



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, September 9, 2008**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.**

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### **SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.**

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

### **STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE**

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

### **ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.**

### **REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.**

**GOLETA CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

#### **Members:**

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

---

#### **Notices:**

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

# Design Review Board Agenda

September 9, 2008

Page 2 of 16

## A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

## B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for August 26, 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. 08-059-DRB

55 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-007)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 37,721-square foot commercial building on an approximately 84,942-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to install a 1,500-gallon liquid nitrogen distribution tank at the southwest corner of the property. The project was filed by agent Dave Jones on behalf of Bermant Development Company, property owner. Related cases: 08-059-SCD, -LUP; 06-065-SCD, -LUP; 91-DPF-014; 79-DP-014. (Continued from 8-26-08) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### 8-26-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

**MOTION:** Branch moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 08-059-DRB, 55 Castilian Drive, as submitted, and continue to September 9, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

## 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

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 9, 2008

Page 3 of 16

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 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.
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.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

# Design Review Board Agenda

September 9, 2008

Page 4 of 16

**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. 08-147-DRB

111 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-025)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 21,800-square foot commercial building on a 3.6-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to remodel the façade of the building, but no changes in building height, building coverage, signage, or floor area are proposed. Features of the remodel include a new aluminum and glass storefront system on the north, south, and west elevations of the building, and an upgrade of existing aluminum glass and doors on the north, east, and south elevations. A new landscape plan is also proposed, with new plantings consisting of *Prunus cerassifera*, *Miscanthus sinensis*, *Syagrus romanzoffianum*, and other plant species. The project was filed by Dave Jones of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Mark Winnikoff of Frieslander Holdings LLC and Nederlander Holdings, LLC, property owners. Related cases: 08-147-LUP. (Continued from 8-12-08) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **8-12-08 Meeting:**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) the applicant is requested to provide lighting cut sheets showing some type of fully-shielded light directed downward.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) the building design is fine; and b) the landscaping plans need to be reviewed in detail.
3. Chair Wignot commented: a) the landscape plans need to be reviewed in addition to site drainage and lighting plans; b) the site needs more landscaping than the proposed minimal landscaping that is shown on the plans; c) the strip along the perimeter of the parking along the roadway would benefit from some shade trees interspersed among existing shade trees which would be something other than the existing "tired" shrubs; d) noted that the property across the street is well-landscaped with some shade trees; and e) noted that the larger parapet on the roof could use some repainting.
4. Member Messner commented: a) the landscape plan should include street trees all the way around the frontages of the project; and b) recommended that the applicant refer to the City's current Recommended Street Tree Planting List and planting guidelines.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with Member Messner with regard to including street trees all the way around the frontages of the project; and b) requested that the landscape plan show the location of the existing palm trees.

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 9, 2008

Page 5 of 16

**MOTION:** Schneider moved, seconded by Branch to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-147-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets showing some type of fully- shielded down light situation, and color and material boards.

**AMENDED MOTION:** Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-147-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets showing some type of fully-shielded down light situation, and color and material boards; and b) the applicant shall provide a landscape plan showing street trees along both frontages of the property; and to continue to September 9, 2008, for Final review by the full DRB on the Final Calendar.

### 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. (Laura Vik)

#### 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

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 9, 2008

Page 6 of 16

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 8-12-08) (Natasha Heifetz Campbell & Scott Kolwitz)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **8-12-08 Meeting:**

The majority of the DRB members did not object to the modification to reduce the number of parking spaces and did not believe there would be a problem. There were no objections to the modification request with regard to the size of the parking spaces.

