



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, March 11, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR

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 – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
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

March 11, 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 February 26, 2008

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

C. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** General comments regarding topics over which the Design Review Board has discretion will be allowed. Comments from concerned parties regarding specific projects not on today's agenda will be limited to three minutes per person.

D. **REVIEW OF AGENDA:** A brief review of the agenda for requests for continuance.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

- None

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-234-DRB

6740 Cortona Drive (APN 073-150-024)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes an approximately 55,302-square foot industrial building on a 3.14-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The building is divided into two tenant spaces; tenant space A occupies 36,412-square feet, while tenant space B occupies 18,890-square feet.

The applicant proposes to install a new wall sign for tenant space B. The sign would read "LCOGT" and would contain a globe logo. The dimensions of the sign would be 60" wide by 26" high, with a sign area of approximately 11-square feet. The wall sign would have ¾ " deep pin-mounted aluminum lettering painted blue, red, yellow, and green with enamel paint. The 26" high globe logo will be painted grey. No lighting is proposed. The project was filed by Dave Jones of Lenvik & Minor Architects, on behalf of Arnon Blau, property owner. Related cases: 07-184-OSP. (Last heard on 2-26-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-26-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Design Review Board Agenda

March 11, 2008

Page 3 of 17

Comments:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended Preliminary Approval 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. 07-234-DRB, 6740 Cortona Drive, as submitted; and continue to March 11, 2008, for Final review on the Sign Calendar.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-008-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 wall sign. The sign would read "FLIR", with 18" tall letters and a double-diamond shaped logo 30" tall. The overall area of the sign is 18 square feet. The wall sign would be constructed of 0.063"-thick aluminum letters painted dark blue (PMS 287C). No lighting is proposed. The project was filed by Christian Muldoon of Vogue Sign Company, agent, on behalf of 55 Castilian LLC, property owner, and FLIR Systems, tenant. Related cases: 08-008-SCC. (Last heard on 2-26-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-26-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Comments:

1. The applicant shall add the words "if applicable" to the generic note on the plans regarding connecting to existing dedicated sign circuit.
2. The height of the letters should be reduced to 15 inches or possibly reduced more.
3. Member Smith commented that there may not be that much difference regarding reducing the height of the letters on a building of this size because either the 18-inch letters would bracket with the window above or the 15-inch letters would bracket with the doorway below.
4. The proposed design and colors are fine.
5. The Sign Subcommittee recommended Preliminary Approval with the condition that the height of the letters be reduced to 15 inches, and possibly reduced more.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-5, No. 08-008-DRB, 55 Castilian Drive, as submitted with the condition that the applicant shall study reducing the height of the letters from 18 inches to 15 inches, and possibly reducing the height more; and continue to March 11, 2008, for Final review on the Sign Calendar.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 11, 2008

Page 4 of 17

H-3 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 2-26-08*, 2-12-08*, 1-23-08*, 1-08-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

Staff recommendation to continue item to April 8, 2008

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-4 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-013-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

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 11, 2008

Page 5 of 17

(Industrial Research Park) zone district. The applicant proposes to install a monument sign at the front of the building. The dimensions of the monument structure would be 8' long by 4'-6" tall with an area of approximately 36-square feet. The sign attached to each side of the monument would be approximately 6'-2" long by 2'-11" tall, with an area of approximately 18-square feet. The non-illuminated signs would have pin-mounted bronze color letters for the building address, pin-mounted bronze colored suite numbers, and pin-mounted aluminum plates with bronze colored vinyl for the tenant names. The CMU monument structure will have 8" by 8" patterns cut into it, and paint to match the building. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 07-191-OSP, -DRB, -CUP, -DPAM. (Brian Hiefield)

H-5 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-024-DRB

7408-7412 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-064)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Hollister Business Park. The proposed OSP provides for two (2) different types of signs: wall signs and directional/informational signs. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 08-024-OSP; -CUP. (Shine Ling)

H-6 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-028-DRB

5730 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property consists of a commercial property for multiple retail tenants on an approximately 8,500-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district (Retail Commercial). The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan for the building. The proposed Overall Sign Plan (OSP) provides for wall signs for individual tenants and for the shopping center. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by David Lemmons of Central Coast Signs, agent, on behalf of Jerry Anderson, property owner. Related cases: 08-028-OSP. (Shine Ling)

I. FINAL CALENDAR

I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-006-DRB

5746 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-008)

This is a request for *Final* 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

