



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, November 12, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 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)	

Notices:

- Requests for review of project plans or change of scheduling should be made to the City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, 93117; Telephone (805) 961-7500.
 - In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City of Goleta at (805) 961-7500. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City staff to make reasonable arrangements.
 - Preliminary approval or denial of a project by the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Goleta Planning Commission within ten (10) calendar days following the action. Please contact the Planning and Environmental Services Department for more information.
 - Design Review Board approvals do not constitute Land Use Clearances.
 - The square footage figures on this agenda are subject to change during the review process.
 - The length of Agenda items is only an estimate. Applicants are responsible for being available when their item is to be heard. Any item for which the applicant is not immediately available may be continued to the next meeting.
-

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 2 of 17

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for October 28, 2008

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

C. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** General comments regarding topics over which the Design Review Board has discretion will be allowed. Comments from concerned parties regarding specific projects not on today's agenda will be limited to three minutes per person.

D. **REVIEW OF AGENDA:** A brief review of the agenda for requests for continuance.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

- NONE

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-131-DRB

5505-5585 Overpass Road & 5410 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-330-011 & 071-330-012)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes the approved Sumida Gardens Apartments development, which will contain 9 buildings totaling 194,448 square feet on approximately 10.26 acres in the DR-20 zone district. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Sumida Gardens Apartments development. The proposed OSP provides for five (5) different types of signs: monument and identification signs; directional signs; pool signage; parking signage; and miscellaneous signage. The OSP would specify the design and maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign. A total of 20 sign types are proposed. Sign materials generally consist of wood, aluminum, and acrylic. Sign colors are generally ivory, gold, beige, brown, red, and green. Some signs are proposed to be internally illuminated. The project was filed by Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, agent for Sumida Family Limited Partnership, property owner. Related cases: 08-131-OSP; -CUP. (Continued from 10-14-08, 9-09-08*, 8-12-08) (Shine Ling)

Staff recommendation to move to the first item on DRB's full calendar.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 3 of 17

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

10-14-08 Meeting:

1. The photograph and proposed landscape plans were provided and reviewed.
2. Proposed illumination for the off-site monument sign: Acceptable as submitted.
3. Off-site monument sign: The applicant shall restudy: a) the letter heights; b) the line spacing; and c) improving the proportionality fit on the face of the sign to address the concern that there was a significant amount of white space.
4. On-site monument sign: The applicant shall restudy: a) the letter heights; b) the line spacing; and c) improving the proportionality fit on the face of the sign to address the concern that there was a significant amount of white space.
5. Front entry directory sign: Acceptable as submitted.
6. On-site directory signs (open space at the base): Acceptable as submitted.
7. On-site directory signs: Acceptable as submitted.
8. Entrance: The height of the rental office sign shall be reduced so that the portion of the sign with the words "Rental Office" will remain and the additional height of the sign will be cut down (which will include the removal of the words "Sumida Gardens Apartments" and removal of the picture of the palm tree).
9. Model number signs: Acceptable as submitted.
10. Address plaques for buildings and address plaques for units: Acceptable as submitted.
11. Pool signage: Acceptable as submitted.
12. Parking signage: Acceptable as submitted.
13. Miscellaneous Signage: Acceptable as submitted.
14. Any other proposed signs: Will need to be presented for review.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION: There being no objections, Item H-1, No. 08-131-DRB, 5505-5585 Overpass Road and 5410 Hollister Avenue, was continued with comments to November 12, 2008, for Preliminary review.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-182-DRB

7127 Hollister Avenue (APN073-440-001 & 073-440-012)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 21,444-square foot commercial tenant space on a 9.3 acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to install two wall signs on the existing tower element, one on the east elevation and one on the north elevation. The 18-foot by 3.08-foot sign will have 24-inch blue letters reading "PACIFIC SALES", and 9-inch red letters reading "KITCHEN, BATH & ELECTRONICS" with a total sign area of 55.44 square feet. The individually pin mounted vinyl channel letters will be internally illuminated with white and red LED bulbs. The project was filed by agent Christian Muldoon on behalf of Islay Investments, property owner. Related cases: 23-SB-OSP; 23-SB-CUP; 23-SB-DP AM01; 23-SB-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-186-DRB

