



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, July 22, 2008**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.**

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### **SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.**

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

July 22, 2008

Page 2 of 18

### A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

### B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

#### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for July 8, 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 6-24-08\*, 4-22-08, 3-25-08, 2-26-08, 9-18-07, 08-21-07) (Cindy Moore)

**Staff request to be continued to September 23, 2008**

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

# Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 3 of 18

## 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.**

## G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

## H. SIGN CALENDAR

- NONE

## I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

### I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-136-DRB

7410 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-064)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. The original project consisted of exterior building improvements and a new landscape plan on the eastern parcel of the HBP. The applicant now proposes to enclose an aluminum canopy structure adjacent to the Employee Activity Center building. The proposed enclosed space would have a floor area of 2,423 square feet. The height of the new enclosure would be 14'-9". Materials for the enclosure would consist of aluminum framing and glass. The project was filed by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 08-136-LUP RV. (Shine Ling)

## J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

## K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

### K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 37-SB-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Preliminary review*. The property includes two screened storage areas and nine buildings totaling 326,490 square feet on a 92.25-acre lot in the 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

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 4 of 18

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 6-10-08\*, 4-22-08, 4-20-04, 3-16-04, 2-17-04\*, 1-6-04, 12-2-03) (Cindy Moore)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **4-22-08 Meeting:**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) the applicant is requested to provide a streetscene showing the three buildings lined up along Hollister Avenue because he has some concerns and would prefer making the Building 1 architecture slightly different and not so repetitive of Building 2 and Building 4; b) while he appreciates the curved glass element at the entry he has some concerns having the curved glass element that goes towards the restaurant; c) Building 2 and Building 4 are fairly well done; d) the buildings work with the existing architecture across the street; e) the metal curtain wall forms that lead into the project will be somewhat successful; f) the trellis structure is unsuccessful and needs to be reworked; g) the façade that shows thickness as it turns the corner and turns into the glass element works well; however the wall seems too thin at the corner; h) the lighting plans need to show photometrics and cut sheets; i) expressed concern regarding the water feature at the corner and would prefer a solution that doesn't use water, stating that he believes it is a bad precedent to set in this area; and k) the project is headed in a reasonable direction.
2. Member Wignot commented: a) overall the project is moving in the right direction based on his review of the minutes of the previous review; b) it would be beneficial if reclaimed water service could be used for irrigation, given the size of the property and relative proximity to the reclaimed water mains that are in use at UCSB; c) a water feature at the corner of the intersection may not be appropriate especially if potable water would be used; however the intersection is very busy and could benefit from another type of calming effect, for example, some type of wind sculpture element; d) he appreciates the ingress and egress plans for the corner; e) the location and screening for utility boxes and transformers need to be shown on the plans; and f) the plan to locate a restaurant on the corner is appreciated.
3. Member Smith commented: a) the entry off of Hollister Avenue with the two curved wall panels is appreciated; b) he agrees with the comment from Member Schneider that the end wall may need to be slightly thicker; c) the Building 1 architecture should be a little more distinctive, for example with an international style element, than Building 2 and Building 4; d) he does not believe there is a great need for the buildings to have architectural allegiance with the buildings across the street on Hollister Avenue which seem unattractive big-boxes with holes; e) he appreciates the concept of a water fountain feature on the corner, noting that the same water could be re-circulated; and f) requested a little more use of the stone material on the buildings.
4. Member Brown commented: a) there needs to be some sort of sense of separation between the pedestrians and the roadway traffic on Los Carneros; b)

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 5 of 18

requested the applicant pursue working with the owner of the property next door to provide access to the Kmart property; c) requested that the proposed metal and stone materials be incorporated consistently throughout the site; d) the applicant shall provide a lighting plan; e) suggested consideration of another way to feature the corner rather than a water feature with regard to this era of scarce resources; f) the streetscape should include the façade of the proposed restaurant and its relationship to the buildings next door; f) the opportunity for people to walk and bike throughout the project is a good feature; g) the landscaping plans for many trees is appreciated; h) the path that cars and pedestrians would take to and from the restaurant needs to be clear on the plans; i) expressed appreciation that stormwater issues are addressed and incorporated in the plans; j) requested that the plans show the building elevations integrated with the landscaping, particularly when the restaurant is reviewed; k) suggested that the project provide for recycling of green waste on the site through composting and mulching; and l) expressed appreciation for the thoughtfulness and concern for the community that has gone into the design of the project.

