



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REVISED AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

WEDNESDAY, January 23, 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
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

Members:

Scott Branch (Architect), Chair

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

Thomas Smith (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 Revised Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 2 of 16

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for January 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. 07-219-DRB

370 Storke Road (APN 073-100-008)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,230-square foot restaurant, 1,998-square foot car wash, and 20,000-square foot outdoor storage area on a 1.0-acre parcel zoned C-3 in the Inland Area of the City. The applicant proposes to renovate the exterior of the existing restaurant, replacing wood siding with stucco, changing out doors and windows, replacing the existing mansard roof with a 4-foot high parapet, adding a continuous covered eave with a copper colored standing seam roof around the west, north, and south elevations of the building, a copper colored standing seam roofed eave above the mechanical/electrical cabinet and utility door on the east elevation, and replacing the existing roof-mounted HVAC equipment with new HVAC equipment that would also be mounted on the roof. In addition, exterior lighting along the north and south property lines and new landscaping is proposed along with two additional planter areas on the south and east sides of the building. The existing parking area would be re-stripped and one new handicapped parking space would be added. A new 36" high masonry wall around the existing outdoor dining area in the front of the restaurant is also proposed. No expansion of any aspect of the existing structure is proposed as part of this project. The new stucco would be painted "coconut." New flashing would use copper colored aluminum. The project application was filed by Harwood White, agent, on behalf of John Price, property owner. Related cases: 06-185-LUP, 06-185-DRB, 07-095-APP, 07-183-LUP, 07-183-DRB, & 07-219-LUP. (Last heard on 1-08-08) (Alan Hanson)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-08-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Comments:

1. The raised planter on the south elevation needs to be shown on the elevation.
2. The proposed fence on the southern property line needs to be incorporated into the site plan if a fence will be installed as part of the project even though a Land Use Permit for the fence by itself may not be required.
3. Chair Branch said it would be appropriate for the applicant and adjacent property owner to address the concerns regarding the fence and drainage, which were expressed by Bob Murray, outside of the DRB review process.
4. The applicant shall remove the first word, "Employer", in Item #11 under the Floor Plan Reference Notes on Plan #A 1.1.
5. Member Schneider commented that his personal preference architecturally would be for the roof over the trellis elements to be in sections over the windows rather than be continuously wrapped around; however, he understands the concern for having a solid roof at the drive up window.
6. Chair Branch commented that he does not have a concern regarding the wrap around roof design. Member Smith said that the wrap around design is fine.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item J-2, No. 07-219-DRB, 370 Storke Road, with the condition that the following changes shall be shown on the site plans to be submitted for Final review: 1) the raised planter on the south elevation shall be shown on the elevation, 2) the language regarding the exterior materials (e.g. standing seam roof on overhangs and the window trims) to show consistency, and 3) the wood fence proposed for the property line including materials; and to continue Item J-2, No. 07-219-DRB, to January 23, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-216-DRB

55 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-007)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 32,800-square foot single-story commercial property on a 1.95-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to install a new sign on an existing freestanding monument sign that would read "Castilian Research & Technology Center". There would be an approximately 2'-4" high logo associated with the sign. The dimensions of the sign would be 11'-9" long by 2'-4" tall, with an area of approximately 27-square feet. The monument dimensions are 17' long by 4'-10" tall, with an area of approximately 82-square feet. The non-illuminated sign would have pin-mounted PVC lettering finished with enamel. The permitted monument sign is located in the front yard setback along Castilian Drive and is not proposed to be moved. The project was filed by Ken Sorgman, sign contractor, on behalf of Sabine Freistuhler, property owner. Related cases: 07-216-SCC; 92-SCC-001; 91-BAR-390. (Last heard on 1-08-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Design Review Board Revised Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 4 of 16

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-08-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Comments:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended Preliminary Approval of Item H-4, No. 07-216-DRB, as submitted.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-4, No. 07-216-DRB, 55 Castilian Drive, as submitted, and to continue to January 23, 2008, for Final review.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-211-DRB

