



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Scott Branch (Architect)

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

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

October 14, 2008

Page 2 of 19

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for September 23, 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

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 06-054-DRB

7295 Butte Drive (APN 077-103-003)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 1,663-square foot residence and an attached 473-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,035-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 741-square feet in additions, consisting of a 264-square foot 1st floor addition, and a new 477-square foot second story. This proposal also includes a 186-square foot porch on the first floor. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,877 square feet, consisting of a 2,404-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 473-square foot 2-car garage. This proposal meets the maximum allowable floor area guideline for this property, which is 2,437.7 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. New materials consist of sepia brown wood fascia and beams, paint colors swiss coffee, salsa, and autumn wheat, and presidential, shadow grey, 40-year, composition shingles. The project was filed by agent R. Brian Nelson on behalf of Jeff and Michelle Liephardt, property owners. Related cases: 06-054-LUP; 07-143-APP; 07-198-APP. (Continued from 09-23-08, 09-09-08, 07-03-07, 06-05-07) (Laura Vlk)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

9-23-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. The cut sheets for the proposed light fixtures are not included with the Final submittal.
2. Member Schneider clarified, in response to a question from speaker Lou Izzo, that the standard practice in the architecture field is to label the master bedroom

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 3 of 19

as the master, and not to have a number count, and that the plans submitted by the applicant follow normal labeling procedures.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown) to continue Item J-2, No. 06-054-DRB, 7295 Butte Drive, to October 14, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar, with the following comment: 1) the applicant shall submit the cut sheets for proposed lighting fixtures that adhere to "Dark Sky" principles.

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 *Conceptual* 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 9-09-08*, 8-12-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

8-12-08 Meeting:

1. The applicant is requested to provide a photograph of the area where the off-site monument sign will be located and also the proposed landscape plans.
2. The applicant is requested to provide a night rendering/picture to help understand the proposed illumination and intensity for the off-site monument sign.
3. Member Brown commented that the off-site monument sign should fit in with the area with regard to intensity of illumination and landscaping. The sign will change the character of the area because there are no other signs currently of similar size and illumination.
4. The applicant is requested to provide landscape plans with regard to the on-site monument sign area.
5. The applicant is requested to provide a detailed example of the front entry directory sign, showing the map information larger, and the sign somewhat smaller with less white space.
6. The applicant is requested to provide details with regard to the open space at the base of the on-site directory signs, such as landscaping, or filling in the base. Possibly consider stone veneer on the base if the material is compatible.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 4 of 19

7. The applicant is requested to provide the plans for the reconfigured on-site directory signs.
8. The applicant is requested to restudy the entrance because it seems cluttered with too many signs that are fairly close together of the same shape with the same logo. Suggest that the rental office sign and on-site monument sign be combined. Member Brown made a suggestion with regard to combining three signs into one sign closer to the sidewalk.
9. The proposed temporary model number signs are fine; however, there needs to be clarification as to the duration and location of these signs.
10. The applicant is requested to provide a picture to help understand the location of address plaques for buildings and address plaques for units, which will be helpful for review when shown on the plans.
11. The proposed pool signage plans are fine.
12. The proposed parking signage plans are fine.
13. The proposed miscellaneous signage plans are fine.
14. Any other proposed signs such as off-site signs or banner signs associated with the project would need to be presented for review.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to continue Item H-2, No. 08-131-DRB, 5505-5585 Overpass Road & 5410 Hollister Avenue, with comments, to September 9, 2008.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-141-DRB

6325 Lindmar Drive (APN 073-005-021)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 27,927-square foot industrial/manufacturing building, 20,276-square feet of courtyards, loading docks and parking, an as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage/water treatment enclosure/addition, and 23,535-square feet (32%) of landscaping on a 73,616-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a mechanical courtyard in the existing courtyard between buildings A and C, construct two new mechanical roof wells (one on building B and one on building C), permit the aforementioned as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage area on the west side of building A, permit an as-built parking lot on the east side of buildings B and C (which requires the removal of 1,167-square feet of landscaping), alter the loading area on the west side of building A, abandon an existing driveway on the north side of the property, remove equipment from the front yard setback for re-location into the proposed mechanical courtyard, remove an unpermitted parking lot storage area on the southwest side of the property, and re-locate equipment from the side yard (along the south property line) setback. All materials used for this project are to match the existing buildings with the exception of new lighting, which will be Lamps Plus bronze, 9" high outdoor dark sky tube lights. The project was filed by agent Bruce Burke on behalf of James L.

