



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, May 13, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

**GOLETA CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

Members:

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair	Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)
Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair	Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Scott Branch (Architect)	Carl Schneider (Architect)
Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)	

Notices:

- Requests for review of project plans or change of scheduling should be made to the City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, 93117; Telephone (805) 961-7500.
 - In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City of Goleta at (805) 961-7500. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City staff to make reasonable arrangements.
 - Preliminary approval or denial of a project by the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Goleta Planning Commission within ten (10) calendar days following the action. Please contact the Planning and Environmental Services Department for more information.
 - Design Review Board approvals do not constitute Land Use Clearances.
 - The square footage figures on this agenda are subject to change during the review process.
 - The length of Agenda items is only an estimate. Applicants are responsible for being available when their item is to be heard. Any item for which the applicant is not immediately available may be continued to the next meeting.
-

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 2 of 19

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for April 22, 2008

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

B-4. BUILDING OFFICIAL DISCUSSION – TIME CERTAIN: 3:20-3:45

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. 08-043-DRB

Cambridge Drive Community Church; 550 Cambridge Drive (APN 069-560-030)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes an existing 2,640-square foot church sanctuary, an existing 1,450-square foot classroom building, and an existing 2,200-square foot office/classroom building on a 2.4-acre lot in the DR-3.3 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 449-square foot office addition to the education/classroom building. The resulting one-story structure would be 1,899 square feet. A 345-square foot as-built storage shed near the education/classroom building is also part of the scope of the project. No changes to the other buildings are proposed. All materials used for this project are to match the existing building. The project was filed by Donald Sharpe, architect, on behalf of Cambridge Drive Community Church, property owner. Related cases: 08-043-SCD; 08-043-LUP. (Continued from 4-22-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-22-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. The applicant is requested to show the plans for the porch cover element that connects to the existing building.
2. The proposed lighting should be fine because it is underneath the porch but the applicant needs to submit lighting plans for review.
3. Member Schneider commented that while the bat and board material adds some character, the style is foreign to the other elements on the site.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 3 of 19

4. Member Wignot commented that the office doorway on the southeast elevation would benefit from the larger overhang on the eastern side of the building.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-043-DRB, Cambridge Drive Community Church, 550 Cambridge Drive, as submitted, and continue to May 13, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall provide light fixture cut sheets; 2) the applicant shall provide color boards; and 3) the applicant is requested to show the plans for the porch cover element that connects to the existing building.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-013-DRB

6860 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-015)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes three buildings totaling approximately 31,800 square feet of industrial building, warehouse, and chemical storage space on a 4.4-acre parcel in the M-RP (Industrial Research Park) zone district. 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. (Last heard on 4-08-08*, 3-25-08, 3-11-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-25-08 Meeting:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended that Item H-1, No. 08-013-DRB, be continued to April 8, 2008, because the applicant did not incorporate the notes and conditions of Preliminary Approval into the plans, which need to be shown.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-1, No. 08-013-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, to April 8, 2008, for Final review, with the following conditions from Preliminary Approval to be incorporated into the plans: 1) the lamp should be mounted so there is no light spillage above or beyond the sides of the monument sign; and 2) the applicant shall add appropriate groundcover area to soften the sign.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-024-DRB

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

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 4 of 19

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. (Last heard on 4-08-08, 3-25-08, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-08-08 Meeting:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended the following changes to the draft Overall Sign Plan:
 - a. The following language shall be added to Section II. Signage Allowances - A. Monument Signs on Page 2, and Section III. Sign Specifications Item #7, and shall be shown on the plans: "The light source shall be shielded so there is no light trespass beyond the sign."
 - b. The plans need to show that the face of the proposed Informational Signs is 30-square feet, not the cabinet. The applicant shall provide a diagram for clarity.
 - c. The language shall be changed from "28-square foot wall sign" to "35-square foot wall sign" in Section II. Signage Allowances - C. Wall Signs, for clarity.
 - d. "Item 1) e) The eastern elevation of the Activity Center" shall be removed from Section II. Signage Allowances - C Wall Signs because this wall sign was deleted from the plans at the last hearing.
 - e. The following language shall be added to B. Informational Signs (Directory Signs) Items B. 1) and B. 2) for clarity: "The sign shall be internally illuminated with opaque backgrounds with push-through copy."
 - f. Item C) 4) shall be deleted from Section II. Signage Allowances - C Wall Signs because it is a duplicate of Item C) 5).
 - g. The language "creative, exciting, imaginative" shall be removed from the first sentence in Section III. Sign Specifications, #1, because it is subjective.
 - h. Staff shall add language in Section III. Sign Specifications #8 that requires all signs to be made from durable, quality materials.
 - i. The language regarding temporary signs in IV. Prohibited Signs #8 needs to be very clear. Staff shall note that portable signs are prohibited and also add language that addresses temporary signs related to construction as well as temporary signs for occupied tenants until permanent signs are permitted, for clarity
 - j. Staff shall add punctuation, such as a colon, after the headings for the items in IV. Prohibited Signs.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item H-3, No. 08-024-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, with comments to May 13, 2008, for Preliminary review.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 5 of 19