120 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-050-030)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The applicant proposes to install a two sided freestanding entry sign for the Patterson Place Apartments measuring a maximum of 4-feet 4-inches tall by 8-feet wide. The sign area is proposed to be approximately 18 ½ -inches by 7-feet 4-inches for an aggregate of approximately 11 square feet on each side of the structure. The non-illuminated sign shall have aluminum pin mounted flat cut out (F.C.O.) "Burnt Crimson" lettering. The portion of the sign reading "Patterson Place" will have 6-inch high letters, the portion of the sign reading "APARTMENTS" will have 4-inch high letters, and the address portion of the sign will have 4 ½ -inch high letters. The sign would be located approximately 9-feet east of the edge of public right-of-way and approximately 36-feet north of the Patterson Place Apartments entrance. No logos are allowed as part of the sign. The application was filed by agent Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, property owner. Related case: 74-CP-39, 07-211-SCC. (Last heard on 1-08-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

Applicant request to be continued to February 12, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-08-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Comments:

1. The preference for lighting is downward halo-lit illumination which is fully shielded. The applicant is requested to restudy and provide cut sheets that show lighting that is fully shielded. The illumination should be restricted to just lighting the sign. A suggestion was made that the applicant possibly consider two simple lights that can be fully shielded.
2. Possibly consider a pole light standard to provide lighting at the corner instead of a light for the sign. A pole light would also be a decorative feature for the landscaping.
3. The applicant is requested to address concerns with staff regarding the sight distance and placement of the sign, and to show that the placement of the sign is consistent with the site plan.

Design Review Board Revised Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 5 of 16

4. The applicant is requested to provide the landscape plan showing the new sign.
5. The design of the sign is fine.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION: By consensus (Recused: Schneider) the Sign Subcommittee continued Item H-3, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to January 23, 2008, with comments.

I. FINAL CALENDAR

- None

J. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-095-DRB

7121 Del Norte (APN 077-113-003)

Revised Project Description: This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an existing approximately 36-square foot balcony, an existing approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, and a 390-square foot 2-car carport on a 6,300-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to permit a 120-square foot garden shed, 76-square foot fire pit and 50-square foot Jacuzzi, to construct a 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis, and to expand the approximately 36-square foot balcony to an approximately 108-square foot balcony that would be partially supported by the existing carport. Access from the proposed second-story balcony extension to the top of the carport is not proposed. The resulting 2-story structure would be a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an approximately 108-square foot balcony, an approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, a 390-square foot 2-car carport, a 120-square foot garden shed, a 76-square foot fire pit, a 50-square foot Jacuzzi, and 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis. This existing permitted structure is above the recommended maximum allowable floor area for this property, which is 1,984 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage; however, as the proposed project consists of non-habitable structures, the situation will not be exacerbated. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Victor Alvarez on behalf of Juan & Lola Zaragoza, property owners. Related cases: 05-095-LUP. (Continued from 1-08-08, 10-16-07*, 09-05-07*, 08-21-07, 12-18-05*) (Scott Kolwitz)

Applicant request to be continued to February 12, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-08-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Comments:

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Revised Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 6 of 16

1. It is appreciated that the project has been scaled back. The plans are an improvement from the previous plans that brought much of the massing forward.
2. The elevations need to reflect the existing conditions including the exterior stairway, the door/window situation at the top of the landing, and lighting.
3. The applicant is requested to explore using permeable materials for hardscape and to explain the hardscape on the site plans.
4. Member Messner commented that he does not believe the balcony should be connected to the carport and that these should be free standing from one another.
5. Chair Branch confirmed with the applicant that the balcony is being connected to the carport for structural support purposes.
6. Member Schneider stated that he is not in favor of the proposal to paint the rails with a dark stain because it would draw visual attention, and he thinks that matching the blue color on the carport might be better. He said that his biggest concern is the potential for someone to step over the rail to use the carport which would result in a privacy issue.
7. The applicant shall submit a full set of plans with all of the requirements for Preliminary review and include what is to be demolished and reconstructed. Also, color boards need to be submitted for the body of the house, carport, trim/fascia and the balcony and stair railing.
8. Member Wignot requested that staff update the project description on the DRB agenda for January 23, 2008.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item J-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte, with comments, to January 23, 2008.

K. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

K-1. 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 Revised Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 7 of 16

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 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-18-07 Meeting:

Comments:

1. Member Smith stated that the modified plans are a big improvement. He appreciates that the building was stepped back from the street and would not be concerned if the building needed to be moved forward slightly because of Fire Department constraints.
2. Member Schneider appreciates the modifications added at the corner which soften and set back the architecture. He expressed concern architecturally regarding the rigid, relatively flat three-story wall facing Hollister Avenue because this type of urban massing is not seen in the area where one and two-story buildings with sloped tile roofs are located across the street. One possible solution would be to bring a one-story form out at the street and step back to create a soft one-story form. He also expressed concern that the area is too small for the amount of proposed square footage. The addition of stone material is appreciated but the form seems awkward located along Hollister Avenue. The proposed landscaping seems appropriate. The trees will screen the building when they reach maturity which will be fifteen to twenty-five years; however, the project along Hollister Avenue would not be acceptable at installation. He suggested that the tie be somewhat stronger across the parking lot.
3. Member Messner appreciates the glass reflection in the front and the addition of the stone material but the stacked style would not be appropriate for the main hospital. He also appreciates the addition of the glass reflection area. He recommended some type of pavers, possibly with color, to designate and connect the pedestrian walkway area rather than concrete. He suggested adding some type of treatment such as stonework, concrete pillar, artistic wrought iron, etc., to the small supporting poles that would help visually break down the vertical lines.
4. Chair Branch would prefer an one-story form that is brought out closer to the street if it would help eliminate the three-story wall on the building. He suggested considering adding some articulation so the building is at least perceived as a series of buildings rather than a box. He said that a stepped

Design Review Board Revised Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 8 of 16

approach would be more in character with the existing buildings; however the three-story element is not a concern on the parking lot side. The addition of the stone is appreciated but there needs to be additional study regarding its relationship to the building. He expressed concern that the three-story element may be required based on the actual steps of the process of construction. He suggested consideration of a way to phase the chronology of the construction to avoid this situation.

STRAW POLL:

How many DRB members would favorably consider a one-story element moved closer to the setback along Hollister Avenue if it will reduce some of the three-story mass?

DRB members responding in the affirmative: Branch, Messner, Schneider, Smith (4).

DRB members absent: Brown, Herrera, Wignot. (3).

Chair Branch and Member Schneider stated that a two-story element along Hollister Avenue would be acceptable if needed to make the modules work, in response to a question from Suzanne Elledge.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Herrera, Wignot) that Item K-1, No.07-171-DRB, located at 351 S. Patterson Avenue, be continued to January 23, 2008, with comments.

K-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 03-051-DRB

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

This is a request for further *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.

Design Review Board Revised Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 9 of 16

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. Related cases: 03-051-CUP, 03-051-DP. (Continued from 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

Applicant request to be continued to February 12, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-18-07 Meeting:

1. The environmental buffers need to be shown on the site plans to help understand the constraints and potential impacts on the site, during the conceptual review.
2. The applicant is requested to provide all information required for conceptual review including photographs and site statistics, and to delineate the materials in the parking lot to understand the concept for the pavers and the drainage.
3. Generally, the mass, bulk, scale, and height of the project are fine, except for concerns regarding the tower massing and design which need further study. The ridge of the building is fairly close to the height of the buildings across the street.
4. Comments Regarding the Tower/Dome: The tower location has changed which minimizes the impact to the view sheds at the intersection, but there are concerns that impacts to the views from the park may be increased. Chair Branch has no concerns regarding the shape of the dome but he is concerned that the base that the dome rests upon seems massive. He would prefer the tower to be more of an architectural element rather than a wing on its own. Member Schneider has concerns regarding the massing of the tower. Member Messner suggested that the dome radius be more rounded with the massing reduced, and meshing the dome with the building rather than standing alone. Member Smith expressed concerns regarding the proportion of the dome to the building and also regarding the scale of the base that the dome rests upon. He suggested exploring the idea of a reasonable dome size which was proposed in the e-mail from Gary Vandeman.
5. The public has expressed concerns regarding the impact of the project on the view from the Lake Los Carneros preserve. Consider a method to require that the applicant plant some trees on the park property within approximately five to fifteen feet of the property line to help screen the property, possibly as an off-site mitigation. Suggest planting a few trees now to serve as future replacement trees.

