



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**WEDNESDAY , May 28, 2008**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.**

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### **SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.**

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

### **STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.**

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

### **ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.**

### **REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.**

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

#### **Members:**

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Scott Branch (Architect)

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

---

#### **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 28, 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 May 13, 2008

#### B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

#### B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

#### B-4. PROJECT PREAMBLE 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. 07-222-DRB

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

This is a request for *Final* 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. (Last heard on 5-13-08) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **5-13-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

1. Vice Chair Smith stated that it is appreciated that the project totally blends in.
2. Member Schneider stated that there does not appear to be any ramifications from the project.
3. The plans will need to show that the colors will match existing.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 07-**

**222-DRB, 1 South Los Carneros Road, as submitted; and continue to May 28, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

**F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-230-DRB**

7154 Tuolumne Drive (APN 077-104-019)

This is a request for *Final* 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 5-13-08, 4-08-08, 2-26-08) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

**5-13-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) the plans are an improvement from the plans that were originally submitted; and b) while the hip roof on the stair tower is somewhat foreign to the architecture, it does help the shadow impact slightly with regard to the property to the east.
2. Member Branch commented: a) agreed with Member Schneider's comment regarding the hip roof, stating that upon review of the shadow study, hipping the roof over the tall element is not a significant impact; and b) the applicant concentrated the massing of the project centrally on the plans about as best as possible.
3. The applicant needs to provide plans regarding colors and exterior light fixtures.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Abstain: Messner; Absent: Brown, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 07-230-DRB, 7154 Tuolumne Drive, with the following comment: the applicant shall provide the plans with regard to colors and exterior light fixtures; and to continue No. 07-230-DRB, to May 28, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

**F-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-076-DRB RV01**

Happy Harry's Produce Market; 7020 Calle Real (APN 077-155-036)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The approved project involved construction of a 2,984-square foot produce market with a 24.5 peak height, 10 standard and 1 ADA accessible parking spaces, access improvements, covered refuse/recycling enclosure, grading, removal of 1 arroyo willow and 1 coast live oak tree, and installation of an herb garden and associated landscaping on a 0.53 acre parcel in the CN zone district. Exterior building materials consist of the

## Design Review Board Agenda

May 28, 2008

Page 4 of 19

following; roof—Sherwood Forest color Certain Teed Grand Manor Shingles, walls—Hardi-Plank siding color California Beach, window trim—color Irish Moss, and aluminum windows—color white. The proposed project involves expanding the covered trash enclosure to accommodate both trash and recyclable dumpsters and relocating the enclosure to the NE corner of the property. The project application was filed by Hesh Ghorbanzadeh, agent, on behalf of Alireza Ebrahimi Khamseh and Mohammad Abbass Ali, property owners. Related cases: 46-SB-DRB & 46-SB-LUP (Alan Hanson)

### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

### H. SIGN CALENDAR

#### H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-024-DRB

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

This is a request for *Final* 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. (Last heard on 5-13-08, 4-08-08, 3-25-08, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **5-13-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

1. The applicant has responded to all of the previous DRB comments with the exception that the word “face” should be added at the end of the last sentence in Section 11. Signage Allowances, #1 and #2; and the following sentence should be added at the end of Section III. Sign Specifications, #7: “The light source shall be shielded so that there is no light trespass beyond the sign face”.
2. The Sign Subcommittee recommends that Preliminary Approval be granted with the Subcommittee’s comments.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-2, No. 08-024-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) the word “face” shall be added at the end of the last sentence in Section II. Signage Allowances, #1 and #2; and 2) the following sentence shall be added at the end of Section III. Sign Specifications, #7: “The light sources shall be shielded so that there is no light trespass beyond the sign face.”; and to continue No. 08-024-DRB to May 28, 2008, for Final review.**

## Design Review Board Agenda

May 28, 2008

Page 5 of 19

### H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-028-DRB

5730 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-006)