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-028-DRB

5730 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-006)

This is a request for *Preliminary* 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. (Last heard on 4-22-08, 4-08-08*, 3-25-08*, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-22-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. The maximum length of the anchor tenant sign shall be thirty-five (35) percent of the frontage of the building.
2. Staff is requested to consider adding 'human' portable signs along with other items that are not permitted in item IV Prohibited Signs. Member Brown expressed concern that it is distracting when humans use portable signs for advertising purposes.
3. The word "decorative" shall be removed from item IV.7 Light bulb strings and exposed tubing.
4. The language "not to exceed thirty (30) days" shall be added to item IV.7 Light bulb strings and exposed tubing with regard to temporary holiday lighting.
5. The word "seasonal" shall be added between the words "for" and "promotional" in item IV. Prohibited Signs, #8 Temporary signage and advertising devices.
6. The word "logos" (which are not allowed for tenants) shall be removed from item VI.1 Procedures for Signage Review and Approval.
7. The Anderson Building Overall Sign Plan shall be renamed to the La Placita de Goleta Overall Sign Plan.
8. The temporary banner sign shall be placed in a fixed location on the east elevation directly below the logo, with small eye bolts permanently mounted, which shall be explained on the plans as to the relationship.
9. The font needs to be bolded on the "LA PLACITA" words on the Directional/Information signs. The Directional/Informational Sign concept is appreciated.
10. The concept of grand opening signs will not be considered at this time, per the applicant's suggestion.
11. This is a nice building and the applicant's efforts are appreciated.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-2, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, with comments, to May 13, 2008, for Preliminary review.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 6 of 19

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

5737 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-033-005)

This is a request for *Preliminary* 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 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. (Last heard on 4-08-08, 03-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Staff request to be taken off calendar

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-08-08 Meeting:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) overall, the project is fine and he could support the minor setback modifications requested; b) he understands the parking problems in the neighborhood and would be in favor of not having doors on the garages to prevent the possibility using the garage for living space; c) recommended that the small gable form on Page A.2.1, on the east elevation for Unit #1, be removed for simplification, stating that it would not be of use or be seen from the street; d) recommended that the alignment be reworked on the floor line as the two-story form goes up where the one-story roof runs in, on the south elevation; e) suggested the applicant consider whether window looking down into the foyer area is appropriate as shown on the floor plan for Unit #2 in the second bedroom.
2. Member Smith commented: a) agreed with the architectural comments made by Member Schneider; b) did not support removing the doors on the garages making them carports because of security concerns; c) supported language that would restrict a garage conversion; d) appreciates the reduction of square footage; e) expressed concern that the parking for Unit #1 would demolish the 'Tom Thumb' *Pittosporum* species to be planted along that side of the property;

