



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REVISED AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, July 8, 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

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

July 8, 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 June 10, 2008
- B. Design Review Board Minutes for June 24, 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. 08-083-DRB

5980 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-051-024)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 1,260-square foot commercial building on an approximately 7,800-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to change the colors of the existing Taco Bell building to a new color palette, with a dark brown color as the dominant color for the exterior walls (Sherwin Williams SW2823 "Rockwood Clay"). No changes in building height, building coverage, signage, or floor area are proposed. A new landscape plan is also proposed, with new plantings consisting of *Phoenix robelinii*, *Arctostaphylos hookerii*, and other plant species. The project was filed by Tim Friedrich of T. L. Friedrich, Inc., agent, on behalf of Robert M. Coe, property owner, and Taco Bell of Lompoc, tenant. Related cases: 08-083-LUP. (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-24-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Chair Wignot expressed concern that it appears that the center *Phoenix robelinii* palm tree is located in front of the center window which is being used for display signage. He suggested consideration of having four palm trees or having a tree on either side of the center arch.
2. Member Messner commented: a) recommended that the location of the center *Phoenix robelinii* tree be offset which would be more attractive than an equal spacing for the three trees; and 2) recommended increasing the size of the *Phoenix robelinii* trees to minimum 36" ground-trunk height (if the tree is multi-trunk, at least one trunk must be at least 36" tall ground-trunk height), which

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

July 8, 2008

Page 3 of 18

- would be more substantial and would blend better with the landscaping because the 15-gallon size is too small and slow-growing.
3. Member Brown commented that she does not believe the proposed “Amber Wave” color is appropriate in Old Town. She noted that she appreciates the color selection on the Taco Bell building located in Santa Barbara.
 4. Member Schneider commented: a) agreed with Member Brown that the “Amber Wave” color is not an appropriate color, stating that doesn’t resolve itself well with the proposal; b) recommended that “Amber Wave” be eliminated, “Camelback” be used for the body, “Rockwood Clay” be used as the base color, “Iron Ore” be restricted to any wrought iron or metal (not including parapet caps), the parapet caps should match the adjacent body color, and “Alabaster” be used for the white brick trim; and c) agreed with Member Messner’s comments with regard to increasing the size of the *Phoenix robelinii* trees and moving the middle tree to a location that is off-center.
 5. Member Branch agreed with the above comments. He noted that the plans imply that there are four arches on the front of the building, however, there are only three existing arches.
 6. Chair Wignot agreed with the above comments.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 08-083-DRB, 5980 Hollister Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) the proposed colors are approved with the exceptions that the #2 color “Amber Wave” shall not be used, and that use of the #5 color “Iron Ore” shall be limited only to accent metals, if there is any wrought iron on the building, but not used on the parapet caps; 2) the color of the parapet caps shall be painted out to match the adjacent body color; 3) the size shall be minimum 36” ground-trunk height for the three *Phoenix robelinii* palm species in the front (if the tree is multi-trunk, at least one trunk must be at least 36” tall ground-trunk height), and 4) the position of the center *Phoenix robelinii* tree shall be relocated so it is offset and not in front of the central arch; and to continue Item L-2, No. 08-083-DRB, to July 8, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-088-DRB

6860 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-015)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes three buildings totaling approximately 31,800 square feet of industrial building, warehouse, and chemical storage space on a 4.4-acre parcel in the M-RP (Industrial Research Park) zone district. Tenant spaces A and B occupy the front industrial building, totaling approximately 25,000 square feet. Tenant space C occupies the warehouse building on the northern property line totaling approximately 5,000 square feet of warehouse space. A Chemical Storage Building in the rear of the property comprises the final 1,800 square feet of development.

The applicant proposes to construct a new façade around the existing entry. The 18’-6” high by 19’-9” wide curved plaster façade will be painted Frazee color “Wise Crack” green to contrast the color on the remaining front façade. The existing accent lighting adjacent to the entry will be reused on the new façade, and there will be new down lighting added to the overhang above the entry. The existing steel sculpture and storefront doors are to remain. There will be pathway lighting added adjacent to the existing steel sculpture. There is no new square footage

Design Review Board Agenda

July 8, 2008

Page 4 of 18

proposed. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 04-229-LUP, -DRB; 03-073-DP, -DRB. (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-24-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) expressed concern that the bollard lighting tends to be disbursed outward and may not be shielded downward; and b) requested that the applicant check the photometrics to ensure that the bollard lighting is shielded downward and provide illumination details.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) expressed concern with regard to the bollard lighting that relates to the light source and brightness of the reflector; and b) green color could be a little deeper.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-088-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, with the following comments: 1) the applicant shall check the photometrics and provide illumination details that address the concerns with regard to shielding the light illumination from the bollards; and 2) there is the possibility that the applicant may explore a green color that is a little more deeper which may be reviewed for approval at the Final review; and to continue Item L-3, No. 08-088-DRB, to July 8, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-089-DRB

