



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, September 23, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

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

September 23, 2008

Page 2 of 20

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for September 9, 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. 05-059-DRB

5575 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-090-085)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes 14 Housing Authority apartments known as Grossman Homes, as well as management and maintenance offices on a 2.43 acre lot in the Design Residential (DR-20) zone district. The applicant requests a two lot subdivision to subdivide the parcel into two parcels of 2.19 acres (Parcel 1) and .24 acres (Parcel 2), and an amendment to a previously approved Development Plan which would allow the construction of a community center for the residents of the Grossman Homes on Parcel 1, the Miller Community Center, and an additional single-family dwelling, The Braddock House, on Parcel 2. The community center would be 16'3" tall and total 1,536 square feet. The Braddock House would be 16'5" tall and total 2,755 square feet and would be used as a Special Care Facility to provide semi-independent living for up to four (4) developmentally disabled adults. Access is provided via an existing 25' wide driveway from Armitos Avenue. The Goleta Water District and Goleta Sanitary District would continue to provide water and sewer service to the site. Modifications from the requirements of the zoning ordinance are being requested for the number of parking spaces, parking areas setbacks, and landscaping. The project was filed by the County of Santa Barbara Housing Authority, property owner. Related cases: 83-DP-014. (Continued from 7-22-08*, 6-24-08*, 4-22-08, 3-25-08, 2-26-08, 9-18-07, 08-21-07) (Cindy Moore)

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

September 23, 2008

Page 3 of 20

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-22-08 Meeting:

Comments:

1. The applicant's time and work with the DRB on this project are appreciated.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-2, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to grant Preliminary Approval, as submitted, and continue to June 24, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-090-DRB

7837 Langlo Ranch Road (APN 079-600-030)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 3,086-square foot two-story residence and an attached 446-square foot 2-car garage on a 7,533-square foot lot in the DR-4 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 174-square feet in additions on the first-floor, consisting of a 44-square foot bathroom, a 24-square foot living room, 53-square foot garage, and a 53-square foot attached utility shed. The applicant also proposes to convert 133 square feet of the existing garage into habitable square footage for a bathroom and laundry room. The resulting 2-story structure would be 3,260 square feet, consisting of a 2,814-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 446-square foot 2-car garage. This proposed project exceeds the maximum allowable Floor Area Ratio Guidelines (FAR) for this property, which is 2,313.25 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Lawrence Thompson on behalf of James Kirwan III, property owner. Related cases: 89-V-028 J; 90-LUS-136; 08-090-LUP. (Continued from 9-09-08, 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

9-09-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Branch commented: a) achieving the 20-foot depth in the garage makes the plans work; b) the impacts to the neighborhood have already occurred with regard to the project's current size, bulk and scale, and the intensity of use; and c) the overall project is relatively minor and simple.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) agreed with Member Branch that the neighborhood impacts have already occurred; b) the extra square footage for the proposed storage shed may not be needed considering the number of bedrooms and study area; and c) there needs to be room for a water heater.
3. Member Brown commented: a) agreed with comments made by Members Branch and Schneider.
4. Chair Wignot commented: a) the issues raised by neighbors at the last meeting related mostly to the number of vehicles associated with the property, and that vehicles are not being parked in the garage; b) given the number of bedrooms, it seems reasonable to add the number of bathrooms; and c) noted that the addition of a bathroom in the garage may invite the potential for an unpermitted unit, but he does not believe this concern is within the DRB's mandate.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

September 23, 2008

Page 4 of 20

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-4, No. 08-090-DRB, 7837 Langlo Ranch Road, as submitted, with the following comment: 1) the proposed storage shed on the west side yard shall be reduced in size to be big enough only to encompass the water heater; and to continue to September 23, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

- NONE

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 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)

Staff recommendation to continue to October 28 or November 12, 2008

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

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

September 23, 2008

Page 5 of 20

- 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.