This is a request for *Final* 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 5-13-08, 4-22-08, 4-08-08\*, 3-25-08\*, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### 5-13-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. The applicant has responded to all of the previous DRB comments except comment #5 that the word "seasonal" shall be added between the words "for" and "promotional" in Section IV. Prohibited Signs, #5; and comment #8 that the relationship shall be explained on the plans with regard to the temporary banner sign placed on a fixed location directly below the logo, with small eye bolts permanently mounted into the wall.
2. A typographical correction is needed to change the word "daus" to "days" in Section IV. Prohibited Signs, #7.
3. The Sign Subcommittee recommends that Preliminary Approval be granted with the Subcommittee's comments.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-3, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) the word "seasonal" shall be added between the words "for" and "promotional" in Section IV. Prohibited Signs, #5; and 2) the relationship shall be explained on the plans with regard to the temporary banner sign placed on a fixed location directly below the logo, with small eye bolts permanently mounted into the wall; and to continue No. 08-028-DRB, to May 28, 2008, for Final review.**

#### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- SEE ITEM F-1

#### J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

#### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

**L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR**

**L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-095-DRB**

7121 Del Norte Drive (APN 077-113-003)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an existing approximately 36-square foot balcony, an existing approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, and a 390-square foot 2-car carport on a 6,300-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to permit a 120-square foot garden shed, 76-square foot fire pit and 50-square foot Jacuzzi, to construct a 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis, and to expand the approximately 36-square foot balcony to an approximately 108-square foot balcony that would be partially supported by the existing carport. Access from the proposed second-story balcony extension to the top of the carport is not proposed. The resulting 2-story structure would be a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an approximately 108-square foot balcony, an approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, a 390-square foot 2-car carport, a 120-square foot garden shed, a 76-square foot fire pit, a 50-square foot Jacuzzi, and 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis. This existing permitted structure is above the recommended maximum allowable floor area for this property, which is 1,984 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage; however, as the proposed project consists of non-habitable structures, the situation will not be exacerbated. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Victor Alvarez on behalf of Juan & Lola Zaragoza, property owners. Related cases: 05-095-LUP. (Continued from 04-08-08\*, 2-26-08, 2-12-08\*, 1-23-08\*, 1-08-08, 10-16-07\*, 09-05-07\*, 08-21-07, 12-18-05\*) (Scott Kolwitz)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

**2-26-08 Meeting**

1. The plans need to accurately reflect the existing conditions and show the proposed plans including the dimensions and materials. Accurate plans at the carport level and the balcony level are needed to understand the sizes. The front elevation needs to be consistent with the side elevations. There is a railing detail on the last page that does not show the existing detail, which need to match.
2. Member Smith commented: a) he does not have a concern with the design but there is a problem with the way the plans are presented; and b) the proposed square columns would be better than having something spindly which currently exists.
3. Chair Branch commented: a) suggested the applicant may consider pitching the carport roof to match the pitch of the house's roof which would suggest that the carport roof would not be used as a habitable area or for storage.
4. Member Brown requested that staff provide a condition of approval that would restrict access and use of the carport roof unless for temporary repair and maintenance, and possibly prohibit storage.
5. Member Schneider commented: a) accurate plans are needed; and b) the proposed blue color does not seem to fit with the rest of the color scheme.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

May 28, 2008

Page 7 of 19

**MOTION:** Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, to April 22, 2008, with the following comments: 1) the applicant needs to provide clear and accurate architectural drawings that reflect both the existing conditions and the proposed plans, including the columns, and the balcony and its relationship to the carport; 2) the trellis and all other items not being proposed should be removed from the project plans; 3) the applicant shall provide clarity regarding what color will be painted on the structures; and 4) staff is requested to provide a condition of approval that would restrict access and use of the carport roof and not allow use for habitable purposes.

### M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

#### M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 03-051-DRB

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

This is a request for further *Conceptual* review. The project site is undeveloped. The applicant proposes a new 8,184-square foot, three-story Islamic Center. The proposed center would include a 3,468-square foot first floor, 3,792-square foot second floor, and 468-square foot third floor, and a 456-square foot mechanical dome. The first floor would include a 635-square foot prayer area, 646-square foot meeting room, 574-square foot restrooms, 433-square foot entry/foyer/vestibule, 192 square feet kitchen and 988-square foot of additional storage and circulation areas. Additionally, a 1,046-square foot entry court, 414 square foot loggia and 1,107 square foot play area would be available for non-habitable exterior use. The second floor would include a 1,431-square foot dining room, 537-square foot lecture room, 303-square foot office, 270-square foot storage area, 393-square foot of circulation, and a 858-square foot residence. The third floor would include the final 468-square foot residence with 456-square foot of additional mechanical areas above.