5801 Calle Real (APN 069-110-097)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 55,669-square foot shopping center on a 1.28-acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a new freestanding monument sign using elements from the existing monument sign. New façade elements of the sign would consist of new off-white stucco top cap, pole covers, and bases. The applicant proposes to re-use the existing 100-square foot sign panel. The sign would be an internally illuminated cabinet sign. The height of the sign structure would be 21'-6". The project was filed by Kelli Ingber of Lighting Contract Service, agent, on behalf of Jack Jakosky, property owner, and Albertsons, store owner. Related cases: 08-089-SCC. (Continued from 6-24-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-24-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended Preliminary Approval with the following conditions: a) the size of the letters shall match the size of the existing letters; b) push through letters shall be used; c) the background shall be opaque and painted Sherwin-Williams Navajo White; d) the color of the letters shall be Albertsons' blue color; and e) no landscaping around the sign is acceptable;

Design Review Board Agenda

July 8, 2008

Page 5 of 18

however, the use of some type of permeable materials such as gravel or pavers is requested.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-1, No. 08-089-DRB, 5801 Calle Real, with the following conditions: 1) the size of the letters shall match the size of the existing letters; 2) push-through letters shall be used; 3) the background shall be opaque and painted Sherwin-Williams Navajo White; 4) the color of the letters and logo shall be Albertsons' blue color; 5) no landscaping around the base of the sign is approved, however, the use of some type of permeable materials such as gravel or pavers is requested; and to continue Item H-2, No. 08-089-DRB, to July 8, 2008, for Final review.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-082-DRB

7526 Calle Real (APN 079-121-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 5,300-square foot church on a 74,052-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 177-square foot covered entry and demolish an existing 247-square foot carport roof. The existing mansard roof parapet on the front facade will be replaced with a new sloped roof to tie in with the proposed covered entry. The existing windows will be replaced with new wood windows. A new colored concrete patio is proposed beneath the new covered entry, and minor repairs will be done to existing concrete walkways to improve accessibility. New lighting will consist of three (3) wall sconces along the front façade and two (2) hanging pendant lights beneath the proposed covered entry. There is no new habitable square footage proposed. The project was filed by agent Thomas Hashbarger on behalf of El Camino Presbyterian Church, property owner. Related cases: 68-CP-43; 08-082-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 04-226-DRB

7388 Calle Real (APN 077-490-043)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The revised project has been reduced by two units and includes a final development plan for nine condominium units

Design Review Board Agenda

July 8, 2008

Page 6 of 18

totaling 19,949 square feet, associated infrastructure, and common open space. Two residential unit types are proposed within four two-story structures arranged along a central drive aisle. The buildings would have a maximum height of 30 feet. Buildings A, C, and D would each contain two three-bedroom attached units (2,205 and 2,223 square feet, with an approximately 400 square foot two-car garage each). Building B would contain three three-bedroom units (two @ 2,223 square feet and one @ 2,205 square feet with an approximately 400 square foot two-car garage each). Access to the site would be via Calle Real. Parking would include 18 garage parking spaces and seven visitor spaces, for a total of 25 spaces. The proposed project site includes approximately .94 acres in the Design Residential zone district. The project was filed by Detlev Peikert, representing 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner. Related cases 04-226-TM, - DP (Continued from 5-2-06, 3-21-06) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

5-2-06 Meeting:

1. Although parking requirements will be met, concern that there may be a need for additional parking for different occasions.
2. Concern that cars backing out of the garages are immediately into the driveway and walkway, and whether the design concept for the driveway and garages is workable.
3. One member said that the visual impacts of garages is not minimized.
4. Concern regarding size, bulk and scale. The units on the south elevation need to be smaller in scale and not appear so massive to the street, particularly coming from either the east or west along Calle Real.
5. Suggest adding one-story elements or stepped two-story elements on the south elevation.
6. The architecture should not be over-detailed because these are small houses.
7. Prefer the previous drawings with architecture that was simpler. The buildings next door are somewhat plain.
8. The character of the architecture is nice. Appreciate the concept of duplexes.
9. Concern that the buildings are close to the commercial site on the west elevation and that the second-story floor overlooks to the parking lot. One member said there is a lack of buffer between housing and non-residential.
10. There needs to be a more compatible/friendly relationship between the residential and commercial buildings and bar at the back of the property, particularly regarding the affordable housing end unit.
11. One member said that the affordable unit site would be an awkward place to live. Suggest that moving the northwest corner of the building eastward would provide more room.
12. A suggestion was made to eliminate a unit which would allow for a more communal open space or could become added guest parking.
13. One member suggested removing the tot lot or moving it to the other side.
14. Possibly adding some tall trees along the western property line would help buffer.
15. Appreciate the trees that are located on the east side of the project.
16. It would be useful to install a gate in the wall to allow for access to the commercial area without having to walk out to Calle Real.
17. The color of the driveway ribbon should match the adjacent color.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