6021 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-082-028)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes an approximately 28,000-square foot hotel on a 0.7-acre lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes a change to the faces of three existing signs: a 54-square foot freestanding pole sign, an approximately 109-square foot wall sign, and a 4.3-square foot freestanding directional sign. The signs will be constructed of yellow

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 4 of 17

polycarbonate with a vinyl overlay for graphics. The two faces of the freestanding sign are 9 feet tall by 6 feet wide each, and the face of the wall sign is 33 feet wide by 3.3 feet tall. The two faces of the freestanding directional sign are 25 inches tall by 25 inches wide. An as-built Conditional Use Permit is also requested for the freestanding directional sign. The project was filed by Christian Muldoon of Vogue Signs, agent, on behalf of Van Bivens, secretary for the H. Oliver Dixon Trust, property owner. Related cases: 08-186-CUP, 08-186-SCC, 08-187-SCC, and 08-188-SCC. (Shine Ling)

H-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-148-DRB

5892 Calle Real (APN 069-110-061)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a commercial building occupied by Bank of America. The applicant proposes to install new signage associated with Bank of America, including a new freestanding pole sign (Sign 1), two wall signs (Signs 14, & 15), and two directional signs (Signs 11, & 13). Signage proposed that will not require permits are a sign for disabled parking (Sign 3), glass door signage (Signs 9, & 10), and a Do Not Enter sign to replace the existing sign (Sign 12). The project was filed by agent Steve Stallone on behalf of Bank of America, property owner. Related cases: N/A. (Brian Hiefield)

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 37-SB-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Final review*. The property includes two screened storage areas and nine buildings totaling 326,490 square feet on a 92.25-acre lot in the Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Buildings 1, 2, 4 and associated improvements, improvements for the private internal drive, and street and frontage improvements to Hollister Avenue and Los Carneros Road as part of the phased build out of the previously approved Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 1 would be a two-story, 80,000-square foot structure and Buildings 2 and 4 would both be two-story, 60,000-square foot structures. Associated improvements for each building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, and parking. New materials consist of concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out, the Cabrillo Business Park would total 946,282 square feet, including 704,600 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. The project was filed by agent Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN. (Continued from 9-23-08*, 7-22-08, 6-10-08*, 4-22-08, 4-20-04, 3-16-04, 2-17-04*, 1-6-04, 12-2-03) (Cindy Moore)

Applicant request to continue to February 10, 2009

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 5 of 17

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-22-08 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the current proposed location for the Goleta Water District backflow preventer is the preferred location, noting that the equipment would be pushed back as far from the curb as possible, and that the current location shown is in the realm of forty feet; b) the backflow preventer equipment should be landscaped; c) requested that the applicant provide more details regarding the lighting plan, including cut sheets and lighting elements; and d) requested a better understanding with regard to the poles with the lighting standards.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) suggested that the water feature be pulled back and not so far into the parking lot; b) expressed support for the proposed location for the backflow preventer equipment; and c) the changes are fine and the project is looking very nice.
3. Member Branch commented: a) the boldness of the cobalt blue color is appreciated and the muted blue color is not attractive; b) agreed with Member Schneider's recommendation to move the water feature into the center of the landscape element; c) agreed with the DRB members' suggestion to move the water backflow preventer equipment as far off from the street as possible.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) agreed with previous comments from members with regard to the location of the backflow preventer and moving the water feature; b) expressed appreciation for the changes on the Hollister Street frontage on Building 1, stating that the building is very nice and pays some homage to the original Delco Building located up the street by having the building step, and with the glass wrapping the corners.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with DRB comments recommending moving the backflow preventer from the sidewalk and relocating the water feature; and b) the building design is appreciated.
6. Member Messner commented: a) noted that he believes that the water fountain does not necessarily need to be brought into the center, stating that he would prefer off-center; and b) the bus stop needs to have a pull-out for the bus to facilitate traffic flow.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) the project continues to move in a very good direction; b) the changes respond to the DRB comments from the previous meeting; c) recommended that the applicant refer to the City's current Recommended Street Tree List with regard to planting trees in the right-of-way; d) the suggestion that some of the existing palm trees be re-located to the median on Hollister Avenue would not comply with the City's recommended list; e) expressed support for the public comment suggestion removal of the pampas grass; e) agreed with the DRB comments supporting the location shown for the backflow preventer; and f) the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-1, No. 37-SB-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, with comments; and to continue to September 23, 2008, for Final review on the Final Calendar by the full DRB.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- **NONE**