5. Member Messner commented: a) the performance bonds are needed with regard to the relocation of palm trees; b) the landscape plans need to show that the double rows of Ginkgo trees need to be only male species due to concerns with regard to pollen; c) the plans for street lighting should include lighting outside the parking lot and in connection with the airport; and d) the landscape plans need to conform to the City's current Recommended Street Tree Planting List and planting guidelines with regard to trees in the right-of-ways.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) the concept of a water feature in the corner is appreciated; b) the landscaping plans with many trees throughout the property is appreciated; c) the drainage plans are fine; and d) the use of reclaimed water on the site would be great.
7. Chair Branch commented: a) the applicant is requested to provide a streetscene showing how the building integrate on the site; b) he appreciates that the Building 1 architecture relates to Building 2 and Building 4 but suggested some difference in Building 1, for example, in terms of materials and proportions; c) the accent wainscot seems somewhat thin on the bottom; d) the green sea glass is a great element; e) the wing that is protruding seems a little thin and may need to be returned or thickened; f) reclaimed water would be useful on the site being that it is so large; g) the water feature at the corner is attractive but he does have concerns with regard to the water conservation point of view; h) he appreciates the design wherein Building 2 and Building 4 guide into the project; and i) this project is well done and it is clear a lot of time and work has been spent on it.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-1, No. 37-SB-DRB, Cabrillo Business Park, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to June 10, 2008, with comments.**

## L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

### L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-108-DRB

475 Camino Laguna Vista (APN 077-422-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,576-square foot residence and an attached 423-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,250-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 6 of 18

construct 179.5 square feet in additions on the first-floor as well as to permit an as-built 205-square foot patio cover. The resulting 2-story structure would be 3,383.5 square feet, consisting of a 2755.5-square foot single-family dwelling with an attached 205-square foot patio cover, and an attached 423-square foot 2-car garage. All materials used for this project aside from the doors, windows, and exterior lighting are to match the existing residence. Details of new doors and new exterior lighting can be found within the plan set. The project was filed by agent Martha Gray on behalf of Stacey & Alex Matson, property owners. Related cases: None. (Brian Hiefield)

### M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

#### M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 03-051-DRB

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

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

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

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

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

The property is zoned C-H (Highway Commercial), and the land use designation in the City's General Plan is Office & Institutional. The project was filed by the Islamic Society of Santa Barbara as the applicant and property owner with Md Wahiduzzaman, Mukhtar Khan and Ken Mineau as owner representatives.

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 7 of 18

Related cases: 03-051-CUP, 03-051-DP. (Last heard on 6-24-08\*, 5-28-08, 4-8-08\*, 2-12-08\*, 01-23-08\*, 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **5-28-08 Meeting**

1. The applicant's flexibility is appreciated. The site constraints have been changing which is challenging for site planning and prolongs the review process.
2. Member Brown commented: a) expressed concern that over half of the site will be used for parking; b) the use of permeable materials to help soften the proposed hardscape is appreciated; c) she hopes that the reciprocal parking arrangements will work out; d) more information with regard to the buffer setbacks will be useful; e) expressed concern that the perimeter fence will extend the built environment around the building when it is moved towards Calle Real; f) the fence materials should be more permeable so there is not a visual barrier as the building is viewed from Calle Real and Los Carneros; g) requested some reduction in the square footage of the building since it will be moved closer to Calle Real and the square footage has increased; h) stormwater and flooding information are land use issues but it would be helpful to have some information available for site planning; i) if street lights are required, suggest lighting that incorporates dark sky standards; and j) recommended no lights on the northern part of the building.
3. Member Branch commented: a) the use of permeable paving materials is appreciated from a runoff standpoint especially along the back against the preserve; b) the bulk and scale of the building feels large as it is moved up to the corner; c) the massing of the building in itself has some nice proportions and nice elements but would probably fit better if it were reduced to about eighty-five percent of the size; d) expressed concern regarding the eight-foot wall which seems out of scale with regard to how the project integrates with the neighborhood; e) it would be better not to have exterior lighting unless required; and f) suggested that perhaps bollards at the driveway entry would have less impact in the area as a whole than street lights.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) suggested that shifting the building more to the east as far as possible from the standpoint of visibility for traffic; b) moving the building to the center would be awkward with parking on both sides; c) the building would fit with existing buildings on either side of Calle Real by being pulled back farther; d) permeable pavement materials are appreciated; e) he would prefer not having street lights; and f) story poles and more project details are needed.
5. Member Messner commented: a) he is still concerned regarding parking and would like information regarding flood zones; b) larger trees are needed in front, not palm trees, but substantial size trees; c) larger trees in larger boxes are available which can be inspected to make sure the trees are not root-bound; d) the trees planted in right-of-ways will need to conform to the City's Recommended Street Tree List and planting guidelines; e) permeable paving is good; f) suggested steel grate tree wells in the parking lot; g) he is not in favor of the perimeter wall; and h) expressed reservations regarding the height of the project.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) although there are permeable pavers, a bioswale would be beneficial to filter and retain water before it drains into the