July 8, 2008

Page 7 of 18

18. One member has reservations regarding the drainage. What is called out for in the drawing is inadequate. Also, the soil is a clay soil and retains a lot of water. The member believes there will be potential problems with the wall on the west side of the property. There is another development below this wall and the other property owners below could be negatively impacted.
19. Recommend using a paving material for parking that is durable. Turf block type material may not be appropriate for heavy use.
20. Request staff research whether there is a plan to add a combination of right and left turn lanes from Calle Real into the project site and/or Ellwood Station Road and the commercial site.

Member Massey said that she thinks it would be appropriate that issues such as size of units and setbacks be reviewed by the Planning Agency for direction prior to architectural review by the DRB.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, said that the following changes will be made to respond to some of today's comments: 1) The building on the northwest side of the property will be moved to the east to create a little more space between the existing building. 2) Some changes will be made to the treatment of the front elevations such as wrapping the entrance porch around and creating some low roofs to create a more friendly view to the street. Mr. Peikert said that from his experience in designing projects of this density type he has a clear understanding regarding how the driveway turning movement would work. He suggested that DRB members discuss concerns regarding soils and drainage directly with their project engineer at Penfield & Smith. He said he would appreciate the opportunity to move forward with the application process.

MOTION: Pierce moved, seconded by Vandeman and carried by a 9 to 0 vote that Conceptual review has been completed with comments on Item I-2, No. 04-226-DRB.

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

Design Review Board Agenda

July 8, 2008

Page 8 of 18

Mediterranean and native tree species, both ornamental (e.g., Melaluca, London Plane Tree, etc.) and indigenous to the area (e.g., coast live oak and sycamore).

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

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

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

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

Applicant request to be continued to July 22, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-24-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

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

Design Review Board Agenda

July 8, 2008

Page 9 of 18

- 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 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 turning garages, particularly the dual turning 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

Design Review Board Agenda

July 8, 2008

Page 10 of 18

- 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 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. 07-171-DRB

351 S. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue (APNs 065-090-022, -023, -028)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review of a new application for the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital which proposes to improve its existing facilities in order to comply with State Senate Bill 1953, a law requiring the seismic retrofit and/or upgrading of all acute care facilities. Existing development consists of a 93,090-square foot hospital and a 41,224-square foot Medical Office Building (MOB).

The applicant proposes to replace the hospital with an entirely new facility and demolishing the old hospital building, resulting in a total of 152,658 square feet, a net increase of approximately 59,568 square feet. The existing MOB located north of the hospital is also proposed to be replaced and will be demolished, resulting in a total of 55,668 square feet, a net increase of approximately 14,444 square feet.

Parking to serve both the hospital and MOB uses will be redeveloped on both sites and a temporary construction parking area including 377 spaces is proposed across South Patterson Avenue in the northwestern portion of the parcel known as the "Hollipat" site.

Design Review Board Agenda

July 8, 2008

Page 11 of 18

Phased construction is planned through 2011 in a manner that will continue to provide all existing medical services to the community.

The hospital, MOB, and a portion of the Hollipat parcels have a General Plan Land Use Designation of Office & Institutional. The hospital parcel has a Hospital Overlay. The remaining portion of the Hollipat parcel has split land use designations of medium and high density residential. The zoning for the hospital, MOB, and a portion of the Hollipat parcel is Professional & Institutional (PI). The remaining portion of the Hollipat parcel has split zoning of Design Residential, 20 and 25 units per acre. The MOB parcel and a portion of the Hollipat parcel have a Design Control Overlay and the southern portion of the hospital parcel has the Approach Zone Overlay. The project was filed by agent Suzanne Elledge on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 07-171-OA, 07-171-DP. (Continued from 6-24-08, 5-28-08, 5-13-08*, 2-12-08, 01-23-08, 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-24-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Comments Regarding the Medical Office Building (MOB) Conceptual Plans:

1. Member Branch commented: a) overall, the progress made with the design is appreciated and he believes the MOB will be very complementary with the hospital; b) requested that the windows on the north elevation be pushed back/recessed and all of the horizontal members go back with it, but the top member remains in place, which would provide for an "eyebrow" feel and shadow line; c) on the west elevation, with regard to the elements on the bottom that protrude and throw a shadow, the proportion and design seems somewhat off; and d) the use of stucco material for the transformer enclosure is the best solution.
2. Member Brown commented: a) requested that the applicant provide a grading plan, including the location of trees, and a lighting plan; b) requested consideration of stormwater issues in terms of curb cuts with regard to the parking lot areas for the MOB and hospital; c) on the east elevation, the set-back design is appreciated and will add some interest, as well as the round element; d) the east elevation will be improved by the proposed landscaping; e) the west elevation is very handsome and successful; f) suggested that some street trees be planted now with regard to the parking lot that can grow over time; g) suggested planting trees along the creek bank area such as *Toyons*, *Lemonade Berries*, or *Sycamore species* considering the amount of asphalt that will be installed on the site; h) the parking lot landscaping needs to be more interesting with more variety in addition to the row of *Catalina Cherry* species which just looks like its trying to screen the parking lot; i) requested consideration be given to the probability that pedestrians will be walking in the grove area with regard to planting appropriate groundcover; and j) the applicant should meet with the Community Services staff prior to the next review to discuss and understand the permanent as well as temporary requirements with regard to the temporary parking lot.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) overall, the building design is much better, including the entry, resolutions, round form and color; b) agreed with Member

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

July 8, 2008

Page 12 of 18

Branch with regard to recessing the window forms, particularly on the elevation facing Hollister Avenue, stating that the depth needs to be in the 12" to 18" range; c) also, on the stair tower forms, there needs to be a significant recess in the 12" range for the design to function and work; d) agreed with Member Branch that the proportions of the openings on the west elevation would be better as a square form; e) expressed concern that the pipe rail may look clunky if not done properly and suggested the applicant study the size and proportions; f) suggested adding a center island in the entry driveway to separate incoming and outgoing traffic; g) suggested that the applicant meet with the Community Services Department staff now regarding the permanent requirements for the parkway and sidewalk as well as what would be accepted on a temporary basis, which will be useful for the DRB review and help understand what could be installed that would be viable on a permanent basis (it is important for the two street frontages to have some significance - the creek frontage is of less concern); h) with regard to a suggestion by Member Messner to consider using gravel in the temporary parking lot for permeability purposes, he would be leery and noted his concerns related to dust and inconvenience for pedestrians; and i) the elevations with regard to the glass corners in the courtyard will need to be shown at the appropriate review level.

4. Member Herrera commented: a) the design has come a long way and is appreciated; b) the corner with the round element is attractive; c) agreed with the other DRB members that trees should be planted on the parkway and inside the parking lot; and d) expressed support for providing an appropriate method for safe pedestrian crossing at the temporary cross walk.
5. Member Messner commented: a) overall, the plans are fine; b) the entry area and the big planter area are appreciated on the south elevation; c) there needs to be a little more stone work on the north elevation, noting that there is a square pillar and suggesting something a little larger such as a rectangle, possibly cantilevering out from the overhang, to help visually draw attention to the entrance; d) adding trees on the outside would be nice; e) suggested that benches be added in the grove area; f) agreed with Member Schneider's suggestion to consider a center divider at the entrance; and g) suggested consideration of the cost-ratio with regard to the use of gravel rather than asphalt for the temporary parking lot, stating that gravel may cut down on certain problems with having runoff and would have a lot of permeability, noting that the size and location of the gravel may vary.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) the work of the applicant and ad hoc committee resulted in a more interesting design and good changes on all elevations for the MOB; b) agreed with DRB comments made today; c) the relocation of the transformer is appreciated; d) recommended that the applicant works with Goleta Water District regarding placement of the backflow preventer devices, which need to be shown on the plans, and screen this equipment with hedges or other landscaping/materials that will be approved by the Goleta Water District; e) the trash enclosures will need to be shown on the plans and be screened; f) the water hydrant locations along Hollister Avenue and/or Patterson Avenue will need to be shown on the plans; g) supported the use of the asphalt paving as proposed for the temporary parking lot, stating that the bioswale collection of runoff is good; h) requested some planting of flowers in the boundaries of the temporary parking lot for the projected three-year period; i) the applicant shall provide cut sheets for the proposed lighting plans at the appropriate level of review; and j) it appears that the traffic flow will work fine.

Comments Regarding the Hospital Conceptual Plans:

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

July 8, 2008

Page 13 of 18

1. Member Schneider requested that the applicant provide sections and roof plans showing the location of the mechanical screenings, the distance from the face of the building and the visibility.
2. Chair Wignot commented that the line-of-sight perspective view on Sheet A-7 seems to show that the equipment is pretty adequately shielded.
3. Member Messner commented that he understands the changes made with regard to the hospital front entry and the applicant's preference for a solid canopy.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to continue Item M-2, No. 07-171-DRB, 351 S. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue, to July 8, 2008, with comments, including minor changes suggested with regard to architecture, and to review landscaping and roof/mechanical screenings.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

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 8, 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 8, 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 8, 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 8, 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 8, 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.