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-045-DRB

5484 Overpass Road (APN 071-220-033)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 5,780-square foot shop building, a 1,362-square foot office building, a 18,835-square feet of unenclosed materials storage (a portion of which – in the southwest corner of the property – is as-built), an as-built 640-square foot storage unit, and two unused fuel pumps and associated underground fuel tanks on a 84,070-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 2,961-square foot, two story office addition, and a new trash enclosure. This application also includes a proposal to permit the aforementioned as-built outdoor material storage area and storage unit, and to re-configure the site's parking areas. All materials used for this addition are to match the existing office building with the exception of the proposed lighting, which would be the Capri Mini by The Plaza Family. The project was filed by agent Joseph H. Moticha on behalf of Randy Douglas, Tierra Contracting, Inc., property owner. Related cases: 07-045-DP AM01, 07-045-LUP. (Continued from 10-14-08*, 09-23-08*, 09-09-08) (Laura Vik)

Applicant request to continue to January 13, 2009

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

9-09-08 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) suggested the applicant consider replacing, at some location on the site, the two avocado trees that will be removed.
2. Member Branch commented: a) the transition of the board and bat materials to a stucco façade at the corner of the building seems odd; b) the stucco appears as a wainscot; and c) as an example for consideration, on some buildings on other sites, stucco is used up to the floor height, with board and bat materials used above the stucco.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) the overall design of the building is good; b) there needs to be a better resolution of materials, for example, using a little more board and bat materials on the new addition (he noted that the existing building style seems to be board and bat); c) requested that the applicant document the existing trees located along the eastern property line; and d) requested the applicant consider the possibility of adding one or two trees that would help fill in the area along the eastern property line where the avocado trees will be removed, planting a tree species that grows upright such as the Sycamore species.
4. Member Messner commented: a) recommended that the tree species that would be added to the landscape plan should be evergreen rather than a Sycamore species which is deciduous for continual privacy.
5. Chair Wignot commented: a) the applicant's use of double pane windows and additional insulation along the eastern property line will be helpful to address the noise from the adjacent animal control use; and b) suggested that the applicant consider using solar panels for hot water and/or electricity, if feasible.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 7 of 17

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith) to continue Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, to September 23, 2008, with the following comments: a) the applicant is requested to restudy the resolution of materials on the building; b) the applicant is requested to provide a landscape plan showing all approved landscaping and what is being removed; and c) the applicant is requested to study the potential addition of a couple of trees along the eastern property line.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-169-DRB & 08-170-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes two screened storage areas and nine buildings totaling 326,490 square feet on a 92.25-acre lot in the M-RP and M-S-GOL zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Buildings 12A and 12B and associated improvements as part of the phased build out of the Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 12A would be a one-story, 10,000-square foot structure and Building 12B would be a one-story, 7,500-square foot structure. Associated improvements for each building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, and parking. New materials consist of metal, concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out the Cabrillo Business Park as proposed to be amended would total 948,782 square feet, including 707,100 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. The project was filed by agent Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 08-107-DP AM, 08-039-LUP, 08-040-LUP, 08-041-LUP, 08-042-LUP, 08-160-LUP, 08-119-LUP, 08-025-LUP, 07-144-MC, 07-236-MC, 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN. . (Continued from 10-14-08) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