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

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

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

The property is zoned C-H (Highway Commercial), and the land use designation in the City's General Plan is Office & Institutional. The project was filed by the Islamic Society of Santa Barbara as the applicant and property owner with Md

## Design Review Board Agenda

May 28, 2008

Page 8 of 19

Wahiduzzaman, Mukhtar Khan and Ken Mineau as owner representatives. Related cases: 03-051-CUP, 03-051-DP. (Last heard on 4-8-08\*, 2-12-08\*, 01-23-08\*, 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **12-18-07 Meeting:**

1. The environmental buffers need to be shown on the site plans to help understand the constraints and potential impacts on the site, during the conceptual review.
2. The applicant is requested to provide all information required for conceptual review including photographs and site statistics, and to delineate the materials in the parking lot to understand the concept for the pavers and the drainage.
3. Generally, the mass, bulk, scale, and height of the project are fine, except for concerns regarding the tower massing and design which need further study. The ridge of the building is fairly close to the height of the buildings across the street.
4. Comments Regarding the Tower/Dome: The tower location has changed which minimizes the impact to the view sheds at the intersection, but there are concerns that impacts to the views from the park may be increased. Chair Branch has no concerns regarding the shape of the dome but he is concerned that the base that the dome rests upon seems massive. He would prefer the tower to be more of an architectural element rather than a wing on its own. Member Schneider has concerns regarding the massing of the tower. Member Messner suggested that the dome radius be more rounded with the massing reduced, and meshing the dome with the building rather than standing alone. Member Smith expressed concerns regarding the proportion of the dome to the building and also regarding the scale of the base that the dome rests upon. He suggested exploring the idea of a reasonable dome size which was proposed in the e-mail from Gary Vandeman.
5. The public has expressed concerns regarding the impact of the project on the view from the Lake Los Carneros preserve. Consider a method to require that the applicant plant some trees on the park property within approximately five to fifteen feet of the property line to help screen the property, possibly as an off-site mitigation. Suggest planting a few trees now to serve as future replacement trees.
6. Member Schneider suggested that the applicant consider negotiating for an agreement with the commercial site located across Calle Real for conjunctive use parking. He commented that one of the factors related to this review is that the entire block is open space property. He stated that the following items that have been reviewed previously are fine: lighting and landscaping plans, color scheme for the buildings, and the architectural style, except for the dome.
7. Member Messner stated that he has concerns about parking and requested information regarding the Fire department comments regarding maximum occupancy. Member Messner stated that fruit bearing olive trees should not be planted on the front area of the property as the droppings will cause a safety issue for pedestrians and will also increase street maintenance for the City. If fruit bearing olive trees are desired, they should be planted on the back area of the property to ensure that the property owner is responsible for the maintenance. Member Messner recommended that the trees in front should be substantial in size. He also recommended considering steel tree wells for the

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.



## Design Review Board Agenda

May 28, 2008

Page 9 of 19

trees in the parking lot as this will allow for more room for the tree roots and parking. The steel tree wells will be level to the ground and cars will be able to drive over it. He suggested the applicant review the City's planting and street tree guidelines.

8. Chair Branch commented that the proposed use for the project is less intense than what is currently allowed per the zoning designation for the site.
9. Member Smith stated that the view from the Highway 101 overpass at Los Carneros is one of the most outstanding views in the area.

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

### **M-2. 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 5-13-08\*, 2-12-08, 01-23-08, 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

May 28, 2008

Page 10 of 19

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **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.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

May 28, 2008

Page 11 of 19

13. Chair Branch suggested consideration of locating the access to the building closer to the bus stop to shorten the walk to the lobby.
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 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.**

### M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-208-DRB

401 Storke Road (APN 073-440-019)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is a vacant 3.02 acres (131,551 square feet) commercial property in the Retail Commercial (C-2) zone district with an Airport Approach Zone F(APR) overlay. The applicant proposes to construct a 73,828-square foot two-story 99-room service hotel. The hotel is proposed to have a Spanish architectural design to compliment the Camino Real Marketplace.