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 8 of 18

wetlands towards the east; and b) suggested reducing the height of the project if the size is reduced with consideration for the wildlife flight path.

7. Chair Wignot commented: a) he agreed with the above DRB comments; b) expressed concern that moving the building to the southwest corner brings up the issue of size, bulk and scale because there will be too much mass at the corner; c) the adjacent properties are located back from Calle Real with parking in front of the buildings; spaces in pulled there should be consideration regarding whether traffic mitigation would be required with to what is happening in the area; d) he believes there will be a need for a traffic signal; e) expressed concern that it would be difficult to exit and turn left on Calle Real; and f) the project would benefit by the willingness of the applicant to plant trees on the northern and eastern property line so over time the trees will mature and screen the building from people walking along the public preserve and Lake Los Carneros.

**MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to continue Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, with comments, to June 24, 2008.**

### **M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-102-DRB**

Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road (APN 079-210-049)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is a vacant 14.46-acre property in the DR-8 zone district, located in western Goleta on a parcel extending west of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection.

Proposed structural development includes 102 single family residences and townhouses, including 20 affordable units. Individual units would range in size between 566 and 2,872 square feet. The single-family residences would have a maximum height of 24 feet. The townhouses would have a maximum height of 22 feet. The proposed architecture proposed for both detached and attached units is described as a mix of Spanish, Ranch, and Monterey styles. All units would have private outdoor areas. A total of 258 parking spaces would be provided.

Common open space would total approximately 302,282 square feet (48%) exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated to the City of Goleta, and includes a children's play area and trail, with benches throughout the proposed Devereux Creek restoration area. A conceptual landscape plan includes restoration of the Devereux Creek corridor. The 87 eucalyptus and 8 cypress trees to be removed would be replaced with a total of 282 drought tolerant Mediterranean and native tree species, both ornamental (e.g., Melaluca, London Plane Tree, etc.) and indigenous to the area (e.g., coast live oak and sycamore).

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

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



## Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 9 of 18

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

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

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **6-10-08 Meeting:**

#### **Overall General Comments of Majority of DRB Members:**

1. The applicant is requested to provide a full site plan and conceptual landscaping and architectural plans. (An aerial photograph is requested for reference purposes.)
2. The applicant is requested to address all DRB comments including previous reviews.
3. The applicant is requested to address the DRB recommendation that a raised boardwalk and path be added through the open space area in the center of the site, noting that this is a strong recommendation by a majority of members.
4. The DRB strongly recommends that the fire road on the west side of the eastern cluster goes through in order to provide a loop for vehicular access.
5. The DRB expressed appreciation for the changes made by the applicant which are a good improvement for the project.

#### **Comments of Individual DRB Members:**

1. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) expressed appreciation for the changes in the arrangement of the structures with regard to the design, layout and groupings, which are very creative.
2. Member Branch commented: a) the changes make the project much better; b) expressed appreciation that the plans now show that the guest parking is more obvious as a guest parking situation; c) suggested studying whether it is possible to move the units so that guests could park in the depth of the driveway for units that are far enough away from the parking clusters; d) strongly recommended that the fire road on the west side of the east cluster goes through to provide a loop for vehicular access; e) strongly recommended that there is a bridge through the center of the open space, which has been suggested previously by the DRB; and f) pulling back the plans will read well from Hollister Avenue and provide space between the units which will allow for the change of architectural styles.
3. Member Brown commented: a) agreed with the comments from Vice Chair Smith and Member Branch; b) expressed appreciation that the project feels more like a community and a neighborhood; c) even though the units are attached, the idea of separating living areas from the attached units is appreciated; d) the new site plan is much more interesting; e) the increased open space is appreciated; f) the side-loaded garages are great because it allows for more of a welcoming presentation of the house and front door/patio area; g) increasing the size of driveways to a full size is recommended; h) a pedestrian bridge and walkway connecting the east and west portions of the project through the open space