10-14-08 Meeting:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) He appreciates that the buildings are oriented towards Hollister Avenue because it brings activity to the street; b) From a landscaping standpoint, the continuation of the circular plaza works fairly well, and the landscaping works well to connect to the parking lot; c) The proposed water fountain at the entry should remain, however he would support removing the second water feature; d) The metal cap element needs to be studied; e) The trellis element between the two sections of the building would work well; e) The architecture seems very bland on the east elevation of Building 12 B, facing Los Carneros Road after turning the corner, and should have a better design statement because this is the signature corner of the project; and f) On the south elevation, there needs to be some architectural enhancement to reinforce the location of the walkway portion of the building.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The metal cap elements do not seem appropriate and should be removed; b) The concept of the sandstone curving is appreciated. Also appreciated is the gradient effect of the glazing with the lighter color at the bottom and graduating to darker at the top; c) He supports addressing the overall concepts of green roof architecture and photovoltaics in the plans; d) Suggested considering that the west side on Building 12A would be designated as the back of the building; e) The proposed landscape plan is

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 8 of 17

- appreciated, including the multi-layered texture between the hardscape and softscape; and f) Requested that amenities be provided to facilitate use of the outdoor plaza area for outdoor eating and for musical performances; for example, install electrical outlets for musical instruments.
3. Member Brown commented: a) The lighting fixtures should be mounted with the light facing downward; b) The lighting needs to be addressed to make sure it is sufficient for the pathway; c) The light needs to be appropriate depending on its intended use, for example outdoor dining and pathways; d) Consider adding large trellises and vines for relief along the south side of Building 12A; e) The landscaping which appears rich and robust is appreciated; f) There needs to be enough chairs provided and outdoor places for people to sit and enjoy the open space even if people bring their lunch; and g) The view of the mountains from the outdoor area is important to many people.
 4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Overall, the project is fine; b) The landscape plan is appreciated; c) The metal cap element seems ambiguous and should be removed; d) The secondary water feature should be retained on the south side; e) The south elevation architecture needs to be enhanced particularly to reinforce the walkway portion of the building; f) The architecture on the east elevation of Building 12B, facing Los Carneros, needs to be enhanced; and g) He appreciates that the setback widens as one approaches the intersection.
 5. Member Messner commented: a) Overall, the landscape plan is appreciated, including the groundcovers; b) The tree species located around Building 12A need to be called out on the plans; c) Requested that one or two more Monterey Cypress trees be added on the Los Carneros Road side for balance; for example, in front of Building 12 to tie in with the other two trees, forming a triangle; d) Both water features should be retained; e) Vines on the trellis would be fine considering there will maintenance for the landscaping; f) Suggested that consideration be 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. 03-051-DRB

Northeast Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real (APN 077-160-035)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The project site is undeveloped. The applicant proposes a new 8,184-square foot, three-story Islamic Center. The proposed center would include a 3,468-square foot first floor, 3,792-square foot second floor, and 468-square foot third floor, and a 456-square foot mechanical dome. The first floor would include a 635-square foot prayer area, 646-square foot meeting room, 574-square foot restrooms, 433-square foot entry/foyer/vestibule, 192 square feet kitchen and 988-square foot of additional storage and circulation areas. Additionally, a 1,046-square foot entry court, 414 square foot loggia and 1,107 square foot play area would be available for non-habitable exterior use. The second floor would include a 1,431-square foot dining room, 537-square foot lecture room, 303-square foot office, 270-square foot storage area, 393-square foot of circulation, and a 858-square foot residence. The third floor would include the final 468-square foot residence with 456-square foot of additional mechanical areas above.

A total of 42 parking spaces are proposed, although a parking modification to reduce this number to 38 may be required to extend the length of the site's driveway throats.

Frontage improvements, including sidewalk, curb, and gutter would be provided along Calle Real. In addition, two new street lights are proposed: one near the northwest corner of the site and one near the southwest corner of the site.

The parking area and project site would be landscaped, although landscape plans have not yet been submitted. A 6-foot tall plaster wall is proposed along the perimeter of the property, and an 8-foot tall plaster wall is proposed around the entry court and play area. Other minor structures include a mailbox at the Los Carneros Road driveway, bicycle racks, and a trash and recycling enclosure in the parking lot.