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 7 of 19

- and f) the site is difficult and he is surprised that the vehicle turn movements were possible.
3. Member Brown commented: a) the type of material used for the pavers needs to ensure permeability (for example porous concrete) and requested that the description of proposed materials be provided by the applicant; b) the architecture is fine; c) the reduction in the size of the development is appreciated and helpful for the development; d) privacy issues with regard to windows overlooking neighbors to the east, west or south have not been fully discussed; e) suggested that a deed restriction with regard to garage conversions or removing the doors of the garages making them carports might ameliorate neighbors' concerns regarding parking; and f) expressed concern that there is so much development on the site, even though it is allowed, which adds more density to an area that is already dense.
 4. Vice Chair Wignot commented: a) the changes made to address DRB comments are appreciated; b) the orientation of the bedrooms and bathrooms between the two units is troublesome; possibly consider extensive soundproofing; c) the orientation of the windows needs to be reviewed with regard to whether there is a view from windows onto adjacent properties; and d) expressed concern regarding the short timeframe to review plans submitted today.
 5. Chair Branch commented: a) the reduction in scale makes the project better and more in scale with other developments in the neighborhood; and b) the notice to property owner type of documentation would be useful with regard to restricting the use of garages for living space.
 6. Member Herrera commented: a) the changes including the size reduction are appreciated; b) recommended the use of permeable pavers as much as possible on the site; and c) recommended that the grading in the back of the property be scaled back to appear uniform throughout the area.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded Smith by and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item M-2, No. 07-180-DRB, 5737 Armitos Avenue, to May 13, 2008, for Preliminary review, with the following comments regarding architecture: a) remove the small gable form on Page A.2.1 on the east elevation for Unit #1; b) re-work the alignment on the floor line as the two-story form goes up where the one-story roof runs in, on the south elevation; c) consider whether the window looking down into the foyer area is appropriate, which is shown on the floor plan for the second bedroom in Unit #2; d) the orientation of the windows needs to be considered with regard to neighbors' privacy; and e) suggested consideration of the orientation of the bedrooms and bathrooms between the two units; and with the following comments to the Zoning Administrator: a) the DRB supports the modification request; and b) the DRB requests that staff consider a Notice of Land Use Restrictions and Conditions documentation at the appropriate time.

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. 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

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 8 of 19

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 4-22-08*, 4-8-08*, 3-11-08*, 2-26-08*, 2-12-08*, 1-23-08*, 1-08-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

Applicant request to be taken off calendar

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.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-222-DRB

1 South Los Carneros Road (APN 073-330-023)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 100,000-square foot commercial property on a 10.31-acre lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a wireless communications facility on the roof of the building. The facility would consist of two roof-top mounted antenna arrays and associated equipment located within the existing rooftop equipment screenwalls. Part of the screenwall would be replaced with RF-transparent fiberglass with a finish to match the existing screenwall. No changes to building height, floor area, elevations, or parking are proposed. The project was filed by Gordon Bell of Strategic Real Estate Services, Inc., agent, on behalf of I. V. Investments, property owner. Related cases: 07-222-LUP. (Shine Ling)

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-230-DRB

7154 Tuolumne Drive (APN 077-104-019)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,254-square foot residence with an attached 441-square foot 2-car garage on a 7,245-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 787-square feet in additions, consisting of a 664-square foot second-floor addition, and a 123-square foot interior stairwell leading up to the second-floor addition. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,482 square feet, consisting of a 2,041-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 441-square foot 2-car garage. This proposal is within the maximum floor area guidelines for this property, which is 2,241 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence; however the existing aluminum sliding windows will be replaced with vinyl. The project was filed by agent Fernando Vega on behalf of Maria Teresa and Jose Castillo, property owners. Related cases: 03-093-DRB, -LUP; 07-230-LUP. (Last heard on 04-08-08, 2-26-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-08-08 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) a solar study would be helpful to understand the orientation of the sun and the effect of the second-story addition on sunlight with regard to the neighbor to the east; b) a site plan showing the adjacent houses is needed for review; and c) the changes made by the applicant are appreciated.
2. Member Smith said he believes the only logical place for a second-story addition with regard to this type of house would be in the corner as proposed. He appreciates that the applicant reduced the floor plan mass in the back which addressed his concern regarding the massive appearance of the second story elevation. He suggested that the applicant may wish to refer to the City of Santa Barbara's method for determining solar access on a property which is fairly straight forward.
3. Chair Branch commented: a) a site plan showing the relationship of the project to adjacent projects would be helpful especially when reviewing a second-story addition; b) the changes made by the applicant are appreciated; c) overall, the plans are beginning to take shape; d) rectangular windows would seem to fit better in the stair tower rather than the proposed arched windows; e) it appears that the afternoon sun would get blocked with regard to the neighbor's property; and f) suggested the applicant consider a hip roof in the rear, from a solar access point of view, noting that a hip was introduced over the stair tower.
4. Vice Chair Wignot commented: a) he appreciates that the applicant scaled back the mass of the building; b) the project architect has tried to accommodate DRB Finding #19 that the project will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access; c) the applicant is requested to provide a solar study with respect to the property to the east; d) it seems like the shading aspect may not be a problem in the morning and noontime but may occur more later in the day, possibly over the house rather than the backyard, although more information is needed; and e) he is mindful that the property owner, who had a previous project that was approved by the DRB and the permit

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 10 of 19

expired, has accommodated the DRB request to scale back the massing of the building.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item L-1, No. 07-230-DRB, 7154 Tuolumne Drive, to May 13, 2008, with the following comments: 1) the applicant shall provide site plans showing the relationship of the project to adjacent properties; and 2) the applicant shall provide a solar study to better understand how the second-story affects the property to the east with respect to shading as the sun moves to the west in the afternoon.