The first-floor is proposed as 42,480 habitable square feet with 7,043 square feet of decks, and the second-floor is proposed as 31,348 habitable square feet with 2,705 square feet of balconies. The proposed building coverage is 32.3%, and the proposed Floor-Area-Ratio is 56.1%. The proposed mean height of the structure is 32 feet, proposed second-story peak roof heights range from 25 to 35 feet, and proposed tower peaks are 38 and 48 feet.

A total of 99 rooms would be constructed, of which 47 rooms would be located on the first-floor and 52 rooms would be located on the second-floor. The majority of rooms would be 464 square feet in size with some larger rooms of 639 square feet, and a large 1,445-square foot two-bedroom suite would be provided. A porte cochere is proposed at the front lobby. No restaurant is proposed within the service hotel, but a service area to prepare continental breakfasts and afternoon snacks would be available for guests. Additionally, a meeting room, small board room, fitness room, business center, lounge, pool, spa, fire pits, fountains and

## Design Review Board Agenda

May 28, 2008

Page 12 of 19

patios are proposed as guest amenities. Noise attenuation measures, which include insulation in the exterior walls and roof and insulated glass, are proposed. The applicant anticipates the hotel to be LEED certified. New materials consist of the following:

A plaster (smooth trowel) finish with the following colors: Wall: White (Frazee #001), Trim, Surround & Cornice: Staghorn (Frazee #8731W), Wainscot: Walnut Wash (Frazee #8733M), Windows, Doors & Railing: Peppercorn (Frazee #8615D); Roof Tile: Clay Mission Tiles (Two-piece blended clay barrel tiles); Wood Trellis: Taupe – Olympic Stain; Stone: Cantera Stone.

Vehicular ingress and egress is proposed from Storke Road and Phelps Road. A 40-foot wide driveway apron would front on Storke Road, and a 30-foot wide driveway apron would front on Phelps Road. A landscaped buffer along Storke Road and Phelps Road would be expanded and replace landscaping currently installed. A bus stop would be improved as required by MTD. No additional frontage improvements are proposed to Storke Road or Phelps Road as frontage improvements, which included street lights, utilities, and meandering sidewalks, were installed during construction of the Camino Real Project in the late 1990s.

Onsite vehicular circulation would be provided by a 24-foot wide drive aisle with a minimum of a 14-foot height clearance. A total of 112 parking spaces, of which 5 parking spaces would be ADA compliant, are proposed. An additional storage area has been proposed for a total of 14 bicycles. Pedestrian circulation would be provided through 4-foot wide sidewalk segments, and would connect the hotel entrances and exits to Storke Road, Phelps Road, and the adjacent park.

An architecturally screened trash/recycling and an electrical transformer area is proposed near the northwest corner of the parcel.

Additional proposed grading would consist of 2,500-cubic yards of cut and 2,500-cubic yards of fill. The applicant proposes stormwater catch basins/drains and pollution prevention interceptors onsite and bioswales both onsite and within the right-of-way to avoid cross lot drainage.

A Mediterranean landscape palette is proposed and was in part design to compliment landscaping at the Camino Real Marketplace. The proposed landscape coverage is 24.5%, which is not inclusive of the 16,000 square feet of landscaping located within the right-of-way.

The applicant is requesting a modification under Article III, Section 35-317.8.1 to allow 28 parking spaces to encroach into the southern front yard setback and to allow 30 parking spaces to encroach into the rear yard setback.

The project was filed by Kimberly A. Schizas on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 95-SP-001, 96-EIR-3, 07-208-GP, 07-208-SP, 07-208-DP, 07-208-LUP. (Last heard on 4-8-08) (Scott Kolwitz)