The property is zoned C-H (Highway Commercial), and the land use designation in the City's General Plan is Office & Institutional. The project was filed by the Islamic Society of Santa Barbara as the applicant and property owner with Md Wahiduzzaman, Mukhtar Khan and Ken Mineau as owner representatives. Related cases: 03-051-CUP, 03-051-DP. (Continued from 9-23-08*, 8-26-08, 7-22-08, 6-24-08*, 5-28-08, 4-8-08*, 2-12-08*, 01-23-08*, 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

8-26-08 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the architecture has improved a lot; b) the biological report has not yet been completed for review at this point; c) the

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 10 of 17

- process would have been helped by having final information with regard to issues that need to be addressed; and d) the applicant has been very patient.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) he appreciates the design and how the project fits in with the elevations; and b) he could support moving the project along.
 3. Member Schneider commented: a) the massing, location of the building, and architectural design work very well, noting that there are some details that need to be worked out; b) the proposed use for this site would have less impact than some other possible uses; and c) information is needed regarding the biological resource study and traffic study before the project can move forward.
 4. Member Branch commented: a) the project is looking good at this point in the process, noting that there is the understanding that there is still information that needs to be clarified which may cause a potential change in the project plans.
 5. Chair Wignot commented: a) suggested the applicant consider reciprocal parking with the owners of the parcel to the southeast.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, to September 23, 2008, with comments, and with the expectation that the biological report will be available.

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-157-DRB

600 Pine Avenue (APN 071-130-040)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 59,535-square foot 28.25-foot tall research and development building, consisting of a 42,875-square foot first-floor and a 16,660-square foot second-floor mezzanine, a 540-square foot detached masonry building, a 2,500-square foot mechanical yard, 165 automobile parking spaces, 3 loading zones, 20 indoor bicycle parking spaces and 161,350 square feet of landscaping on a 6.58-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district with an RDA overlay.

The applicant proposes to construct a 23,376-square foot manufacturing/office addition (18,694-square foot first-floor & 4,682-square foot second-floor mezzanine) on the east end of the building and an 1,650-square foot "airlock" addition on the north side of the building, to expand parking from 165 to 239 (188 standard, 44 compact, & 7 ADA compliant) parking spaces, and to retain 3 loading zones and the 20 indoor bicycle parking spaces. The resulting 2-story structure would be 84,561 square feet with a maximum height of 35 feet, consisting of a 63,219-square foot first-floor & a 21,342-square foot second floor mezzanine. Landscaping would be reduced to 119,755 square feet and would require the removal of 13 trees (2 Jacaranda, 1 Liquidambar, 2 Lophostemon, 3 Brazilian Pepper & 5 Tipuana); however 78 new trees (25 Jacaranda/Purple-Leaf Plum, 45 Australian Willow/Brisbane Box, 8 Queen Palm) and additional shrubs and ground cover are proposed. Grading would consist of 3,500-cubic yards of cut and 300-cubic yards of fill. Stormwater would be directed to two detention basins prior to reaching Old San Jose Creek. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence/commercial property. The project was filed by agent Laurel Perez & Heidi Jones of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services on behalf of Pine Avenue Associates, property owner. Related cases: 75-DP-11, 75-DP-34, 79-DP-9, 79-ND-3, 79-DP-9 SC01, 79-DP-9 SC02, 79-DP-9 SC03, 79-ND-43

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 11 of 17

Addendum, 75-DP-34 AM01, 06-091-DRB, 06-091-SCD, 07-190-SCD, & 08-157-DP RV. (Continued from 10-28-08, 09-23-08) (Scott Kolwitz & Laura Vlk)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