L-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 Ddesign Systems, agent, on behalf of Robert Andre, property owner. Related cases: 08-026-LUP. (Last heard on 4-22-08*, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Applicant request to be continued to May 28, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-11-08 Meeting:

1. Vice Chair Wignot stated that he cannot support the addition where it is proposed: He commented: a) the proposed addition in front would be too much mass located too close to the street and it is unappealing visually from the street; b) the design does not fit with the configuration of the existing house; c) the views from the second story may not necessarily impact the adjacent neighbors because the view would be onto their roofs and not their backyard; d) a second-story addition set further back on the property may work because the property is elevated immediately in the back; e) he drove around the entire San Miguel tract today and observed approximately six or eight two-story homes located intermittently within the tract; and f) most of the better designed two-story residences in the neighborhood are set back from the street.
2. Member Brown commented that the addition needs to be better integrated with the house and expressed concern that the proposed design appears to be a box on top of the garage.
3. Member Smith stated that the two-story addition needs to be pushed back from the garage, brought off the street, and possibly centered above near the living room and garage mass.
4. Member Schneider agreed with the previous comments from DRB members.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 11 of 19

5. Chair Branch agreed with the previous comments from DRB members. He noted that the hill to the back of the property would be advantageous with regard to pushing back the second-story addition. Window issues can be addressed regarding privacy concerns.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-4, No. 08-026-DRB, 7859 Rio Vista Drive, with comments, to April 22, 2008.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-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.

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 2-12-08, 01-23-08, 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

Applicant request to be continued to May 28, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 12 of 19

2-12-08 Meeting:

1. The DRB members expressed appreciation that the applicant worked with the ad hoc subcommittee and that the height of the building was reduced from three stories to two stories.
2. Member Brown expressed concern regarding the MOB being so close to the corner. She also expressed concern that the MOB looks just like any office building with no distinguishing features, stating that it needs character.
3. Member Smith expressed appreciation that architectural elements were incorporated into the MOB design that fit with the hospital. He stated that he is comfortable with the massing and scale of the MOB.
4. Member Schneider noted that the canopy entry is located very close to the corner. He would prefer that the corner has more landscaping to soften the building. He suggested studying the potential for relocating the entry which would start to break down the building and also help the building design to appear not as symmetrical.
5. Member Schneider appreciates the changes on the west elevation where the stair tower has been rotated and with the canopy which helps soften the building when driving east along Hollister Avenue. He also appreciates that the central portion being recessed in and the landscaping that helps soften the building to Hollister.
6. Member Schneider commented that the horizontal fins on the glass curtain wall on the north elevation are not needed because their purpose is to act as a sun shade device, which works well on the east, south and west elevations.
7. Member Schneider commented that the stair tower on the east elevation is not successful with the glass panel in the Santa Barbara stone which appears to be a foreign material. There is a similar situation on the west elevation.
8. Member Schneider commented that the use of stone on the low wainscot bases does not work and that the stone is more successful as a whole form on the south elevation. He also commented that it appears that the horizontal pattern is missing one element at the top on the south elevation which seems odd if the pattern is to be similar to the hospital pattern.
9. Member Schneider stated that there needs to be consideration regarding the architectural design of the entry so that people can better view how they would enter the building from the parking lot. He said that the location of the entry appears to be in the right place from a site plan standpoint. He also commented that the entry form on the west elevation is not working architecturally and does not resolve itself at the end very well, and that there would be heat gain in the lobby from the west-facing glass. He commented that the building still needs architectural detailing and subtle pushing and pulling to be successful.
10. Member Schneider recommended that the limitations regarding the potential for development on the hospital parcel of the campus development plan be documented for future reference, for example as a condition of approval.
11. Member Messner requested that the canopy which stops at the edge on the south elevation, on the far left, and on the north elevation, on the far right, be changed to cantilever out beyond the edge of the building, stating that in the current design the drop off has a hard line.
12. Member Messner suggested for consideration that the shape of the pillars with the stone be rotated to a diamond shape instead of a square shape which would break down the flat lines.
13. Chair Branch suggested consideration of locating the access to the building closer to the bus stop to shorten the walk to the lobby.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 13 of 19