Design Review Board Agenda

March 11, 2008

Page 6 of 17

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. (Last heard on 2-12-08) (Shine Ling & Jaime Valdez)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-12-08 Meeting:

Comments:

1. The existing screen door will distract from the appearance and should not be placed back on the building. Member Messner suggested exploring adding an opening on the door itself, possibly adding a screen in the window on the door.
2. The decorative light on the left side on the Hollister elevation does not seem necessary and does not add to the architecture. Member Messner has seen decorative lights with a low glow that have a nice effect but he would not recommend that the light illuminates the street.
3. The lights that project out to light the sign should reflect down. Two lights may be needed.
5. Member Brown stated that in her opinion the existing building is probably the original design and that the addition of the tile at the top of the building is unnecessary and is an artifice that does not add anything to the building. She commented that she appreciates that this is a nice, clean storefront in Old Town.
4. Member Smith appreciates the appearance of the cornice with the tile at the top stating that it is a decorative feature and that he has seen this type of element in buildings from that time period.
5. Member Schneider stated that if the tile is added at the top of the building it should be down flat so that the edge can be seen and not similar to the adjacent property which has the tile on an angle. S-tile should not be used if there is an edge.
6. Chair Branch stated that the tile on the roof should be different from the tile on the adjacent property such as a different height or with an edge.
7. Chair Branch suggested that the corner on the side should be flush.
8. Member Messner suggested that the applicant may want to consider adding tile that is diamond-shaped to replace the tile on the ground that will be removed to provide aesthetically more of a flow stating that there are boxy squares in front.
9. Overall, the design, colors and awning are fine.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item J-3, No. 08-006-DRB, 5746 Hollister Avenue, as submitted with the following conditions: 1) The light to the left on the front elevation (Hollister Avenue elevation) shall be removed; 2) the applicant shall provide cut sheets for the lights that will light the sign portion; 3) the applicant shall provide the resolution regarding the tile colors and materials to replace the tile that is to be removed at the sidewalk level; 4) the existing screen door shall not be re-installed; 5) the roof tile shall either be eliminated or flat as shown in the section so the edge

Design Review Board Agenda

March 11, 2008

Page 7 of 17

treatment can be seen; and 6) the location of the gooseneck lights shall be shown on elevation; and to continue to March 11, 2008, for Final review on the full DRB agenda.

J. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- None

K. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-103-DRB

26 Coromar Drive (APN 073-150-013)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 33,600-square foot manufacturing building, a 360-square foot compressor room, a 400-square foot storage garage, a 1,000-square foot hazardous materials building, and a 2,160-square foot covered storage area on a 155,580-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct additions on site in three phases. Phase I, a 1,000-square foot hazardous materials building, was previously constructed under case number 06-093-SCD & 06-093-LUP. Phase II consists of a new 8,800-square foot clean room addition to the main manufacturing building, two 400-square foot outbuildings, and the demolition of 1,760-square feet of the covered storage area. A landscape plan is also a part of this proposal, and all materials used for this phase are to match the existing commercial property. Phase III proposes a 10,400-square foot office addition to the existing manufacturing building. This phase also includes its own landscape plan, and all materials used for this phase are to match the existing commercial property. The project was filed by agent David L. Burke on behalf of Renco Encoders, property owner. Related cases: 06-093-SCD, 06-093-LUP, & 07-103-DP. (Continued from 1-08-08) (Laura Vlk)

Staff recommendation to take item off calendar

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-08-08 Meeting:

Comments:

1. The applicant is requested to landscape the overparked areas during Phase II to provide the benefits of landscaping until Phase III is completed in the future.
2. The applicant is requested to consider permeable paving, if possible, considering the hazardous materials concern. Member Wignot suggested that it might be useful for the applicant to discuss permeable pavement treatment options with Cathleen Garnand of the County Water Agency's Project Clean Water.
3. Chair Branch stated that conceptually the selection of materials is fine. Member Smith agreed with Chair Branch.
4. Member Schneider stated that the additions work well with the existing building architecturally; with the exception that he would prefer the shape of the shading canopies to be more rectangular and flat, which would match better

Design Review Board Agenda

March 11, 2008

Page 8 of 17

architecturally, rather than the pitched element, and suggested that the applicant may consider restudying. Chair Branch and Member Wignot said they prefer the pitch element but can understand Member Schneider's concern regarding matching with a flat element.

5. The applicant is requested to rename the "cooling tower" on the plans with language to indicate that it is a low architectural element rather than a tower form.
6. The applicant is requested to submit a final landscape plan and lighting plan at the next review. The DRB also requested that the applicant's landscape architect attend the next review as well.
7. The DRB expressed appreciation for the completeness of the application.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-1, No. 07-103-DRB, 26 Coromar Drive, to March 11, 2008, with comments.

