



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, February 12, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 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
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 Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 2 of 17

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for January 23, 2008

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

B-4. REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY STORE FRONT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PRESENTATION **(TAKEN OFF CALENDAR)**

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. 08-018-DRB RV

6056 Berkeley Road (APN 077-510-040 & 077-500-056)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a 112-unit Planned Unit Development in the DR-4.6 zone district. The applicant proposes to revise their lighting plan on the HOA owned grounds of the subdivision. The project was filed by Robert Young on behalf of The Meadows HOA, property owner. (Brian Hiefield)

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-019-DRB RV03

420 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-130-061)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The project site is located within the Fairview Corporate Center (FCC), which includes 17.31 acres gross (16.67 acres net) addressed as 420, 430, and 490 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-130-057, 071-130-061 & 071-130-062). Two existing buildings are located on site. 430 South Fairview Avenue is a 60,797-square foot structure and 500 South Fairview Avenue is a 108,000-square foot structure (the 11,000 square foot loading dock is to be demolished). A third 73,203-square foot 30-foot tall 2-story shell building located at 420 South Fairview Avenue is under construction. The project site will have associated parking, landscaping, hardscape, and accessory structures such as refuse and recycling areas.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 3 of 17

The applicant proposes to revise the approved elevations, site plan and landscape plan for 420 South Fairview Avenue as follows:

- East Elevation Changes:
 - Remove the standing seam metal hip roof and replace with flat roof; and
 - Remove the steel trellis and replace it with an awning;
- Site Plan Changes:
 - Remove requirement for enhanced color entry paving at building sidewalks;
 - Remove two stairs from sidewalk through landscape area on the west side;
 - Remove enhanced color stamped driveway pattern between the eastern side of 420 South Fairview Avenue and 430 South Fairview Avenue;
 - Replace onsite pavers along the front entrance with concrete; and
 - Remove landscape detail showing black Mexican beach pebble inlay warning strip for exterior stairs. Replace with tooled warning strips that match warning strips at 430 South Fairview Avenue.
- Landscape Plan Changes:
 - Plant 10 additional 5-gallon *Pittosporum Nana* in place of stairs on the west side.

The project was filed by Craig Minus of the Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 98-DP-024, 99-OA-024, 02-083-LLA, 02-088-OSP, 02-088-DP AM01, 03-166-PM (TPM 32,016), 02-088-DP AM02, 04-070-LUP, 04-110-LUP, 05-078-SCD, 05-075-MC, 06-122-DRB, 06-122-SCD, 06-122-LUP, 07-123-DRB RV01, 07-123-LUP RV01, 07-148-DRB RV02, 07-148-LUP RV02 & 08-019-LUP RV03. (Scott Kolwitz)

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-172-DRB

6860 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-015)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* 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 install two new wall signs for tenant space B at the front and rear (locations B1 & B2 on the site plan) of the building. The dimensions of the two identical signs would be 6'-1/8" long by 2'-6" tall, with an area of approximately 15-square feet. The non-illuminated signs would have 1" deep pin-

Design Review Board Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 4 of 17

mounted aluminum lettering painted grey. The 2'-6" high vinyl GE logo will be painted white. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 07-191-OSP, 07-191-DRB, 07-191-CUP, & 07-191-DPAM. (Brian Hiefield)

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

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

(Applicant requests continuance to February 28, 2008)

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 1-23-08*, 1-08-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-08-08 Meeting:

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.
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.

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-241-DRB

6860 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-015)

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 5 of 17

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* 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 install two new wall signs for tenant space A at the front and rear (locations A1 & A2 on the site plan) of the building. The dimensions of the two identical signs would be 5'-6" long by 2'-6" tall, with an area of approximately 14-square feet. The non-illuminated signs would have 1/2" thick pin-mounted acrylic lettering painted black. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 07-191-OSP, 07-191-DRB, 07-191-CUP, & 07-191-DPAM. (Brian Hiefield)

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)

(Applicant requests continuance to February 28, 2008)

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

Design Review Board Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 6 of 17

Victor Alvarez on behalf of Juan & Lola Zaragoza, property owners. Related cases: 05-095-LUP. (Continued from 1-23-08*, 1-08-08, 10-16-07*, 09-05-07*, 08-21-07, 12-18-05*) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-08-08 Meeting:

Comments:

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.

J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-206-DRB

163 Aero Camino (APN 073-070-004)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 16,450-square foot industrial/office building on a 43,560-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to install a liquid nitrogen distribution tank screened with pultruded I-bar cladding. The proposal includes a remodel of the exterior façade including new plaster screen walls, a new entry feature, and framing and plastering over existing vertical supports. The proposal includes replacing the existing onsite sidewalk in front of the building with pavers, and drought resistant planters. New parking striping and curbing are also proposed to improve circulation and access to parking. No additional floor area is proposed with this submittal. The project was filed by agent David Jones with Lenvik &

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 7 of 17

Minor Architects on behalf of Marc Winnikoff, property owner. Related cases: 65-V-025, 65-V-008, 74-DP-024. (Brian Hiefield)

J-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-006-DRB

5746 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-008)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 700-square foot retail commercial building on a 2,000-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to remodel the front façade and construct a new wall sign. New materials for the façade include a tile roof parapet, a new forest-green cloth awning, dual glazed windows with red ceramic tile accents, a glass front door with dark brown wood trim, and smooth trowel plaster (La Habra Eggshell 73/Base 100 stucco). The new awning would project 4' from the face of the building. The wall sign would be constructed of 1"-thick injection-molded plastic letters in Times Roman face. The sign would read "DEL VALLE GRILL" on the top line, with 8"-tall red letters, and "MEXICAN RESTAURANT" on the bottom line, with 4"-tall black letters. The overall area of the sign is 10 square feet. The sign would be lit by a gooseneck wall-mounted light fixture (Teka DWM5160). The project was filed by Jorge Escamilla of sTitch Studio, agent, on behalf of Solita Velazquez, property owner, and Ruben Del Valle, tenant. Related cases: 08-006-LUP; 08-007-SCC. (Shine Ling & Jaime Valdez)

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.