1. Member Messner commented: a) overall the project is fine; b) expressed concern regarding vehicle accessibility to and from the store, and recommended that the two curbs at the front of the store be minimized, and that the length of the curbing be minimized at the entrance, to help with traffic flow; c) moving the door for automobile stereo installation may reduce congestion; d) recommended that larger tree sizes be used for the new trees (plant 24" box size instead of 15-gallon size) to equalize the landscaping; e) the reason why a larger size new tree may not grow as fast as a smaller size is that the roots have become root-bound; however a landscape architect can certify on the drawing specifications that a tree will not be root-bound no matter what size, and can inspect them on the site as well.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) expressed concern that automobiles would be backing out from the door into the traffic aisle on the southeast corner; b) conceptually, the plans are fine and the information presented indicates there are no problems with the reduction of the number of parking spaces; and c) the parking space sizes are acceptable.
3. Member Branch commented: a) overall, the project is fine; and b) from his experience and knowledge with regard to parking on the site, he does not believe there will be problems with parking.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) agreed with Member Messner's recommendation to minimize the length of the curbs to help facilitate traffic flow; b) he walks by the site often and has not seen a parking problem; c) the project design is fine and he appreciates that the main element of the façade was shifted over.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with the DRB members' comments; and b) he does not believe parking will be a problem, noting that from his experience parking spaces are available on the southwest corner of the Costco site.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 9, 2008

Page 7 of 16

6. Chair Wignot commented: a) agreed with the DRB members' comments; b) the location of the door for automobiles to enter the building on the southeast corner seems problematic; c) suggested that the northeast corner would be more logical for the automobile door and noted there would be adjacent parking spaces for the automobiles at this location; however, the relocation of the door would not be a requirement for his decision to approve the project; d) he does not believe the reduction of parking would cause a problem; and e) from his experience he believes the proposed tenant is a reputable company.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown) to continue Item M-1, No. 08-075-DRB, 7090 Marketplace Drive, including the comment that the applicant is requested to study relocating the proposed automobile door on the southeast corner, which would be good, and noting that approval of the project would not be contingent on relocating the door; and to continue Item M-1 to September 9, 2008.**

### **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 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 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

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 9, 2008

Page 8 of 16

- 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.



## Design Review Board Agenda

September 9, 2008

Page 9 of 16

### **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. 08-090-DRB**

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* 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 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **8-12-08 Meeting:**

1. Member Branch commented: a) the impacts to the neighborhood have already occurred with regard to the project's current size, bulk and scale; b) the intensity of use already exists with the current bedrooms, making note that no more bedrooms are being added; c) there is a need for more bathrooms with regard to the many bedrooms; d) the proposed size of the square footage is not significant, noting that the current project exceeds the FAR Guidelines; moreover, the square footage existed prior to the institution of the FAR guidelines; e) noted that the public comment indicates that there are a lot of neighbors who expressed concerns; and f) he could probably support the project.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) agreed with Member Branch's comments with regard to existing impacts to the neighborhood and intensity; b) the proposed architecture is fine and it continues with the appearance of the existing architecture; c) extending the depth of the garage would hopefully accommodate the parking of cars; d) there have been a lot of issues expressed by neighbors in the area with regard to the applicant's property; e) he is cognizant of the

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 9, 2008

Page 10 of 16

- comments made by speaker Gary Vandeman with regard to the handicapped bathroom; and g) he would probably support the project.
3. Member Herrera commented: a) expressed concern that new square footage would be added to the project which already exceeds the FAR Guidelines; and b) the neighbors' comments indicate they have concerns with regard to problems in the neighborhood.
  4. Member Messner commented: a) upon review of the photographs, noted that there is a trench covered with boards; however permits have not been issued yet to install the sewer line.
  5. Chair Wignot commented: a) the proposed amount of square footage to be added to the footprint is not a substantial change and could be considered for approval; b) the neighbors' comments in opposition to the project express concerns with regard to the applicant's property, particularly parking issues; and c) although the parking issues are not within the DRB's purview, he would support the applicant making the choice to address the neighbors' concerns as a "good neighbor".
  6. Member Schneider commented: a) agreed with Member Branch that the intensity of use already exists; b) the proposed addition of square footage for the bathroom in the southeast corner is reasonable, not visible, and does not add to the mass, bulk, and scale; c) he cannot support the proposed garage conversion, the addition of the handicapped bathroom in the garage, or compromising the existing garage space, particularly since the garage is not currently being used for vehicle parking, and the neighbors have concerns with regard to parking for cars generated by the project site; and d) he understands the need for the handicapped bathroom and suggested there may be another place in the house to locate the handicapped bathroom.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown) to continue Item L-2, No. 08-090-DRB, 7837 Langlo Ranch Road, to September 9, 2008, with the following comments: 1) the proposed addition for the bathroom in the rear, in the southeast corner, is acceptable; 2) the applicant is requested to restudy the bathroom, laundry, and garage area in an effort to maintain at least a 20' depth, or possibly more, in the garage to reduce the impact to the garage; and 3) the applicant is encouraged to restudy relocating the handicapped bathroom in another location in the interior space of the house; and to continue to September 9, 2008.**