K-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 & Minor Architects on behalf of Marc Winnikoff, property owner. Related cases: 65-V-025, 65-V-008, 74-DP-024. (Continued from 2-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-12-08 Meeting:

Comments:

1. The architectural design aspects of the project are fine, except for the colors.
2. The applicant needs to provide a better rendering showing the colors and materials.
3. Member Smith stated that unfortunately many of the buildings in the area appear drab and that a color such as yellow would be nice as a bright accent color and would create more visual interest with the yellow and the darker color.
4. Member Schneider stated that because of the material, the shadow will tone down the yellow color, and that his preference would be yellow rather than gray.
5. Member Brown commented that a combination of red and yellow would be a very fresh appearance.
6. Member Messner commented that if yellow is used, the side with the flat surface would be more reflective and that the other side would not reflect back so it would not have a bright appearance.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 11, 2008

Page 9 of 17

7. Chair Branch said that the yellow seems appropriate considering the context of the building and the area where it is located.
8. The element should return on the west elevation.
9. The applicant is requested to resolve the concern regarding the existing parapet in the back on the site plan.
10. The light fixtures and the floodlight shown in the photographs shall be removed.
11. Member Messner requested that some type of landscaping, approximately three trees, or greenery, be added to help soften, blend and balance the site. He suggested that the trees would not need to be the same height or species.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to continue Item J-2, No. 07-206-DRB, 163 Aero Camino, to March 11, 2008, with comments.

K-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-023-DRB

7408-7412 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-064)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. On the eastern parcel of the HBP the applicant proposes to augment the landscape and lighting plans, to construct a new park/seating area on a grassy area at the northeast corner of the eucalyptus barranca, to construct a new access ramp and door on the western elevation of Building 5, to convert the water treatment building into a fitness activity center, to construct a new basketball court next to the fitness activity center, and to convert existing water storage tanks into thermal storage tanks. No changes in building height, building coverage, or floor area are proposed. The materials for the revisions to the exterior elevations of Building 5 and the fitness activity center would match existing materials. The project was filed by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 08-023-SCD; -08-023-LUP. (Continued from 2-26-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-26-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) expressed concern that the *vinca* species are very invasive and requested that all invasive plants be eliminated; b) requested consideration that more native plantings be incorporated; and c) recommended that the project landscape architect research what plantings would be required if there is a concern that the Eucalyptus barranca area is an area for butterflies, after a determination is made by staff.
2. Member Messner commented: a) the *vinca* species which are invasive would not be appropriate; b) the *asparagus myerii* species, and possibly the *asparagus sprengeri*, are of concern as being invasive and do not seem appropriate; c) the *westringia* species have different heights which should be kept in mind when calling out the appropriate size; d) expressed concern that the *California Pepper* trees will generate a lot of droppings and attract bees which would be

Design Review Board Agenda

March 11, 2008

Page 10 of 17

undesirable, particularly located near people; and e) suggested considering the *variegated Cream de Mint Pittosporum* species, which would provide a variegated tone so there would not be a wall mass of green, rather than the *Wheeler's Dwarf Pittosporum* species.

3. Member Schneider commented: a) overall the project is very good; b) the use of lighting bollards would be appropriate in the corner area to provide lighting for access and security, particularly since the building operates twenty-four hours per day; and c) there is an opportunity to possibly add some color into the architectural elements for the proposed fitness activity center area that is somewhat different from the rest of the buildings.
4. Vice Chair Wignot stated that the project is moving in a good direction.
5. Chair Branch commented: a) the project and the overall improvement are very good; b) the addition of many trees is appreciated; c) the lighting which is his main concern seems to be moving in a good direction; and d) recommended that the net on the basketball hoop be made of cotton or nylon and not chain; and the backboard preferably be made of plexiglass.
6. The applicant is requested to provide plans and architectural details regarding the existing water storage tanks and the fitness activity center, including colors, and to show the existing canopy, which is shown in the photographs, on the plans..
7. The applicant is requested to provide the lighting plan showing fully shielded fixtures and to include lighting fixtures and bollards.
8. The applicant is requested to revise the landscape plan in response to comments.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-3, No. 08-023-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, to March 11, 2008, and request that the applicant address all of the comments.

