

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE RECORD OF ACTION

April 22, 2009

Item No. 1 **Time:** 9:30 a.m. **File:** PLP08-0011
Applicant: Olmsted and Associates **Staff:** Dave Hardy
Env. Doc.: N/A
Proposal: Request for Design Review of an expansion to the existing Sea Ranch Lodge to include 60 lodging units, reuse of original post office building with retail and commercial uses and a new 23,882 square foot administration building, restaurant and lounge, and a new building with conference and meeting rooms totaling 2,760 square feet on 52 acres.
Location: 60 Sea Walk Drive, Sea Ranch
APN: 122-200-009 **Sup. Dist:** 5
Zoning: CT (Commercial Tourist), CC (Coastal Combining), SR (Scenic Resource)
DR Level: Preliminary
Public Hearing: No

PEOPLE PRESENT

Design Review Committee:
Don MacNair, Jim Henderson, Blake Hillegas

Staff: Dave Hardy
Applicant: Peter Heineman, Passport Resorts
Others: John Ashworth, Joni Janecki, Steve Butler, Richard Ratecki, Bob Hartstock, Sheila Brady, John Kelley, Anne Burton, Barry Weiss, Lee Mueller, Patricia Romeiro, Dick Whitaker, Julie Gibson

ACTION ON ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: Not Applicable

PROJECT DESIGN: Preliminary Review

ACTION: PROJECT DESIGN NEEDS REVISION (AS INDICATED ON ATTACHED COMMENTS)

DETAILS OF ACTION:

Bring Back on Regular Calendar: Site Plan; Building Design/Elevation Drawings; Building Color/Materials; Landscape Design Drawings; Landscape Construction Documents; Signs; Grading; Exterior Lighting; Fence Design;

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Don MacNair: Aye	Jim Henderson: aye	Blake Hillegas: Aye
Ayes: 3	Noes: 0	Absent: 0
		Abstain: 0

**DESIGN REVIEW RECORD OF ACTION SHEET
(COMMENTS)**

Applicant: Olmsted and Associates
Address: 60 Sea Walk Drive, Sea Ranch

File: PLP08-0011
Date: April 22, 2009

NOTE: THE APPLICANT IS URGED TO RESPOND UNDER EACH COMMENT AS TO HOW PLANS HAVE BEEN REVISED. IF A RECOMMENDED CHANGE IS NOT MADE, PLEASE INDICATE WHY. PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR RESPONSES WITH PLANS FOR FINAL DESIGN REVIEW.

SITE PLAN

1. Existing access to the lodge feels like a back entry. Consider aesthetic improvements at this entry, including concerns with regard to the prominence of the service area.

Response: _____
2. Provide a Site Plan detail of the existing Highway 1 access and any vehicular improvements as warranted or proposed.

Response: _____
3. Does pool complex need to be where it is?

Response: _____
4. Look at County guidelines for parking lot design and add landscape islands in the parking lots.

Response: _____
5. Provide a detailed parking analysis explaining whether proposed parking will be sufficient for the mix of uses and activities.

Response: _____

ARCHITECTURE

6. Building height and mass are an issue for the lodge, fire side room, south cluster as viewed from the ocean bluff trails, and the meadow cluster due to its potential to impede ocean views. Building heights should be more compatible with existing building heights and the 24 foot height limit. The south building cluster appears out of scale with the existing historic post office building as viewed from the ocean side.

Response: _____
7. Existing views from the public parking lot need to be better protected. The view corridor needs to be opened up by relocating the three-unit cluster situated south of the proposed view corridor.

Response: _____

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

8. Need to provide visual screening of parking lot from Highway 1.

Response: _____

9. Provide more detail on landscape enhancements.

Response: _____

OTHER

10. Improve lodge signing for ease of access.

Response: _____

11. Verify what corridor grade is as noted in the Staff Report.

Response: _____

12. Will the golf cart transportation work given the often cold, damp, and windy environment?

Response: _____