J-2. 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

Design Review Board Agenda

September 23, 2008

Page 6 of 20

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 07-03-07, 06-05-07) (Laura Vik)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-03-07 Meeting:

1. Member Smith stated he is in favor of the design and does not think the project is grandiose. He appreciates that the applicant pared down the tower element on the stairway in the back; and also that the applicant measured the distance to the houses to the back, and that the fence was measured.
2. Member Schneider stated that he can support the project and believes that the style is attractive and simplified, and fits with the character of the neighborhood. He said that the second-story mass, which is centered in the middle of the house and has a soft roof on all four sides, is appropriately designed for a second-story addition. He understands that although there may be CC&Rs, it is not within the purview of the DRB or the City to enforce CC&Rs. He appreciates that the applicant worked with the DRB to pare down the original plans. He commented that when projects have houses of a certain size in relation to the neighborhood, the situation may become more of a land use issue rather than design issue.
3. Chair Branch said he agrees that the centered second-story addition is appropriate and thinks that the applicant has come a long way to make the original plans better. He does not see privacy concerns for the neighbor to the south because there are no windows on the second floor on the south elevation, and he noted that to the west decks have been removed and there are now only windows upstairs on the elevation. He said that he has some concerns related to parking although the parking issue is somewhat subjective.
4. Vice-Chair Wignot said he can see both sides of the issues and he pointed out that the character of the neighborhoods in the City has changed from when they were when originally built in the 1950's and 1960's. He believes the applicant has worked to make the house design a better fit for the neighborhood and to respect private views. He noted that the neighborhood has other two-story homes so precedent is not being set. His only concern at this time is related to parking.
5. Member Brown said that because of her concern that there is not sufficient parking for a five-bedroom house of this size, she cannot make Finding 6.2.20 (The project will provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way.). She does not believe that the project is considerate of private views, as indicated by the neighbor at 7218 Butte, and; therefore, cannot make Finding 6.2.19 (The project architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access.). She said there have been considerable changes to the plans by the applicant that are better for the project; however, it is still a very big house. She said that in some of the existing neighborhoods there are issues regarding CC&Rs and that adding second stories do change the traditional character of the neighborhoods; however, that it doesn't mean that there cannot be an acceptable second story addition but she believes it is very difficult to make a project this size acceptable.

Design Review Board Agenda

September 23, 2008

Page 7 of 20

6. Member Messner said he is still concerned that there are too many bathrooms and also that the project will not provide sufficient parking. He appreciates that the second-story addition is centered on the plans.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 5 to 2 roll call vote (Ayes: Branch, Pierce, Schneider, Smith, Wignot; Noes: Brown, Messner) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item J-3, No. 06-054-DRB, as submitted with the following condition: 1) The applicant shall submit a lighting plan at Final review that specifies the use of light fixtures that adhere to "Dark Sky" principles; and that Final review of No. 06-054-DRB, will be held on August 7, 2007.

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 Light Industry 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 09-09-08) (Laura Vik)

Applicant request to continue to October 14, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

9-09-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

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

Design Review Board Agenda

September 23, 2008

Page 8 of 20

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.
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 solar materials, 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. 08-075-DRB

7090 Marketplace Drive (APN 073-440-013)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* 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 (Shopping Center) 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 9-09-08, 8-12-08) (Natasha Heifetz Campbell & Scott Kolwitz)

Design Review Board Agenda

September 23, 2008

Page 9 of 20

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

9-09-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Schneider commented: a) the documentation on the plans relative to signs are not being reviewed at this time, and noted that a separate sign review would be needed.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith) to continue Item L-2, No. 08-075-DRB, 7090 Marketplace Drive, to September 23, 2008, for Conceptual/Preliminary review.

L-3. 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 2,545 square 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 9-09-08*, 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Applicant request to continue to October 14, 2008

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 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

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

September 23, 2008

Page 10 of 20

- 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; 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-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-145-DRB

598 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-090-052)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The subject property consists of 12.29 net acres and includes agricultural operations, an existing farmhouse, a produce stand, and a bathhouse/restroom in the AG-I-5 zone district. Vehicular ingress/egress is provided by a 16-foot (to be upgraded to 20-foot) wide gravel driveway from Stow Canyon Road, and through the City's adjacent library parking lot. A modification was granted to require a total of 19 designated parking spaces on the property. Minor amounts of grading would be required to facilitate building pads and the installation of utilities.