## M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

### M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-132-DRB

1 South Los Carneros (APN 073-330-026, 073-330-028, & 073-330-029)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The applicant proposes to construct a 275-unit, 14-building multi-family residential subdivision on three existing parcels totaling approximately 27.04 acres (gross), identified as Lots 4, 6 & 7 of TM 32,036, a resubdivision of Lots 1-7 of TM 14,500 (APNs 073-330-026, 028 & 029).

The Village @ Los Carneros Phase II project proposes to create ten new lots, nine of which are proposed to accommodate 14 multi-family residential structures and one of which will provide for common recreational facilities. Lot 4 is located on the west side of Los Carneros Road opposite Calle Koral, while Lots 6 & 7 are located

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

September 9, 2008

Page 11 of 16

north of Los Carneros Road, approximately 150 feet east of Castilian Drive, with access from Cortona Drive. The Union Pacific Railroad tracks and Highway 101 are located to the north of Lots 4 and 7.

Primary vehicular access to the Phase II project is provided either via a 40-foot wide road approved in Phase I of the Village at Los Carneros, beginning at a new entrance at the intersection of Los Carneros Road and Calle Koral, through portions of Lots 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7, or from Cortona Drive via the planned bridge across Tecolotito Creek.

In total, approximately 56% of the project is landscaping and nearly 53% of the site is identified as common open space. In addition to the amenities provided with Phase I, an additional pool and cabana will be provided on Lot 7.

The development observes a 50-foot setback from the top-of-bank of both Tecolotito Creek and the unnamed drainage channel bisecting Lot 7. The project proposes to construct a 24 foot wide Class I bike/pedestrian/emergency/flood control access path within the setback and on top of the existing County Flood Control easement. A habitat restoration program with riparian plant and shrub species native to the area for the Tecolotito Creek riparian corridor is incorporated into the project. The project also includes additional 20-foot to 24-foot wide Class I bike/pedestrian paths that provide emergency access throughout the project. These "paths" generally consist of two permeable paving "lanes" and an intermittent center median lawn strip using Grass-Pave II or similar Fire Department approved turf block. The project proposes to utilize the triangular area in the northwest corner of Lot 7 as a neighborhood park by constructing a clear spanning bridge over the unnamed drainage channel, removing non-native invasive plant species, re-contouring the land, re-vegetating the area with native grasses, trees and wetland/riparian species and providing small picnic and play areas.

Project grading will involve 16,900 cubic yards of net cut material and require 57,250 cubic yards of fill material. Three biofiltration basins will be constructed on Lot 4 and three on Lot 7 to provide stormwater treatment prior to offsite discharge via the stormdrain system into Tecolotito Creek. (Alan Hanson)

### **N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- **NONE**

### **O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

#### **O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

### **P. ADJOURNMENT**

# Design Review Board Agenda

September 9, 2008

Page 12 of 16

## 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 9, 2008

Page 13 of 16

- 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 9, 2008

Page 14 of 16

## 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 9, 2008

Page 15 of 16

## 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 9, 2008

Page 16 of 16

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.