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 5 of 19

Bartlett, property owner. Related cases: 07-141-DP AM01; 07-141-LUP.
(Continued from 08-26-08) (Laura VlK)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

08-26-08 Meeting:

1. The addition of trees in the front would be nice and would soften the building.
2. The colors need to be called out on the plans.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 07-141-DRB, 6325 Lindmar Drive, with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall provide a landscape plan that includes the addition of trees on the eastern elevation and northern elevation; and 2) the colors shall be called out on the plans; and to continue for Final review on the Final Calendar on October 14, 2008.

J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-075-DRB

7090 Marketplace Drive (APN 073-440-013)

This is a request for *Final* review. The development includes 475,487 square feet of commercial development with 2,490 parking spaces on approximately 49 acres over 7 parcels in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 7,770-square foot addition to an existing 24,017-square foot building previously occupied by CompUSA and to eliminate 31 parking spaces. The entry would be relocated from the east elevations' northern end to the center of the building, and a car stereo installation bay would be created on the southern elevation. The resulting total onsite development would include 483,257 square feet, and the 1-story structure would be 31,787 square feet. Available parking throughout the entire shopping center would be reduced from 2,490 to 2,459 parking spaces with a reduction from 177 to 146 parking spaces located on this parcel. Parking stall sizes are proposed to remain in their current modified configuration. A total of 12 Bradford Pear trees, 3 Brisbane Box trees, and 1 Tipu tree are proposed to be removed, but 17 comparable trees are proposed to be planted. Minor alterations to drive aisles and lighting are also proposed. New materials include a storefront/entry with a kynar finish/clear anodized aluminum, "Solar Gray" glazing, new metal doors to be painted to match the adjacent surfaces and new bollards with either an unspecified finish or to be painted Ben Morre #343 "Bright Yellow." All other materials (including lighting and landscaping) for this project are to match the existing commercial property. The project was filed by Kimberly A. Schizas on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 95-SP-001, 95-DP-026, 96-EIR-3, & 08-075-DP AM. (Continued from 9-23-08, 9-09-08, 8-12-08) (Natasha Heifetz Campbell & Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

9-23-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Schneider requested that the applicant research to find a light fixture with a flat bulb that is similar to the bulb in the existing fixtures, which is

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 6 of 19

preferred, rather than the bulb that drops down in the proposed lighting fixtures, for the front of the building.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 08-075-DRB, 7090 Marketplace Drive, with the condition that the applicant is requested to research to find a lighting fixture that has a flat bulb, similar to the existing fixtures, which is preferred, rather than a bulb that drops down, and to submit further lighting details for Final review; and to continue to October 14, 2008, for Final review.

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 09-23-08*, 09-09-08) (Laura Vlk)

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

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 7 of 19

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.

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. 08-087-DRB

266 Spruce Drive (APN 079-530-027)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,061-square foot residence and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,968-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 1,734 square feet in additions, consisting of a 159-square foot first floor addition, a 325-square foot new second story, and a 1,250-square foot basement. The resulting 2-story structure with basement would be 4,245 square feet, consisting of a 3,795-square foot single-family dwelling with basement and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage. As the proposed project exceeds 3,000 square feet of habitable square footage, a third enclosed parking space would be required per Ordinance No. 03-05. When the basement is included, the proposed habitable square footage would be 3,795 square feet which exceeds the maximum allowable floor area (FAR) guidelines for this property, which is 2,642 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. When the basement square footage is removed, the proposed habitable square footage would be 2,545square feet, which is within the maximum allowable FAR guidelines for this property. A total of 629 cubic yards of cut for grading is proposed for construction of the basement. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence aside from new doors, windows, and exterior lighting as shown on plans. The project was filed by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. Related cases: 08-087-LUP. (Continued from 09-23-08*, 9-09-08*, 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

8-12-08 Meeting:

1. Member Branch commented: a) the concept of adding a subterranean basement is a creative idea to add space that does not impact neighbors, noting that it is a big task and must be done properly; b) it appears in the plans that