K-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-026-DRB

7859 Rio Vista Drive (APN 079-600-034)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,180-square foot residence and an attached 462-square foot two-car garage (with a permitted partial garage conversion of 168 square feet) on a 6,534-square foot lot in the DR-4 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 623 square feet in additions (114 square feet on the first-floor and 509 square feet on a new second-floor). The resulting two-story structure would be 2,265 square feet, consisting of a 1,803-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 462-square foot two-car garage (with a permitted partial garage conversion of 168 square feet). This proposal is consistent with the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by Tony Xiques of Dexign Systems, agent, on behalf of Robert Andre, property owner. Related cases: 08-026-LUP. (Shine Ling)

L. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-180-DRB

5737 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-033-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property consists of an existing single family dwelling and detached garage on a 6,227-square foot lot in the R-2 zone

Design Review Board Agenda

March 11, 2008

Page 11 of 17

district. The existing single family home and garage will be demolished, to be followed by the construction of a two-story duplex. The proposed project is a one-lot subdivision of a 0.14-acre lot for condominium purposes to create a duplex structure, consisting of two (2) attached residential airspace units. Unit #1 (front unit) will be 3 bedrooms, 2.75 baths and would total 1,999 square feet, while Unit #2 (rear unit) will be 3 bedrooms, 2.5 baths and would total 1,735 square feet. The proposed building coverage on site will be 2,077 square feet or 33% of the 6,227 square foot lot. Landscaping will consist of 2,495 square feet or 40% of the existing lot; paved areas consist of 1,665 square feet or 27% of the existing lot. The proposed Floor-to-Area ratio (FAR), including garage areas, is 0.60. The maximum height of the structure is 25'-7". Discretionary approval for a Modification to required front and rear yard setbacks is also requested. The project was filed by Troy White of Dudek Engineering and Environmental, agent, for Eva and Silvino Guerrero, property owners. Related cases: 07-180-TPM; -M; -LUP. (Shine Ling)

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-229-DRB

10 South Kellogg Avenue (APN 071-090-082)

TIME CERTAIN START: 3:15

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 4,400-square foot, two-story warehouse/office, an 875-square foot garage, and a 1,750-square foot carport for a total of floor area of 7,025-square feet on an 89,628-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes the demolition of all existing structures and grading involving approximately 610-cubic yards of cut and 1,950-cubic yards of fill to prep the site for the construction of a 3-story self-storage facility comprised of 3 separate, 3-story buildings with both drive-up and interior storage units. The project also includes an office/sales space and an onsite manager's apartment.

Building A would be 36,055 square feet with 1,025 square feet devoted to office/sales use and include a 2-story manager's apartment of 1,428 square feet. Building B would be 37,890 square feet, all of which would be devoted to storage. Building C would be 37,785 square feet, all of which would be devoted to storage space. A total of 48 parking spaces would be provided and the property's perimeter would be fenced and gated.

The project also includes upgraded water service from the Goleta Water District, connection to the Goleta Sanitary District sewer system, electrical upgrades, grading and installation of drainage structures on the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way to improve drainage from Highway 101 and the railroad in the vicinity of the project site.

Landscaping for the project will include landscape improvements in the parking areas and around the perimeter of the property, as well as in the area adjacent to San Jose Creek. No native or specimen trees will be removed for project construction.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 11, 2008

Page 12 of 17

New materials consist of metal building panels and related trim pieces with "signature 200" siliconized polyester finishes. New colors/other materials consist of the following:

- Primary wall color: Light stone
 - Window and door trim: Colony green
- Primary Accent wall color: Desert Sand
 - Window and door trim: Colony green
- Secondary accent wall color: Colony green
 - Wall coping: To match wall color
- Window and door awnings: Colony green
- Windows and doors: Dark ionized aluminum
- Roll up doors: Desert sand
- Gutters: Colony green
- Down spouts: To match wall color
- Trash Enclosures: CMU block walls with low sloping roofs to match the storage buildings.

The project was filed by agent Gregory C. Rech of Architects West on behalf of Schwan Brothers, South Kellogg Properties (Tom Schwan), property owner. Related cases: 07-229-GPAM, 07-229-DP, 07-229-CUP. (Last heard on 2-26-08) (Laura Vlk)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-26-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 07-229-DRB, 10 South Kellogg Avenue, to March 11, 2008, to be the first item on the agenda.

M. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- None

N. DISCUSSION ITEMS

N-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

N-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

N-3. PROJECT APPROVAL v. BUILT SLIDESHOW

Staff recommendation to continue item to March 25, 2008

O. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

March 11, 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

March 11, 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

March 11, 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

March 11, 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

March 11, 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.