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 10 of 18

- area would be useful and important; i) she looks forward to reviewing the architecture style and liked the last design that was submitted; j) she supports the building concepts which she believes would work, particularly the attached single-family conceptual floor plans; k) with the buildings located opposite one another, there may be privacy issues to consider; l) while sound walls do provide a function, there is more of an open feel without having a sound wall; and m) the sidewalks will need to be shown with the landscape plans.
4. Member Schneider commented: a) the changes are a great improvement in the site plan, including not having the entries in the back side along the western property line, and the project is moving in a good direction; b) it is critical that an elevated boardwalk be allowed across the open space area to connect the east and west portions of the site and provide access; c) the proposed bridge and path along the northern property line should remain for access purposes as well as the addition of a boardwalk across the center open space area; d) the fire road on the west side of the east cluster should go through in order to provide a loop for access, however, the pavement treatment should be different for the portion of the road through the open space area that acknowledges the road runs through an open space area; e) the other fire access road should have pavement material such as Grasscrete that would blend with the landscape but indicate the road would only be used for fire access; f) the single-access point for vehicles on the east works well particularly with the view of the open space when entering the site; g) suggested that some landscaping be added to soften the view at the west entrance which currently has two parking spaces and a garage; h) the turn-in garages, particularly the dual turn-in garages, work very well; i) expressed some concern regarding parking and suggested lengthening the driveways when possible to provide for guest parking; j) the photographs provided have full-length driveways, not short driveways; k) the architecture should be reviewed during Conceptual review; l) the applicant is requested to provide a aerial photograph of the larger area for reference purposes; and m) requested that staff address the issue with regard to the City's plans for Las Armas Road.
  5. Member Messner commented: a) the fire road on the west side of the east cluster should go through in order to provide a loop for access, and suggested adding some type of thick wood bridge for the portion of the fire road across the open space area that would blend well with the bridge and walkway which is requested to be located across the center open space area and would allow passage underneath; b) strongly supported an elevated boardwalk across the open space area to connect the east and west portions of the site; c) suggested that lawn be possibly added in the areas between the two buildings that may be used by children for play; d) the use of the appropriate tree species, sizes and heights, needs to be considered to facilitate the flow and ambience of the project site; e) suggested considering the use of the large square style pavement in some of the areas between the homes, which is shown in the first photograph in the conceptual site plan document; and f) the utility boxes, backflows and irrigation check valves should be screened and shown on the landscape plan.
  6. Chair Wignot commented: a) agreed with the DRB members that the layout presented today is an improvement from the plan that had more single-family residences; however, he still has some problems, particularly with the traffic circulation pattern and parking; b) with regard to parking, it does not appear that there is the ability to park a full-length sedan or truck in the short driveways and the on-street parking appears to be limited for full-size vans or pick-up trucks; c) not allowing the road to go through on the western end of the eastern portion of the site would be awkward for deliveries and trash collection trucks, and would

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 11 of 18

result in constraints for vehicle users; and noted that he prefers two access points off of Las Armas Road; d) the traffic circulation on the eastern portion needs to be improved, and the western traffic circulation is marginally better; e) he commented in general that he believes there are a lot of people in an area that has limited egress in the event of an emergency, for example, if there was a need to evacuate, and noted that this project would be one of the closest residential projects to Venoco, although this may not be within the purview of the DRB; f) he does not understand why public opposition with regard to adding anything in the middle of the open space area has not been put on the table; and g) suggested consideration that a sound wall may be needed along Hollister Avenue.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera) to continue Item M-1, No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road, with comments, to July 8, 2008, with the comments from this meeting and the previous DRB reviews.**

### **M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-217-DRB**

7760 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-057)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The applicant proposes to construct a 70,510 square foot senior assisted living facility on a 2.94 acre property with a General Commercial (C-G) land use designation and Industrial Research Park (M-RP) zoning. The facility would accommodate a maximum of 99 elderly residents. There would be a total of 44 employees with a maximum of 24 employees for daytime staffing.

The structure would be two stories with a maximum height of 34'2" and include a covered porch at the entrance, a large central courtyard and a barbeque terrace. The architecture is reminiscent of the agricultural tradition of Goleta with exterior finishes consisting of horizontal and clapboard siding and the use of stone veneer on the entry, retaining walls, and chimney. The proposed color palette includes yellow, tan, red, and white trim accents. All mechanical equipment would be screened in mechanical wells. The project would maintain the existing Venoco Offsite 30-foot Meteorological Station previously permitted to monitor air quality downwind of the gas processing plant.