Design Review Board Revised Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 10 of 16

6. Member Schneider suggested that the applicant consider negotiating for an agreement with the commercial site located across Calle Real for conjunctive use parking. He commented that one of the factors related to this review is that the entire block is open space property. He stated that the following items that have been reviewed previously are fine: lighting and landscaping plans, color scheme for the buildings, and the architectural style, except for the dome.
7. Member Messner stated that he has concerns about parking and requested information regarding the Fire department comments regarding maximum occupancy. Member Messner stated that fruit bearing olive trees should not be planted on the front area of the property as the droppings will cause a safety issue for pedestrians and will also increase street maintenance for the City. If fruit bearing olive trees are desired, they should be planted on the back area of the property to ensure that the property owner is responsible for the maintenance. Member Messner recommended that the trees in front should be substantial in size. He also recommended considering steel tree wells for the trees in the parking lot as this will allow for more room for the tree roots and parking. The steel tree wells will be level to the ground and cars will be able to drive over it. He suggested the applicant review the City's planting and street tree guidelines.
8. Chair Branch commented that the proposed use for the project is less intense than what is currently allowed per the zoning designation for the site.
9. Member Smith stated that the view from the Highway 101 overpass at Los Carneros is one of the most outstanding views in the area.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Herrera, Wignot) to continue to January 23, 2008, Item K-2, No. 03-051-DRB, located at the northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, with comments and for plans to be provided that define the environmental buffers to better understand the constraints.

L. ADVISORY CALENDAR

L-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. (Continued from 11-06-07, 10-16-07*, 08-21-07, 07-17-07; 05-02-06) Related case: 05-037-DP. (Rosemarie Gaglione; Laura Bridley)

Applicant request to be continued to April 8, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

08-21-07 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.
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.

M. DISCUSSION ITEMS

M-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

M-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

M-3. LIGHTING SITE VISIT FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION

O. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 12 of 16

Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines

Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)

The purpose of the City Design Review Board (DRB) is to encourage development that exemplifies the best professional design practices so as to enhance the visual quality of the environment, benefit surrounding property values, and prevent poor quality of design.

Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)

The Goleta City Council established the DRB and DRB Bylaws in March of 2002 (Ordinance No. 02-14 as amended by Ordinance No. 02-26). DRB Bylaws have subsequently been amended through Resolutions 02-69, 04-03, 05-27, and 07-22. The DRB currently operates under Bylaws from Resolution 07-22.

Design Review Board Procedures

Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)

The DRB is guided by a set of general goals that define the major concerns and objectives of its review process. These goals are to:

- 1) ensure that development and building design is consistent with adopted community design standards;
- 2) promote high standards in architectural design and the construction of aesthetically pleasing structures so that new development does not detract from existing neighborhood characteristics;
- 3) encourage the most appropriate use of land;
- 4) promote visual interest throughout the City through the preservation of public scenic, ocean and mountain vistas, creation of open space areas, and providing for a variety of architectural styles;
- 5) preserve creek areas through restoration and enhancement, discourage the removal of significant trees and foliage;
- 6) ensure neighborhood compatibility of all projects;
- 7) ensure that architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access;
- 8) ensure that grading and development are appropriate to the site and that long term visible scarring of the landscape is avoided where possible;
- 9) preserve and protect native and biologically and aesthetically valuable nonnative vegetation or to ensure adequate and appropriate replacement for vegetation loss;
- 10) ensure that the continued health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood are not compromised;
- 11) provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way;
- 12) ensure that construction is in appropriate proportion to lot size;
- 13) encourage energy efficiency; and
- 14) ensure that air circulation between structures is not impaired and shading is minimized on adjacent properties.

Aspects Considered in Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.1)

The DRB shall review each project for conformity with the purpose of this Chapter, the applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects, and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations. The DRB's review shall include:

- 1) Height, bulk, scale and area coverage of buildings and structures and other site improvements.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 13 of 16

- 2) Colors and types of building materials and application.
- 3) Physical and design relation with existing and proposed structures on the same site and in the immediately affected surrounding area.
- 4) Site layout, orientation, and location of buildings, and relationship with open areas and topography.
- 5) Height, materials, colors, and variations in boundary walls, fences, or screen planting.
- 6) Location and type of existing and proposed landscaping.
- 7) Sign design and exterior lighting.

Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)

In approving, approving with conditions, or denying an application, the DRB shall examine the materials submitted with the application and any other material provided to Planning and Environmental Services to determine whether the buildings, structures, or signs are appropriate and of good design in relation to other buildings, structures, or signs on the site and in the immediately affected surrounding area. Such determination shall be based upon the following findings, as well as any additional findings required pursuant to any applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations:

- 1) The development will be compatible with the neighborhood, and its size, bulk and scale will be appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.
- 2) Site layout, orientation, and location of structures, buildings, and signs are in an appropriate and well-designated relationship to one another, and to the environmental qualities, open spaces and topography of the property.
- 3) The project demonstrates a harmonious relationship with existing and proposed adjoining developments, avoiding excessive variety and monotonous repetition, but allowing similarity of style, if warranted.
- 4) There is harmony of material, color, and composition of all sides of a structure or buildings.
- 5) A limited number of materials will be on the exterior face of the building or structure.
- 6) There is consistency and unity of composition and treatment of exterior elevation.
- 7) Mechanical and electrical equipment is well integrated in the total design concept and screened from public view to the maximum extent practicable.
- 8) All visible onsite utility services are appropriate in size and location.
- 9) The grading will be appropriate to the site.
- 10) Adequate landscaping is provided in proportion to the project and the site with due regard to preservation of specimen and landmark trees, and existing native vegetation.
- 11) The selection of plant materials is appropriate to the project and its environment, and adequate provision will be made for the long-term maintenance of such plant materials.
- 12) The project will preserve and protect, to the maximum extent practicable, any mature, specimen or skyline tree, or appropriately mitigate the loss.
- 13) The development will not adversely affect significant public scenic views.
- 14) Signs, including their lighting, are well designed and are appropriate in size and location.
- 15) All exterior site, structure and building lighting is well designed and appropriate in size and location.
- 16) The proposed development is consistent with any additional design standards as expressly adopted by the City Council.
- 17) The development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.
- 18) The public health, safety and welfare will be protected.
- 19) The project architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access.
- 20) The project will provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 14 of 16

Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

Conceptual Review

Conceptual review is a required step that allows the applicant and the DRB to participate in an informal discussion about the proposed project. Applicants are encouraged to initiate this review as early in the design process as possible. This level of review is intended to provide the applicant with good direction early in the process to avoid spending unnecessary time and money by developing a design concept that may be inconsistent with the City's architectural guidelines and development standards. When a project is scheduled for conceptual review, the DRB may grant preliminary approval if the required information is provided, the design and details are acceptable and the project is properly noticed for such dual approval.

Information required for conceptual review includes:

- a. Photographs which show the site from 3 to 5 vantage points or a panorama from the site and of the site as seen from the street, and photographs of the surrounding neighborhood showing the relationship of the site to such adjacent properties. Aerial photographs are helpful if available and may be required at later stages.
- b. Site plan showing vicinity map, topography, location of existing and proposed structures and driveways, and locations of all structures adjacent to the proposed structure. The site plan should also indicate any proposed grading, an estimate of the amount of such grading, and any existing vegetation to be removed or retained.
- c. Site statistics including all proposed structures, square footage by use, and the number of covered and uncovered parking spaces.
- d. Schematics of the proposed project shall include rough floor plans and at least two elevations indicating the height of proposed structures. Perspectives sketches of the project are also encouraged. Proposed materials and colors shall be indicated. (Schematics and sketches may be rough as long as they are to scale and describe the proposed development accurately and sufficiently well to allow review and discussion.)

Preliminary Review

Preliminary review involves the substantive analysis of a project's compliance with all applicable City architectural guidelines and development standards. Fundamental design issues such as precise size of all built elements, site plan, elevations and landscaping are resolved at this stage of review. The DRB will identify to the applicant those aspects of the project that are not in compliance with applicable architectural guidelines and development standards and the findings that the DRB is required to make.

Preliminary approval of the project's design is the point in the process at which an appeal of DRB's decision can be made. Preliminary approval of the project's design is deemed a basis to proceed with working drawings, following the close of the appeal period and absent the filing of an appeal.

