA MURRAY – Present
JUDY ORÍAS – Present until 6:04 p.m.
CRAIG SHALLANBERGER – Present until 5:00 p.m.

ADVISORY MEMBER: DR. MICHAEL GLASSOW – Absent
CITY COUNCIL LIAISON: MICHAEL SELF – Absent
PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON: STELLA LARSON – Absent

STAFF: JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor – Absent
MICHAEL BERMAN, Project Planner/Environmental Analyst – Absent
SUSAN GANTZ, Planning Technician – Absent
DANNY KATO, Senior Planner/Development Review Supervisor – Present
GABRIELA FELICIANO, Commission Secretary – Present

Website: www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov

NOTICE:

A. On Friday, December 2, 2011, at 4:00 P.M., this Agenda was duly posted on the indoor and outdoor bulletin boards at the Community Development Department, 630 Garden Street, and online at www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov/hlc.

B. This discussion/workshop meeting of the Historic Landmarks Commission was broadcast live on TV Channel 18 and rebroadcast in its entirety on Friday at 1:00 P.M. A live broadcast could also be seen via personal computer by going to www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov/Government/Video and then clicking *City TV-18 Live Broadcast*. An archived video copy of this meeting will be viewable on computers with high speed internet access by going to www.santabarbaraca.gov/hlc and then clicking *Online Meetings*.

CALL TO ORDER.

The Full Board meeting was called to order at 4:55 p.m. by Chair Suding.

ATTENDANCE:

Members present: Boucher, Drury, La Voie, Murray, Orías, Shallanberger, Sharpe, and Suding.

Members absent: None.

Staff present: Kato and Feliciano.

DISCUSSION ITEM

2559 PUESTA DEL SOL E-1 Zone

(4:55) Assessor's Parcel Number: 023-271-003
Application Number: MST2010-00166
Owner: Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History
Agent: Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services
Architect: Schacht Aslani Architects

(Proposed project consists of the Master Plan for the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. The project components include deconstruction of the majority of the existing structures, approximately 57,700 square feet, with the exception of the designated structures of merit and proposed new development of approximately 100,000 square feet. The project requires a Measure E allocation of 57,000 square feet and has received a dual designation as a Community Priority and Economic Development project.)

(Second conceptual level discussion workshop on Master Plan Improvements proposed for Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. Item last reviewed on November 9, 2011.)

Present: Danny Kato, Senior Planner/Development Review Supervisor
Walter Schacht, Architect, Schacht Aslani Architects
Suzanne Elledge, SEPPS
Susette Naylor, Thompson Naylor Architects
Dr. Karl Hutterer, Executive Director, Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History

Public comment opened at 5:36 p.m.

Kellam de Forest, local resident: applicant going in the right direction and the design looks better with flat roofs; concerned with plazas, green roofs versus a sea of solar panels, and emergency road.

Mary Louise Days, local historian and neighbor: examples shown by applicant not in El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District; concerned that no changes in drawings from the last meeting, importance of heritage buildings, and residential neighborhood full of architecturally important institutions.

Kent Hodgetts, local resident: in support of a project at this site and provided written comments; unique situation for an institution that is not in an urban grid; site is in relation with a unique riparian environment that is both geological and dynamic; some accommodation should be made to waterway; and possible bending of elements.

Public comment closed at 5:45 p.m.

Discussion held with comments only; no action taken.

The Commission provided the following comments:

1. **Process:** Staff shall look into making sure these meeting procedures are not in violation of the Brown Act, and possibly "noticing" the public of future workshops.
2. This is a project that encompasses a place that some have a great deal of affection for; therefore, a dialogue is useful to give the applicant's team some direction and move the project forward.
3. This is a non-binding review of a project that has not been applied for with the City yet.

4. **Roofs:** There should be a blend of flat and pitched roofs; not all can be expressed as flat roofs. A portion of the existing tile roofs shown in the presentation should be articulated on the new part of the campus.
5. The flat roofs are shown on the drawings with equipment that is very difficult to screen and practically at eye-level on a good portion of the campus.
6. **Photovoltaic units/Sustainability:** The campus is on a relatively shaded area and the use of solar panels will be a challenge. What will be seen will exceed the 30 foot limit on most of the structures.
7. An organic response to the local weather would be more acceptable than solar panels.
8. Net zero is a good goal, but that does not mean that all the buildings have to be at the same level.
9. **Style:** Consider that one of the characteristics of Spanish Colonial architecture is that it is not rational, but rather composed of little buildings and a variety of physical experiences in a human scale.
10. Use the scale, composition, irrationality, and Hispanic style of the existing building.
11. Visitors should have a curvilinear experience, not rectangular, with an element of surprise.
12. **Mass, bulk and scale:** The proposed addition is not compatible in size, bulk and scale with an historic resource. It is big, not just in footprint, but in its expression as well.
13. Make the proposed big building look smaller and compose it so that it looks less as a college campus and more of an Hispanic building.
14. Break the building up, reorganize it, and make it human.
15. The volume that is needed for the Mammal Hall building should not be enclosed in a shoebox, but rather the enclosure should be given some shape/character and modulated to be in scale with the existing building.
16. **Model/Drawings:** Providing a model would be of greater assistance as previously requested.
17. Hand sketches would be preferable to computer drawings.
18. **Inspiration:** Be inspired by the examples contained in the El Pueblo Viejo Design Guidelines, but do not imitate them exactly.

<u>The applicant team brought out the following points:</u>

1. The purpose of these discussions is for the design review board to provide early input before the project design team takes the project to a certain point only to find out that the project is not headed in the right direction. These types of discussions have been held with other boards and commissions in the same forum.
2. These are publicly "noticed" meetings in the sense that the agendas are posted within the required Brown Act timeline and the meetings are open to the public. (In addition, they are being televised.)
3. The applicant has had extensive community meetings prior to application submittal. The community has had many opportunities to respond to early concepts and there is a commitment to continue to keep the community updated as progress is made.
4. The historic assembly of the buildings is being used as guidance for redesign, rather than the current design of the museum.
5. The proposed size of the gallery exhibits is very small by contemporary standards.
6. The institution's current use is different from the original intent and use of the buildings. The applicant is attempting to face the challenge of creating a museum that serves a contemporary program.
7. The goal of the applicant's team is to be an example as to what can be done in conformity with the sustainability framework of the newly adopted General Plan.

**** MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:27 P.M. ****