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

Design Review Board Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 8 of 17

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 01-23-08, 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

01-23-07 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Comments:

1. Member Schneider stated he understands the project's constraints but still has a combination of concerns regarding the massing of the three-story building and the architectural detailing. He would like to see some of the massing solution for the hospital related in the MOB. He does not believe that the addition of the stone work and the metal canopies are done in a way that works well. He expressed his concern that the plans presented for the three-story massing at the intersection of Hollister/Patterson are not yet successful. He stated that the previous design was moving in a more successful direction with the blurring of the distinction between floor lines to help break up the elevation and soften the three-story aspect. He questioned whether story poles might be useful at this time.
2. Member Smith stated that he agrees with Members Schneider's comments and that he understands the need for three-story mass for the MOB to be effective. He expressed concern that there is a very prominent horizontal element on the three-story mass and suggested addressing this concern with a little more articulation of the detailing. For example, the hospital renderings show vertical details or segments that break up the horizontal element. He commented that the hospital has a jazzy exterior, musically, and he would like to see the MOB building play with the band. He liked that the MOB was pulled back from the corner to provide view to the hospital.
3. Member Wignot expressed concern that the southeast three-story elevation seems very boxy when driving from the hospital back to the Hollister/Patterson intersection. He requested that the applicant consider ways to break down the elevation such as different textures or treatments architecturally, if the building cannot be extended south to provide for a two-story element. He believes the efforts were good by the design team to soften and step back the three-story massing on the northeast corner. He suggested a possible condition of approval that would preserve the orchard for screening purposes because of his concern there may be the possibility of building on the site in the future.
4. Member Messer appreciates the stone work and how the same type of stone ties together with the stack style on the pillars and the split face style on the hospital.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 9 of 17

He suggested the applicant explore possibly moving the corner element out into the parking area consider removing two rows of trees to compensate for the parking. (Stephen Wen, project architect, stated that there are property line and building constraints regarding Member Messner's suggestion.)

5. Member Herrera appreciates the overall design. He expressed one concern that the north elevation needs to be improved architecturally because of the boxy appearance seen from Hollister Avenue and Patterson Avenue. For example, mix matching of material and pattern.
6. Chair Branch agreed with the DRB members' comments regarding the need for articulation. He appreciates that the applicant has started to address the stepping issues. He suggested that as more of the one-story element is added to max out the footprint, more mass can be reduced from the three-story element. He stated that the design elements and goals need to be more defined and clarified. He expressed disappointment that the sequencing of the project is forcing the acceptance of the size, bulk and scale of the project that is way out of proportion and a three-story building
7. Member Schneider expressed concern that the back elevation is basically a three-story solid mass, with repetitive openings, that needs to be broken up somehow, for example, such as with push and pull, detailing, opening forms, or other methods. He requested the applicant study the west elevation regarding the canopy element which does not appear to be successful architecturally. He suggested the applicant consider wrapping the upper canopy form around the corner on the south elevation.
8. The applicant is requested to restudy the following items:
 - a. shifting the Medical Office Building north towards Hollister Avenue with the one-story element only for the purpose of reducing the third story;
 - b. adding more articulation on the northwest and southeast corners of the third floor, such as providing for more stepping in and stepping out;
 - c. mix matching the materials, patterns and color in the vertical element materials to lessen the horizontal line and break up the element more.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown) to continue Item K-1, No. 07-171-DRB, 351 South Patterson, with comments to February 12, 2008.

Chair Branch appointed Member Schneider, Member Smith and Chair Branch to serve on an Ad Hoc Committee to meet with the applicant to help facilitate the process with regard to the plans prior to the next DRB hearing. Chair Branch requested that the applicant and staff coordinate scheduling the meeting.

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

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

(Applicant requests continuance to April 8, 2008)

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

Design Review Board Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 10 of 17

square foot loggia and 1,107 square foot play area would be available for non-habitable exterior use. The second floor would include a 1,431-square foot dining room, 537-square foot lecture room, 303-square foot office, 270-square foot storage area, 393-square foot of circulation, and a 858-square foot residence. The third floor would include the final 468-square foot residence with 456-square foot of additional mechanical areas above.

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

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

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

The property is zoned C-H (Highway Commercial), and the land use designation in the City's General Plan is Office & Institutional. The project was filed by the Islamic Society of Santa Barbara as the applicant and property owner with Md Wahiduzzaman, Mukhtar Khan and Ken Mineau as owner representatives. Related cases: 03-051-CUP, 03-051-DP. (Continued from 01-23-08*, 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

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

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 11 of 17

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.
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

- None

M. DISCUSSION ITEMS

M-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

M-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 12 of 17

O. ADJOURNMENT

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 12, 2008

Page 13 of 17

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

February 12, 2008

Page 14 of 17

- 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

February 12, 2008

Page 15 of 17

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

February 12, 2008

Page 16 of 17

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

February 12, 2008

Page 17 of 17

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.