Proposed landscaping includes trees planted along the property lines and the use of drought-tolerant plantings along the walking paths and patios, as well as butterfly and kitchen gardens. Approximately 14 trees would be removed from the site, but larger trees along the southern and eastern perimeters would be preserved.

Access would be provided from two driveways on Viajero Drive, with the existing curb cut on Hollister Avenue removed. A 20-foot emergency Fire Department access consisting of grass crete would be provided around the building on the northern and eastern portions of the site. Two parking lots with a total of 48 parking spaces would serve the front and rear of the site. The project proposes to eliminate a private road easement along the eastern portion of the site, and the abandonment by the City of a small portion of Viajero Drive so that the easement is consistent with the constructed road.

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 12 of 18

Estimated earthwork quantities include 9,400 cubic yards of cut, 800 cubic yards of fill, with 8,600 cubic yards of export.

The project was filed by agent Harwood White on behalf of Mariposa, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 07-217-RZ, -DP, -MCUP, -RMM. (Cindy Moore)

### N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

#### N-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-037-DRB

Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange

This is a request for further *Advisory* review. The proposed project includes the removal of the existing Cathedral Oaks Road/Hollister Avenue/US Highway 101 bridge over U.S. Highway 101 and bridge over Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and the construction of new bridges to align with the existing terminus of Cathedral Oaks Road. The proposed overcrossing (US Highway 101) and overhead (UPRR) bridges would accommodate a 12-foot vehicle lane in each direction, one 12-foot center left turn pocket lane/median, 5-foot shoulders/bike lanes in each direction, and a 6-foot sidewalk located on the west side. The project was filed by Caltrans, in association with the City of Goleta. (Last heard on 6-10-08\*, 5-13-08\*, 4-08-08\*, 1-23-08\*, 11-06-07\*, 10-16-07\*, 8-21-07, 7-17-07; 5-02-06) Related case: 05-037-DP. (Rosemarie Gaglione; Laura Bridley)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **8-21-07 Meeting:**

1. Member Brown requested that the project landscape architect consider substituting the *Rhamnus* species for the *Toyon* (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) species which is a nice, colorful, larger shrub and is good for the habitat because birds are attracted to its red berries. She said that there are existing *Toyon* plantings at the Patterson area offramp.
2. Member Messner said the *Toyon* species has different size and growth habits, such as low-growth, medium and high, and suggested that some variances be considered. He agreed with Member Brown that *Toyon* is a better choice.
3. Member Messner requested that the landscape architect consider adding some *Matilija poppies* to the planting mix.
4. Member Messner expressed concern that the *Ceanothus* species, cultivar *Yankee Point*, does not have a very long life and may not last longer than a few years.
5. Member Messner said he appreciates the *Sycamore* and *Live Oak* species but would prefer another species rather than the *Eucalyptus* trees, such as the *Cork Oak*, if possible. Member Brown agreed with Member Messner and noted that *Eucalyptus* trees are existing on the plans. Staff will check with Caltrans regarding how other tree species would fare at this location.
6. The DRB requests that Caltrans consider the comments regarding changes in the planting palette and that staff report back.
7. Vice Chair Wignot requested that staff report back regarding whether the City is developing a landscape plan for the Hollister/Cathedral Oaks intersection. He suggested using similar plant material selections that are elsewhere.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 13 of 18

8. Member Schneider requested that staff report back regarding Caltrans' plans for landscape repair work that is needed at the area where the removed bridge was located near the Hollister/Cathedral Oaks intersection.
9. The DRB appreciates that the recessed treatment will be on both the inside and outside of the bridge.
10. The DRB requests that staff provide exhibits of the architectural treatments for the paved slopes when received from Caltrans for DRB review.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote that further Advisory review was conducted for Item L-1, No. 05-037-DRB, Cathedral Oaks Interchanges, and to continue to October 16, 2007, with comments.**

### **O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**O-1. SEPARATE SIGN COMMITTEE LETTER REVIEW/DISCUSSION**

**O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

**O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

### **P. ADJOURNMENT**

# Design Review Board Agenda

July 22, 2008

Page 14 of 18

## 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

July 22, 2008

Page 15 of 18

- 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

July 22, 2008

Page 16 of 18

## 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

July 22, 2008

Page 17 of 18

## 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**

July 22, 2008

Page 18 of 18

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.