To be in compliance with 08-111-CUP, the applicant proposes to move the existing farm labor camp from its present location near the avocado orchard to a development envelope along the existing driveway near the farmhouse in Phase 4 as follows:

Phase 4 – (To be completed by July 1, 2009):

- Terminate use of existing farm labor camp site and remove all structures; relocate occupants to temporary or permanent residential units in approved building envelope.
 - Temporary units would consist of up to five (5) yurts meeting code requirements and Design Review Board review for precise location and landscaping, with an option to substitute mobile homes. Cooking and sanitary facilities would consist of a mobile kitchen, restroom, and shower units and/or individual built-in kitchens and bathrooms, all connected to the Goleta Sanitary District system.
 - Permanent housing would consist of up to five (5) modular, stick-built, relocated houses or other City-approved permanent housing as approved by the Design Review Board.
- Construct access improvements as required by the Fire Department.
- Provide additional on-site parking.
- Construct the sewer line.

The project was filed by agent Steve Welton of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services on behalf of Center for Urban Agriculture at Fairview Gardens, property owner. Related cases: 08-111-CUP; 08-145-LUP. (Continued from 08-26-08) (Scott Kolwitz)

Applicant request to continue to October 28, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

8-26-08 Meeting:

1. Member Branch commented: a) the project helps keep the small agricultural element in the community.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) the lighting plan should follow dark sky principles, which should be documented; b) the applicant is requested to provide landscaping plans showing the right size and species for appropriate screening, which should be documented; and c) the goal of the project is commendable.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) the applicant needs to provide more details with regard to lighting and landscaping.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to continue Phase 4 of Item M-3, No. 08-145-DRB, 598 North Fairview Avenue, to September 23, 2008, for Conceptual/Preliminary review.

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

Design Review Board Agenda

September 23, 2008

Page 13 of 20

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. (Last heard on 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)

Staff recommendation to continue to November 12, 2008

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 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.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

September 23, 2008

Page 14 of 20

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

M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-168-DRB

598 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-090-052)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The subject property consists of 12.29 net acres and includes agricultural operations, an existing farmhouse, a produce stand, and a bathhouse/restroom in the AG-I-5 zone district. Vehicular ingress/egress is provided by a 16-foot (to be upgraded to 20-foot) wide gravel driveway from Stow Canyon Road, and through the City's adjacent library parking lot. A modification was granted to require a total of 19 designated parking spaces on the property. Minor amounts of grading would be required to facilitate building pads and the installation of utilities.

To be in compliance with 08-111-CUP, the applicant proposes to move the existing farm labor camp from its present location near the avocado orchard to a development envelope along the existing driveway near the farmhouse in Phase 5 as follows:

Phase 5 – (To be completed by July 1, 2013):

- Final permitting and construction of permanent housing. Permanent housing would consist of modular, stick-built, relocated homes or other permanent housing, as approved by the Design Board Review, for up to five (5) units of farm worker housing.
- The farm labor camp would include restroom and kitchen facilities within each of the housing units fully connected to public water and sewer line systems.
- Remove and replace all interim housing units with permanent housing. Use of kitchen and restroom/shower trailers (if any) is discontinued.
- Retain the bathhouse/restroom as a demonstration facility.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

September 23, 2008

Page 15 of 20

The project was filed by agent Steve Welton of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services on behalf of Center for Urban Agriculture at Fairview Gardens, property owner. Related cases: 08-111-CUP; 08-145-DRB. (Continued from 08-26-08) (Scott Kolwitz)

Applicant request to continue to December 23, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

8-26-08 Meeting:

1. Member Branch commented: a) recommended incorporating sustainability elements into the project, for example, solar, photovoltaic, wind, and water reclamation elements.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) the concept and the intent of the grouping plans are fine; b) his concerns at this point would be lighting and screening which will be considered further along in the process; and c) spoke in support of incorporating sustainability elements and alternative building materials into the project, which would be useful and educational, if within the budget constraints.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to continue Phase 5 of Item M-3, No. 08-145-DRB, to September 23, 2008, for Conceptual review; and that Phase 5 be assigned a separate planning permit number (08-168-DRB).

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 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

September 23, 2008

Page 17 of 20

- 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

September 23, 2008

Page 18 of 20

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

September 23, 2008

Page 19 of 20

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

September 23, 2008

Page 20 of 20

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.