14. Chair Branch expressed a preference for more asymmetrical architecture on the north elevation. He appreciates the vertical aspects with the palm trees.
15. Chair Branch commented that the stair tower could be solid, or possibly recessed tile could be added rather than glass.
16. Chair Branch stated that it is important that the south elevation relates to the hospital and that there is some play that needs to happen.
17. Chair Branch stated that from a bulk and scale standpoint the project has come a long way.

STRAW POLL

How many DRB members are comfortable with the proposed mass, bulk and scale of the Medical Office Building at this point?

Members voting in the affirmative: Branch, Messner, Schneider, Smith (4).

Members abstaining: Brown (1).

Members absent: Herrera, Wignot (2).

Member Brown commented that she appreciates that the applicant has reduced the height of the Medical Office Building OB from three to two stories which makes a big difference. She stated that she would prefer that the MOB be moved back.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to continue Item K-1, No. 07-171-DRB, 351 South Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue, to May 13, 2008, with comments.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

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

Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange

This is a request for further *Advisory* review. The proposed project includes the removal of the existing Cathedral Oaks Road/Hollister Avenue/US Highway 101 bridge over U.S. Highway 101 and bridge over Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and the construction of new bridges to align with the existing terminus of Cathedral Oaks Road. The proposed overcrossing (US Highway 101) and overhead (UPRR) bridges would accommodate a 12-foot vehicle lane in each direction, one 12-foot center left turn pocket lane/median, 5-foot shoulders/bike lanes in each direction, and a 6-foot sidewalk located on the west side. The project was filed by Caltrans, in association with the City of Goleta. (Last heard on 04-08-08*, 01-23-08*, 11-06-07*, 10-16-07*, 08-21-07, 07-17-07; 05-02-06) Related case: 05-037-DP. (Rosemarie Gaglione; Laura Bridley)

Applicant request to be continued to June 10, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

8-21-07 Meeting:

1. Member Brown requested that the project landscape architect consider substituting the *Rhamnus* species for the *Toyon* (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) species which is a nice, colorful, larger shrub and is good for the habitat because

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 14 of 19

- birds are attracted to its red berries. She said that there are existing *Toyon* plantings at the Patterson area offramp.
2. Member Messner said the *Toyon* species has different size and growth habits, such as low-growth, medium and high, and suggested that some variances be considered. He agreed with Member Brown that *Toyon* is a better choice.
 3. Member Messner requested that the landscape architect consider adding some *Matilija poppies* to the planting mix.
 4. Member Messner expressed concern that the *Ceanothus* species, cultivar *Yankee Point*, does not have a very long life and may not last longer than a few years.
 5. Member Messner said he appreciates the *Sycamore* and *Live Oak* species but would prefer another species rather than the *Eucalyptus* trees, such as the *Cork Oak*, if possible. Member Brown agreed with Member Messner and noted that *Eucalyptus* trees are existing on the plans. Staff will check with Caltrans regarding how other tree species would fare at this location.
 6. The DRB requests that Caltrans consider the comments regarding changes in the planting palette and that staff report back.
 7. Vice Chair Wignot requested that staff report back regarding whether the City is developing a landscape plan for the Hollister/Cathedral Oaks intersection. He suggested using similar plant material selections that are elsewhere.
 8. Member Schneider requested that staff report back regarding Caltrans' plans for landscape repair work that is needed at the area where the removed bridge was located near the Hollister/Cathedral Oaks intersection.
 9. The DRB appreciates that the recessed treatment will be on both the inside and outside of the bridge.
 10. The DRB requests that staff provide exhibits of the architectural treatments for the paved slopes when received from Caltrans for DRB review.

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

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

May 13, 2008

Page 15 of 19

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

May 13, 2008

Page 16 of 19

- 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

May 13, 2008

Page 17 of 19

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

May 13, 2008

Page 18 of 19

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

May 13, 2008

Page 19 of 19

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.