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 8 of 19

- there is not a significant use for the lofts other than to create light for the space below; c) it is appreciated that the second-story addition is centralized in the plans; d) the proposed window pattern seems somewhat boring and repetitive although it is understood that the purpose is for light and ventilation; and e) he suggests that light could be created by dormers which would reduce the square footage from the plans with regard to the FAR Guidelines.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) if the basement is habitable space, he would not support a modification with regard to the parking space requirement because the size of the house exceeds 3,000 square feet; b) agreed with Member Branch that there is a lot of apparent mass and volume with regard to the loft area which needs to be restudied; c) the submerged basement would solve size, bulk and scale concerns because it would not be visible, however it would be located in the setback; and d) at this point, the bigger issues need to be considered other than the architecture and design.
 3. Member Brown commented: a) agreed with Members Branch and Schneider regarding the massing of the second floor, and stated that there may be other ways to achieve the lighting and ventilation, and requested that the applicant restudy the second-story massing; b) expressed concern that there are no second-story homes shown on the streetscape and that the proposed second story element is fairly big, although something smaller may be acceptable; c) the basement, which seems somewhat large, affects the intensity of the use on the site; and d) the basement square footage adds complexity with regard to the City's parking requirement.
 4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) he would support excluding the square footage from the FAR in this particular project because the basement is completely subterranean; b) he does not have a concern with regard to the proposed two-story house on this street; and c) suggested that the horizontal mass on the upper roof be reworked so there would be a three-gable element facing the street, noting that all of the homes on the street have prominent gable features within a certain size range facing the street so there is more of a balance.
 5. Member Herrera commented: a) expressed concern that there are too many windows on the south elevation facing the neighbor's property; b) he has no concerns with regard to the basement; and c) he could support not counting the basement square footage as habitable space, although it is not an issue for consideration;
 6. Member Messner commented: a) agreed with many of the comments from Members Schneider and Brown; b) the basement square footage should be included in the FAR calculations; and c) expressed concern regarding the windows on the south elevation facing the neighbor's property which need to be addressed.
 7. Chair Wignot commented: a) agreed with comments from the DRB architect members; b) there seems to be a huge amount of mass and bulk being added on the second floor for the purpose of just providing light and ventilation, and suggested consideration of a clerestory feature or dormers; c) suggested that the privacy concern regarding the windows on the south elevation could be addressed by making the windows in the loft area smaller and higher up; d) the basement concept is an innovative approach to add some space that is not counted towards the FARs, but expressed some concerns that it would be habitable in a sense and not located just under the garage; e) the exterior staircase for the basement allows the opportunity for a door and windows, but suggested that the area over the door and window be roofed-over as part of the driveway for liability purposes, not having the total area exposed; f) the applicant should consider how water would be removed from the exterior stairwell area;

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 9 of 19

and g) noted that the concept to locate the washing machine and utility sink in the basement is workable.

STRAW VOTE ON ISSUE #1 IN STAFF REPORT:

How many members believe that some percentage square footage of the fully submerged subterranean basement should be included in FAR calculations?

Members voting affirmative: Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider (5).

Members not voting in the affirmative: Smith, Wignot. (2).

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 08-087-DRB, 266 Spruce Drive, to September 9, 2008, with comments.

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-159-DRB

7390 Calle Real (APN 077-490-041)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property comprises a Community Shopping Center and includes two retail commercial and office buildings (approximately 6,250 square feet and 8,300 square feet) and a gasoline fueling station facility with an approximately 625-square foot canopy on a 1.05-acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to install a new above-ground Healy clean air separator tank for the gasoline fueling station facility. The tank would be placed within a new 42-square foot metal enclosure painted to match the beige color of the building. The enclosure would be 10 feet tall. Air breather piping would extend from the top of the tank to a *minimum* height of 18" above the roof of the building. The air breather piping would match the height of the existing vent risers. No habitable floor area is proposed. The project was filed by Luke Snyder of Quality Project Management, agent, on behalf of Eleni Pertsulakes, property owner. Related cases: 08-159-LUP. (Shine Ling)

L-4. 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. (Cindy Moore)

