



REPORT DATE: October 31, 2008

TO: Planning Commission Chair and Members

FROM: Steve Chase, Planning and Environmental Services Director

CONTACT: Patricia S. Miller, Manager, Current Planning
Cindy Moore, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: 04-226-TM, -DP: Citrus Village located at 7388 Calle Real; 077-490-043

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission's action should include the following:

1. Conduct continued public hearing, receive progress report, and provide direction to staff and the applicant.

This item was continued for purposes of addressing Planning Commission concerns raised at the hearings conducted on August 25, 2008 and September 8, 2008. At the September 8, 2008, hearing, the Planning Commission directed the applicant to move forward with consideration of the 12 unit alternative plan, to include review by the DRB, with the ability for the applicant and DRB to consider the 10 unit alternative plan if the 12 unit alternative plan is found to be problematic within the review process and continued the item to the November 10, 2008, Planning Commission hearing.

The approved minutes from the October 14, 2008 DRB meeting (excerpted) are included in Attachment 1. The proposed plans are included in Attachment 2. On November 10, 2008, the Planning Commission should conduct an in-progress review at the continued public hearing and provide direction to staff and the applicant regarding the proposed 12 unit alternative.



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, October 14, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

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	Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)
Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair	Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Scott Branch (Architect)	Carl Schneider (Architect)
Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)	

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; Cecilia Brown; Scott Branch; Simon Herrera; Chris Messner; and Carl Schneider.

Board Members absent: None.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

given with regard to some type of street art; for example, placing figurines at certain locations; g) The applicant will need to follow standards with regard to root barriers; and h) There are new cost breaks associated with photovoltaic applications.

6. Member Herrera commented: a) Recommended that the plans include as many permeable pavers as possible; b) The landscape plan is very good; and c) The two water features are appreciated.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) He believes the whole design should be flipped so that parking and service areas are located between Hollister Avenue and Building 12A and Building 12B; and the food court areas are located to the south in the current parking area, which would address his concern that the people in the outdoor area would be subjected to the hustle and bustle of traffic, especially during noontime; b) The metal cap element should be removed; c) The east elevation of Building 12B and the south elevation of both buildings need some treatment to relieve the blandness; d) Recommended that provisions be built into the current design for future photovoltaics and green roof applications; and e) The applicant is requested to provide a rendering of the intersection of Hollister Avenue and Los Carneros Road, looking southwest towards the project, that would illustrate the amenities and the plans for screening.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-4, No. 08-169-DRB and 08-170-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to November 12, 2008, with comments.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 04-226-DRB

7388 Calle Real (APN 077-490-043)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The project has been increased by two units following the Planning Commission hearing on September 8, 2008. The revised project includes a Final Development Plan for 12 condominium units totaling 20,952 square feet, including two affordable units, associated infrastructure, and common open space on approximately .94 acres in the DR-12.3 zone district. Five residential unit types are proposed within three, three-story structures (Buildings A-C) arranged along the eastern portion of the site. The buildings would have a maximum height of 34 feet 3 inches and would each contain four attached units consisting of three, three-bedroom units and one two-bedroom unit. The units in Building A would range from 1,043 square feet to 1,463 square feet. The units in Buildings B and C would range from 869 square feet to 1,512 square feet. Access to the site would be via Calle Real. Parking would include 12 one-car garages at 248 square feet each and 24 parking spaces, for a total of 36 spaces. The project was filed by Detlev Peikert, representing 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner. Related cases 04-226-TM, -DP. (Last heard on 7-08-08) (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by Lisa Plowman, planning manager, Peikert Group Architects; Detlev Peikert, representing 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner; and April Palencia, project architect. Lisa Plowman stated that in response to review by the Planning Commission, the applicant has prepared refined conceptual plans for

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 14 of 18

review by the DRB. She clarified that this project is a State bonus density project under State law. Detlev Peikert discussed the details with regard to the revised plans including the Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, and Sections. He provided an aerial photograph showing how the development is configured on the site, and existing footprints of the adjacent condominium; and also photo simulations showing the view of the project from Calle Real.

Senior Planner Cindy Moore stated that the Planning Commission continued the public hearing on this project to November 10, 2008, to allow time for the DRB to respond to the revised plans.

Documents: Letter from Karen Lovelace, Goleta, dated October 14, 2008, Re: October 14, 2008, DRB Agenda Item M-1, 7388 Calle Real, AKA "Citrus Village".

Speakers:

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, discussed the history of previous development plans for the site and expressed concern that the current DR-12.3 zone district would allow the potential for a very high Floor Area Ratio (FAR). She expressed her concerns which included: a) In comparison to adjacent development, this project is way out of scale; b) There would be too much development on the site; c) The items in the landscape plan appear too crammed together; d) The existing landscaping along the east side of the property is not within the control of the project and is located on an elevation approximately five feet lower than the site. e) The landscaping along the west side between the commercial and residential properties would not be adequate; f) The drainage plan shows that the lot slopes between Building A and Building B, and the lot slopes between Building B and Building C, which is not conducive to providing a comfortable open space; g) The lot is located in a drainage basin area; h) The craftsmen design is not appropriate for this site and will stand out; i) Suggested an architectural style that blends in better, with a lower height; j) Recommended story poles for this project site; k) She noted that the Planning Commission did not review the specific details of the revised plans which were provided by the applicant at this review; and m) Requested the DRB make sure the project is compatible with the neighborhood.