Information required for preliminary review, in addition to the information required for conceptual review, includes:

- a. Complete site plan showing all existing structures, proposed improvements, proposed grading, including cut and fill calculations, lot coverage statistics (i.e., building paving, usable open space and landscape areas), vicinity map, and topography.
- b. Floor plans and roof plans
- c. All elevations with heights, materials and colors specified.
- d. Preliminary landscape plan, when required, showing existing and proposed trees and shrubs, including any existing vegetation to be removed. This landscape plan shall also include all retaining and freestanding walls, fences, gates and gateposts and proposed paving and should specify proposed materials and colors of all these items.
- e. Site section for projects on slopes of 20 percent or greater, and when required by the DRB.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 15 of 16

Final Review

Final review confirms that the working drawings are in conformance with the project that received preliminary approval. In addition to reviewing site plan and elevations for conformance, building details and the landscape plan will be reviewed for acceptability.

Final review is conducted by the Planning and Environmental Services staff, in consultation with the DRB Chair or the Chair's designees. In the event that final plans are not in substantial conformance with the approved preliminary plans, the DRB Chair and Planning staff shall refer the matter to the full DRB for a final determination.

Information required for final review, in addition to the previous review requirements, includes:

- a. Complete set of construction drawings, which must include window, eave & rake, chimney, railing and other pertinent architectural details, including building sections with finished floor, plate, and ridge heights indicated.
- b. 8 1/2" X 11" materials sample board of materials and colors to be used, as well as an indication of the materials and colors on the drawings. Sheet metal colors (for vents, exposed chimneys, flashing, etc.) shall also be indicated. All this information should be included on the working drawings.
- c. Final site grading and drainage plan when required, including exact cut and fill calculations.
- d. Final landscape drawings, when required, showing the dripline of all trees and shrubs, and all wall, fence, and gate details. The drawing must show the size, name and location of plantings that will be visible from the street frontage, landscape screening which will integrate with the surrounding neighborhood, and irrigation for landscaping. Landscape drawings shall include a planting plan specifying layout of all plant materials, sizes, quantities and botanical and common names; and a final irrigation plan depicting layout and sizes of all equipment and components of a complete irrigation system (automated system required on commercial and multiple-residential developments). Planting and irrigation plans shall depict all site utilities, both above and below grade.

Revised Final

Revised final review occurs when a substantial revision (e.g., grading, orientation, materials, height) to a project is proposed after final DRB approval has been granted. Plans submitted shall include all information on drawings that reflect the proposed revisions. If the revisions are not clearly delineated, they cannot be construed as approved.

Multiple Levels of Approval at a Single Meeting

Planning staff may accept and process smaller projects for two or more levels of DRB review (e.g., conceptual and preliminary) at a single meeting provided all required information is submitted and the project is properly noticed and agendized for such multiple levels of approval.

Presentation of Projects (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.3)

All levels of review with the exception of the consent agenda require the presentation of the project by the applicant or the applicant's representative. Items on the regular agenda that do not have a representative will be continued to a later hearing or removed from the agenda. The applicant or representative will be responsible for rescheduling the project if the project is removed from the agenda.

Public Testimony (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.4)

Members of the public attending a DRB meeting are encouraged to present testimony on agenda items. At the appropriate time, the DRB Chair will ask for public testimony, and will recognize those persons desiring to speak. A copy of any written statements read by a member of the public shall be given to the DRB Secretary. All speakers should provide all pertinent facts within their knowledge, including the reasons for their position. Testimony should relate to the design issues of the project and the findings upon which the DRB must base its decision. An interested party who cannot appear at a hearing may write a letter to the DRB indicating their

Design Review Board Agenda

January 23, 2008

Page 16 of 16

support of or opposition to the project, including their reasoning and concerns. The letter will be included as a part of the public record.

Continuances, Postponements, and Absences (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.5)

A continuance is the carrying forward of an item to a future meeting. The applicant may request continuance of a project to a specified date if additional time is required to respond to comments or if they will be unable to attend the meeting. This is done either during the DRB meeting or by calling the DRB Secretary prior to the scheduled meeting so that the request may be discussed as part of the agenda status report at the beginning of the meeting.

Appeals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.8)

The preliminary approval or denial of a project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. A letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed, the appeal period is extended until 5:00 p.m. on the following business day. Planning and Environmental Services will notify the DRB as to the scheduled date of the appeal hearing. The DRB will designate a member to attend an appeal hearing.