# Design Review Board Agenda

May 28, 2008

Page 13 of 19

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

## **4-08-08 Meeting:**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) overall, the site plan and massing of the building have been done fairly well but he does have some concerns; b) recommended that the finger planters be added, possibly eliminating a few parking spaces; c) expressed concern regarding the small amount of space between the County Fire Station property with the chain link fence and the site, and suggested finding some way to address this situation; d) expressed concern regarding the water feature in the fountain on the corner with regard to the concept of water conservation; e) the massing with the two-story elements in the rear and the one-story elements to the corner are done well; f) expressed concern that the tower element is too big and seemed to be that large only for purposes of advertising; g) the two rectangular openings at the end of the porte cochere do not seem like they belong with the style; h) the elements with the parapets do not integrate well architecturally when turning the corner and need to be addressed; i) generally, there are some architectural massing and detailing items that need to be worked out with regard to the balconies and other elements; k) the size of the showers seems too small; l) the applicant needs to define the level of commitment with regard to meeting the LEED standards; and m) there is an assumption that Phelps Road will never be widened but if it were widened there would be a problem.
2. Member Brown commented: a) there are many items she appreciates about the project but she also has some concerns; b); the size of the units seems too big, suggesting slightly reducing the footprint and making the rooms smaller; c) to requested that the applicant provide cut sheets showing lighting at the appropriate time d) requested the applicant specify the plans with regard to the LEED standards and encouraged striving to meet the highest standards; e) expressed concern that each unit will have both a shower and tub with regard to water conservation which she believes may be one of the LEED standards; f) suggested the diminishment of the some of the architectural projections such as the towers would help create the illusion that it is a smaller, more intimate 'bed and breakfast' style product in the community; g) suggested diverting from the "Santa Barbara" style influence, and consider something that is more in style with Goleta; h) the planting guidelines for the trees in the parking lot is appreciated; i) requested a list of trees that will be planted on the southern property line to make sure they fit into the tree wells; k) recommended eliminating the London Plane tree species because it tends to hybridize, and eliminating the *Vinca* species because it is invasive; l) the Dark Sky standards are encouraged; and m) appreciates that the parking lot lighting is fairly evenly lit and not over-lit.
3. Member Smith commented: a) in general, he appreciates the proposed project, including the concept and the idea of larger rooms; b) agreed with Member Brown's comments regarding landscaping; c) the drainage plan needs to provide assurance that there will be no impacts with regard to flooding; d) the Camino Real Marketplace architecture seems more Italian rather than Spanish, and ; suggested consideration of a style that is more Italian and less 'Santa Barbara'; e) agreed with Member Schneider regarding massing and detailing concerns; f) expressed concern that the base of the main tower needs to be trimmed down because it is too broad and big with regard to the cupola on top; and g) he believes that it is doubtful that Phelps Road will be widened.

## Design Review Board Agenda

May 28, 2008

Page 14 of 19

4. Vice Chair Wignot commented: a) overall, he appreciates the site plan and project, including features such as the open courtyard, pool, spa, fire pit, and porte cochere element that is covered; b) appreciates the landscaping plan; c) requested that consideration be given to the numbers and location of palm trees with regard to the potential for debris, damage and possible injury from palm fronds, particularly in windy weather; d) suggested that alleviating some of the long interior hallways would be an improvement; e) recommended that the use of more earth tones would soften and complement the project with the Marketplace; f) suggested that the style should be less Spanish Mediterranean; g) the tower element and sign seem too large; h) requested the applicant identify lighting fixtures similar to those proposed in the area that can be viewed at night and provide an exhibit and photograph; i) recommended consideration regarding noise attenuation with regard to rooms located next to elevators; and j) requested architectural screening for the backflow preventor in the southwest corner.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) appreciates the project including the open courtyard and landscaping; b) requested the landscape plan includes plant counts, sizes and locations; c) provided photographs of flooding problems downstream that have occurred in the past and expressed concern that there could be the potential for flooding from the addition of materials that are not pervious; and d) requested consideration that there is flooding downstream whenever there is approximately three inches of rain and that drainage problems exist.
6. Chair Branch commented: a) overall, the design of the project is done very well; b) agreed with Member Schneider that the openings at the front of the porte cochere seem out of place and should be studied; c) the curbed parapets need to be 'fattened up' and not appear thin; d) agreed with Member Smith that changing the color scheme to more earth tones, possibly more brownish tiles than red, would be more in context with a style for Goleta; and e) the applicant is requested to provide more information regarding colors.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item M-3, No. 07-208-DRB, 401 Storke Road, with comments to May 28, 2008, for further Conceptual review.**

### **N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- NONE

### **O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **O-1. SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSION & APPOINTMENTS**

#### **O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

#### **O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

### **P. ADJOURNMENT**

## **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 28, 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 28, 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 28, 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 28, 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.