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)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-08-08 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the location and screening of the utility meters need to be shown on the plans and reviewed; b) requested that the applicant provide lighting plans and cut sheets; c) suggested the applicant discuss with the owner of the adjacent property the possibility of landscaping the western elevation facing the commercial property, at the appropriate time; d) noted that the western elevation faces a commercial site which has an ample amount of night lighting, and suggested that the applicant may want to address this consideration with window design and/or screening; e) suggested consideration of any opportunity for additional parking on the site; and f) recommended that staff direct the applicant to work with Community Services staff regarding the stormwater runoff issues.
2. Member Branch commented: a) the elimination of the two units in the rear helps the project; b) the project is quite handsome; c) it seems like there needs to be additional guest parking; d) suggested restudying the chimney (on Sheet 8) that does not come down to the ground which seems like there is a lot of mass floating; e) suggested consideration that the dormer vents could be larger, or eliminated ; and f) the applicant's decision not to install a gate between the project and the adjacent commercial property is understandable since there is a sidewalk.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) the elimination of the two units is an improvement; b) the project is nice; c) there are some unfortunate constraints on the site, for example, the right-of-way in the front, and the two different slopes at the rear property line; d) agreed with Member Branch that the floating chimney seems odd and also the chimney with a section cut out seems odd (on Sheet 8); e) his preference would be for the dormer vents to be eliminated or minimized; f) overall, the architecture is fine and the project is reasonable; g) the comment

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 11 of 19

from speaker Gary Vandeman will need to be resolved at some time with regard to the western bioswale; h) the suggestion from speaker Gary Vandeman to provide for parking in the right-of-way on Calle Real sounds interesting but would need the City's approval; and i) in his opinion, he would support the concept of reducing the open space requirement for a smaller project based upon private space being provided that is not given credit for open space, to allow for additional parking.

4. Member Messner commented: a) he still has the same concerns from the previous review regarding drainage, noting that there will be a lot of underground water especially in the raised area in the back; b) the concept of the drain located down the center is appreciated; c) there needs to be gutters that will connect into the drains because he is concerned with heavy overflows from the rain; d) the concept of pavers is appreciated to allow some water into the soil; e) the bioswale plans are appreciated; f) the project is nicely landscaped, especially towards the parking lot; g) the plans need to define who is responsible for the landscaping; and h) the landscape plans call out for small and medium trees, however, he believes there needs to be much larger trees, such as the *Brisbane Box* species, to provide more privacy for the second story from the parking lot.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with the above DRB comments that the design is fine; and b) recommended using as much permeable pavers as possible, especially towards the entrance of the project before the water enters the street.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) agreed with the above comments regarding the building architecture; b) the building design is fine (and the internal floor plans are good); c) there seems to be a constraint with the size of this parcel and the layout seems very tight; d) expressed concern that the drive aisle could become congested or blocked when there are service vehicles or movers; e) the parking requirement does not seem adequate particularly in this area where available parking is limited; f) suggested consideration that if the handicapped parking space were located near the tot lot, there could be possibly four or five regular parking spaces where there are presently three spaces; g) suggested that if there is a request for an amendment to the General Plan, consideration be given to requesting a small reduction in the open space requirement for the project to provide for more guest parking; h) the footprint of the project is shown on the aerial photograph as somewhat larger than the actual scale, making the project appear more spacious, and suggested that the photograph be adjusted to show how the project would fit in; and i) recommended that a solid six-foot cinder block wall on the western property line would be of benefit to provide further privacy for the residents in the project from the adjacent commercial center.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote that Conceptual review of Item M-1, No. 04-226-DRB, 7388 Calle Real, has been completed with comments to be forwarded to the Planning Commission including, as a recommendation, support for an applicant request to the Planning Commission with regard to the concept of giving credit for common open space on smaller projects based upon private space being provided by ordinance that is not given credit as common open space, so as to be able to fit more parking on the site; and to take Item M-1, No. 04-226-DRB, off calendar for review by the Planning Commission.

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).

Access to and from the condominiums would be provided from Hollister Avenue and Las Armas Road. A minimum 28-foot wide interior loop is provided on each side of Devereux Creek.

The site would require approximately 105,610-cubic yards of cut and 75,126-cubic yards of fill. A retaining wall on the northern project boundary would have a maximum 6-foot height.

The applicant seeks General Plan amendments to development setbacks from top of bank and visual resource view corridor policies.