10-28-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Branch commented: a) The architecture on the north elevation, that will face Ekwil Street, appears top-heavy, and suggested that the applicant study the window application on the façade and provide solutions to address this concern, perhaps consider adding some windows to create a better rhythm; and b) The high glass element design on the south elevation works fine.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The landscape plan is very good with a nice mix and selection of species; b) The applicant's concept that the building will be a backdrop to the landscaping is appreciated; c) The building architecture, which has a variety of elements, seems appropriate for its Old Town location; d) Recommended planting trees that are larger than one gallon size, for example, plant five gallon size, with regard to the coast live oak mitigation trees, *Quercus agrifolia* species; d) Recommended lighting that incorporates dark sky lighting principles; and e) The applicant will need to provide cut sheets showing full cut-off lighting fixtures and height of the fixtures.
3. Vice-Chair Smith commented: a) He agreed with Member Brown's comments.
4. Member Messner commented: a) The landscape plan is good; b) The existing riparian cottonwood trees (*Populus* species) located within the creek bank are not preferred because of the potential to clog creeks (note: no additional cottonwood trees are proposed); and c) More information is needed with regard to the drainage plan.
5. Chair Wignot commented: a) The applicant has responded to previous comments; b) The applicant is encouraged to continue to work with the City regarding how the project will fit with the Ekwil Street extension project; c) The output point for the drainage is shown in the middle of the Ekwil Street alignment area which will need to be addressed; and d) The buffer zone between the new Ekwil Street extension and the line of trees that will be planted is appreciated.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to continue Item M-1, No. 08-157-DRB, 600 Pine Avenue, to November 12, 2008, with the following comments: a) The applicant shall study the window application on the north elevation and present solutions that address the concern that the façade appears top-heavy, perhaps consider adding some windows to create a better rhythm; b) The applicant shall provide cut-sheets showing fully shielded lighting fixtures and heights; and c) The applicant is encouraged to work with Community Services with regard to the review of the drainage plans and shall provide updated drainage plan information.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 12 of 17

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 13 of 17

Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines

Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)

The purpose of the City Design Review Board (DRB) is to encourage development that exemplifies the best professional design practices so as to enhance the visual quality of the environment, benefit surrounding property values, and prevent poor quality of design.

Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)

The Goleta City Council established the DRB and DRB Bylaws in March of 2002 (Ordinance No. 02-14 as amended by Ordinance No. 02-26). DRB Bylaws have subsequently been amended through Resolutions 02-69, 04-03, 05-27, and 07-22. The DRB currently operates under Bylaws from Resolution 07-22.

Design Review Board Procedures

Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)

The DRB is guided by a set of general goals that define the major concerns and objectives of its review process. These goals are to:

- 1) ensure that development and building design is consistent with adopted community design standards;
- 2) promote high standards in architectural design and the construction of aesthetically pleasing structures so that new development does not detract from existing neighborhood characteristics;
- 3) encourage the most appropriate use of land;
- 4) promote visual interest throughout the City through the preservation of public scenic, ocean and mountain vistas, creation of open space areas, and providing for a variety of architectural styles;
- 5) preserve creek areas through restoration and enhancement, discourage the removal of significant trees and foliage;
- 6) ensure neighborhood compatibility of all projects;
- 7) ensure that architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access;
- 8) ensure that grading and development are appropriate to the site and that long term visible scarring of the landscape is avoided where possible;
- 9) preserve and protect native and biologically and aesthetically valuable nonnative vegetation or to ensure adequate and appropriate replacement for vegetation loss;
- 10) ensure that the continued health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood are not compromised;
- 11) provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way;
- 12) ensure that construction is in appropriate proportion to lot size;
- 13) encourage energy efficiency; and
- 14) ensure that air circulation between structures is not impaired and shading is minimized on adjacent properties.

Aspects Considered in Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.1)

The DRB shall review each project for conformity with the purpose of this Chapter, the applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects, and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations. The DRB's review shall include:

- 1) Height, bulk, scale and area coverage of buildings and structures and other site improvements.

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 14 of 17

- 2) Colors and types of building materials and application.
- 3) Physical and design relation with existing and proposed structures on the same site and in the immediately affected surrounding area.
- 4) Site layout, orientation, and location of buildings, and relationship with open areas and topography.
- 5) Height, materials, colors, and variations in boundary walls, fences, or screen planting.
- 6) Location and type of existing and proposed landscaping.
- 7) Sign design and exterior lighting.

Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)

In approving, approving with conditions, or denying an application, the DRB shall examine the materials submitted with the application and any other material provided to Planning and Environmental Services to determine whether the buildings, structures, or signs are appropriate and of good design in relation to other buildings, structures, or signs on the site and in the immediately affected surrounding area. Such determination shall be based upon the following findings, as well as any additional findings required pursuant to any applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations:

- 1) The development will be compatible with the neighborhood, and its size, bulk and scale will be appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.
- 2) Site layout, orientation, and location of structures, buildings, and signs are in an appropriate and well-designated relationship to one another, and to the environmental qualities, open spaces and topography of the property.
- 3) The project demonstrates a harmonious relationship with existing and proposed adjoining developments, avoiding excessive variety and monotonous repetition, but allowing similarity of style, if warranted.
- 4) There is harmony of material, color, and composition of all sides of a structure or buildings.
- 5) A limited number of materials will be on the exterior face of the building or structure.
- 6) There is consistency and unity of composition and treatment of exterior elevation.
- 7) Mechanical and electrical equipment is well integrated in the total design concept and screened from public view to the maximum extent practicable.
- 8) All visible onsite utility services are appropriate in size and location.
- 9) The grading will be appropriate to the site.
- 10) Adequate landscaping is provided in proportion to the project and the site with due regard to preservation of specimen and landmark trees, and existing native vegetation.
- 11) The selection of plant materials is appropriate to the project and its environment, and adequate provision will be made for the long-term maintenance of such plant materials.
- 12) The project will preserve and protect, to the maximum extent practicable, any mature, specimen or skyline tree, or appropriately mitigate the loss.
- 13) The development will not adversely affect significant public scenic views.
- 14) Signs, including their lighting, are well designed and are appropriate in size and location.
- 15) All exterior site, structure and building lighting is well designed and appropriate in size and location.
- 16) The proposed development is consistent with any additional design standards as expressly adopted by the City Council.
- 17) The development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.
- 18) The public health, safety and welfare will be protected.
- 19) The project architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access.
- 20) The project will provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way.

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 15 of 17

Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

Conceptual Review

Conceptual review is a required step that allows the applicant and the DRB to participate in an informal discussion about the proposed project. Applicants are encouraged to initiate this review as early in the design process as possible. This level of review is intended to provide the applicant with good direction early in the process to avoid spending unnecessary time and money by developing a design concept that may be inconsistent with the City's architectural guidelines and development standards. When a project is scheduled for conceptual review, the DRB may grant preliminary approval if the required information is provided, the design and details are acceptable and the project is properly noticed for such dual approval.

Information required for conceptual review includes:

- a. Photographs which show the site from 3 to 5 vantage points or a panorama from the site and of the site as seen from the street, and photographs of the surrounding neighborhood showing the relationship of the site to such adjacent properties. Aerial photographs are helpful if available and may be required at later stages.
- b. Site plan showing vicinity map, topography, location of existing and proposed structures and driveways, and locations of all structures adjacent to the proposed structure. The site plan should also indicate any proposed grading, an estimate of the amount of such grading, and any existing vegetation to be removed or retained.
- c. Site statistics including all proposed structures, square footage by use, and the number of covered and uncovered parking spaces.
- d. Schematics of the proposed project shall include rough floor plans and at least two elevations indicating the height of proposed structures. Perspectives sketches of the project are also encouraged. Proposed materials and colors shall be indicated. (Schematics and sketches may be rough as long as they are to scale and describe the proposed development accurately and sufficiently well to allow review and discussion.)

Preliminary Review

Preliminary review involves the substantive analysis of a project's compliance with all applicable City architectural guidelines and development standards. Fundamental design issues such as precise size of all built elements, site plan, elevations and landscaping are resolved at this stage of review. The DRB will identify to the applicant those aspects of the project that are not in compliance with applicable architectural guidelines and development standards and the findings that the DRB is required to make.

Preliminary approval of the project's design is the point in the process at which an appeal of DRB's decision can be made. Preliminary approval of the project's design is deemed a basis to proceed with working drawings, following the close of the appeal period and absent the filing of an appeal.