Bill Shelor, Goleta, appreciates that the revised plans will include affordable housing units, stating that the plans are an improvement over the previous plans. He said he is always concerned regarding the potential loss of mountain views. He expressed concern regarding the proposed building height and requested that story poles be installed that fully gauge the visual impact. He questioned whether the trees that are proposed to be located in the front of the buildings will eventually obscure the third levels.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) He understands that including affordable units is desirable, noting that the site plan appears somewhat dense based on the number of units. b) While he understands the desire to add additional parking

spaces, he suggested considering whether it would be more efficient to use one or two parking spaces for a central trash collection area for all units rather than requiring each unit to place bins along the road on collection day and to store bins in each garage; c) The proposed architectural character of the design is fine and works relatively well, noting that it is a friendly style and would be better than trying to match adjacent styles; d) The roof on Building A is softened by keeping the unit a two-bedroom unit, and it softens Building A facing Calle Real quite well; e) He suggested that the northern rear unit in Building C be changed to a two-bedroom unit, softening the roof form, which will address his concern that Building C appears to loom over the adjacent Brookside Condominiums to the north.

2. Member Branch commented: a) He agreed with Member Schneider's suggestion to change the northern unit to a two-bedroom unit to help soften the building mass adjacent to the condominium development; b) He acknowledged the need for a centralized trash collection methodology with regard to the concern that there will be a large number of individual trash cans set out for trash collection; c) He cannot support the reduction of parking spaces, noting that parking is important for this particular site which has no street parking; d) The proposed architecture is a style that would help accommodate a third story; and e) The architectural style is fine, stating that it may be counter productive to try to match existing styles.
3. Member Brown commented: a) There should be a way to find space on the site for recycling and trash collection purposes without reducing parking; b) The placement of the utilities, which makes a difference in the appearance of the final product, needs to be shown on the plans and reviewed; c) In her opinion, the proposed architecture style appears somewhat too stylized; d) Details such as fences will need to be reviewed at the appropriate review level; e) Moving the units away from the west property line is appreciated; and f) In general, infill site are difficult with regard to project development and review.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The proposed plans for twelve units seem to try to place too much development on this site; b) He believes that an eleven-unit project would be more appropriate for the site; c) A centralized trash collection area would be beneficial; d) A central mail area may be beneficial; e) He agreed with Members Schneider and Branch that softening the architecture on Unit 12 on the north elevation is needed; and f) Moving the units away from the west property line is appreciated.
5. Member Messner commented: a) He expressed concern that the Unit 12, with the three-story element, will appear to tower up over the adjacent property; and agreed with the DRB comments to consider softening the architecture; b) Story poles may be useful; and c) The site plan appears tight; and suggested finding ways to reduce this; for example consider a centralized trash collection area and centralized location for mail.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) He suggested reducing the number of units from twelve to eleven; and b) Suggested that an area near the tot lot, located between the first garage and catch basin, be considered for the location of a central trash area.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) It would be beneficial to erect story poles that would show the dimensions of the buildings, particularly the height of Building C in the back; b) He expressed concern with regard to circulation, for example, visitors who park on the west side of the property would need to walk along a foot path to the

east side of the property to enter the units; c) He suggested splitting the garages into two two-car garages with a central alley and gates which would allow visitors to enter the residences from the yard, and also allow the residents to keep their trash containers inside the yard and place them out on collection day; d) He recommended that numbered parking spaces be assigned for each unit and be located as close to the unit as possible; e) Visitor parking spaces should be designated and labeled for use by visitors; f) He requested that a walkway be added along the north side, between Unit 12 and the property line, and also along the south side, between Unit 1 and the detention basin, if there is room; and g) He agreed with DRB comments suggesting that the mass of Unit 12 in Building C be scaled back, noting that there is a large window in Unit 12 looking down into an adjacent yard.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, stated that the DRB comments were very constructive; including the following suggestions: a) change Unit 12 to a two-bedroom unit to soften the architecture to the north; b) explore possible solutions to create a central trash area; c) consider splitting the garages into two two-car garages, (if there is room); and d) consider adding walkways or stepping stones along the south and north side of the site. He said that reducing the number of units from twelve to eleven would not be possible at this time without losing one affordable unit.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 04-226-DRB, 7388 Calle Real, with comments, to December 9, 2008.

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 area. A conceptual landscape plan includes restoration of the Devereux Creek corridor. The 87 eucalyptus and 8 cypress trees to be removed would be replaced with a total of 282 drought tolerant Mediterranean and native tree species, both ornamental (e.g., Melaluca, London Plane Tree, etc.) and indigenous to the area (e.g., coast live oak and sycamore).