The project was submitted on May 8, 2007 by agent Mary Meaney Reichel, Lucon Inc., on behalf of the Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership, property owner. Related cases: 07-102-GP, 07-102-DP, 07-102-VTM. (Last heard on 8-26-08, 7-22-08, 6-10-08, 4-22-08, 3-25-08) (David Stone)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

8-26-08 Meeting:

1. Chair Wignot commented: a) he believes the project would benefit by sound walls, along Hollister Avenue as well as the western and northern boundaries, and that not providing sound walls along the roadway would be a disservice to the people living in the buildings; b) noted that the proposed overpass project across Highway 101 and the railroad tracks will be adding more traffic; c) expressed concern that even if the Zoning Ordinance standards would be met,

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 13 of 19

- he believes that the proposed onsite parking is inadequate, noting that overflow parking would be limited to a portion of the Las Armas Road; and d) the aerial photographs showing the project overlay are informational.
2. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with Chair Wignot that a sound wall along Hollister Avenue should be provided. He asked if 10-foot wide sidewalks were required on both sides of Las Armas Road, as a narrower sidewalk could provide for additional parking area.
 3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) with regard to the multi-family style, the duplex appearance is appreciated; however, he suggested adding some subtle changes and variations in the color and trim to show some differentiation on the building, rather than the design on Page 10 of the booklet which appears consistent throughout the building; b) requested that the "S-tile" be removed from the roof plans; and c) expressed some concern with regard to whether there has been consideration regarding the new Highway 101 overpass project which will be close to the site.
 4. Member Branch commented: a) suggested that the applicant consider where there might be room to add a couple of extra turf-block parking spaces for guests, for example, in the project's northwest corner, noting that every additional parking space would help; b) the Beach Bungalow style is heading in the right direction; c) expressed concern that the multi-family Rustic Farm House and Monterey architecture looks like large single-family buildings; d) requested that the applicant restudy the stone façade treatment on the Rustic Farm House style, which currently provides too massive an appearance. He suggested possibly not filling in the entire gable form with stone, but instead using this material as more of a wainscot element; e) expressed disappointment that the red-tile roof designs, including the "S-tile" roofs, were not completely removed; and f) requested that the plans show how the use of two different colors for differentiation on the multi-family buildings will look like two different buildings, like on the cover of the project materials provided, which is the preferred direction.
 5. Member Schneider commented: a) expressed concern that the "S-tile" roofs were not removed from the elevations in response to the previous DRB hearing, stating that these should be flat tiles; b) requested that the drawings that are presented for Planning Commission review show removal of the "S-tiles"; c) requested that the plans show the number of possible parking spaces on Las Armas Road; d) it may be useful to conduct a study to find creative ways to address potential additional parking on Las Armas Road, although it would not be critical to the overall project; e) wanted to know if there would be a connector road from other project site areas to the east (Diana White, Assistant Engineer, said that this was possible, but not planned at this time); and f) questioned whether additional landscaping would be possible on Las Armas Road (Diana White said yes, though it might not be the standard City design for a 60-foot ROW).
 6. Member Brown commented: a) requested that the landscape plan provide an understanding of the walls extended throughout the duplex and triplex units throughout the site showing their location, relationship, size and height (agent Mary Reichel responded that these walls are 4.5 to 5.0 feet high); b) requested that the landscape plan clarify the internal pedestrian linkages particularly with regard to access from the potential public parking on Las Armas Road; c) agreed with Member Branch's comments that the stone appears heavy and overdone on the Rustic Farm House style, which may be more appropriate on bigger houses on bigger lots, that are not so close together; d) the Beach Bungalow architecture style, which appears light and airy, is innovative for the area and

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 14 of 19

appreciated; e) requested the applicant consider Member Schneider's recommendation to remove the "S-tile" from the plans; and f) wondered if angle parking was possible on Las Armas Road (Diana White, Assistant Engineer, responded that angle parking would not be possible given the configuration of the road).

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Wignot) to continue Item M-2, No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road, to October 14, 2008, with comments; and that the applicant shall provide only elevations showing responses to comments.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. DENSITY DISCUSSION

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 15 of 19

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

October 14, 2008

Page 16 of 19

- 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

October 14, 2008

Page 17 of 19

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

October 14, 2008

Page 18 of 19

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

October 14, 2008

Page 19 of 19

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.