Information required for preliminary review, in addition to the information required for conceptual review, includes:

- a. Complete site plan showing all existing structures, proposed improvements, proposed grading, including cut and fill calculations, lot coverage statistics (i.e., building paving, usable open space and landscape areas), vicinity map, and topography.
- b. Floor plans and roof plans
- c. All elevations with heights, materials and colors specified.
- d. Preliminary landscape plan, when required, showing existing and proposed trees and shrubs, including any existing vegetation to be removed. This landscape plan shall also include all retaining and freestanding walls, fences, gates and gateposts and proposed paving and should specify proposed materials and colors of all these items.
- e. Site section for projects on slopes of 20 percent or greater, and when required by the DRB.

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 16 of 17

Final Review

Final review confirms that the working drawings are in conformance with the project that received preliminary approval. In addition to reviewing site plan and elevations for conformance, building details and the landscape plan will be reviewed for acceptability.

Final review is conducted by the Planning and Environmental Services staff, in consultation with the DRB Chair or the Chair's designees. In the event that final plans are not in substantial conformance with the approved preliminary plans, the DRB Chair and Planning staff shall refer the matter to the full DRB for a final determination.

Information required for final review, in addition to the previous review requirements, includes:

- a. Complete set of construction drawings, which must include window, eave & rake, chimney, railing and other pertinent architectural details, including building sections with finished floor, plate, and ridge heights indicated.
- b. 8 1/2" X 11" materials sample board of materials and colors to be used, as well as an indication of the materials and colors on the drawings. Sheet metal colors (for vents, exposed chimneys, flashing, etc.) shall also be indicated. All this information should be included on the working drawings.
- c. Final site grading and drainage plan when required, including exact cut and fill calculations.
- d. Final landscape drawings, when required, showing the dripline of all trees and shrubs, and all wall, fence, and gate details. The drawing must show the size, name and location of plantings that will be visible from the street frontage, landscape screening which will integrate with the surrounding neighborhood, and irrigation for landscaping. Landscape drawings shall include a planting plan specifying layout of all plant materials, sizes, quantities and botanical and common names; and a final irrigation plan depicting layout and sizes of all equipment and components of a complete irrigation system (automated system required on commercial and multiple-residential developments). Planting and irrigation plans shall depict all site utilities, both above and below grade.

Revised Final

Revised final review occurs when a substantial revision (e.g., grading, orientation, materials, height) to a project is proposed after final DRB approval has been granted. Plans submitted shall include all information on drawings that reflect the proposed revisions. If the revisions are not clearly delineated, they cannot be construed as approved.

Multiple Levels of Approval at a Single Meeting

Planning staff may accept and process smaller projects for two or more levels of DRB review (e.g., conceptual and preliminary) at a single meeting provided all required information is submitted and the project is properly noticed and agendized for such multiple levels of approval.

Presentation of Projects (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.3)

All levels of review with the exception of the consent agenda require the presentation of the project by the applicant or the applicant's representative. Items on the regular agenda that do not have a representative will be continued to a later hearing or removed from the agenda. The applicant or representative will be responsible for rescheduling the project if the project is removed from the agenda.

Public Testimony (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.4)

Members of the public attending a DRB meeting are encouraged to present testimony on agenda items. At the appropriate time, the DRB Chair will ask for public testimony, and will recognize those persons desiring to speak. A copy of any written statements read by a member of the public shall be given to the DRB Secretary. All speakers should provide all pertinent facts within their knowledge, including the reasons for their position. Testimony should relate to the design issues of the project and the findings upon which the DRB must base its decision. An interested party who cannot appear at a hearing may write a letter to the DRB indicating their

Design Review Board Agenda

November 12, 2008

Page 17 of 17

support of or opposition to the project, including their reasoning and concerns. The letter will be included as a part of the public record.

Continuances, Postponements, and Absences (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.5)

A continuance is the carrying forward of an item to a future meeting. The applicant may request continuance of a project to a specified date if additional time is required to respond to comments or if they will be unable to attend the meeting. This is done either during the DRB meeting or by calling the DRB Secretary prior to the scheduled meeting so that the request may be discussed as part of the agenda status report at the beginning of the meeting.

Appeals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.8)

The preliminary approval or denial of a project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. A letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed, the appeal period is extended until 5:00 p.m. on the following business day. Planning and Environmental Services will notify the DRB as to the scheduled date of the appeal hearing. The DRB will designate a member to attend an appeal hearing.