



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, June 10, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE

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

June 10, 2008

Page 2 of 17

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for May 28, 2008

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

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

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

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

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

This is a request for *Final* 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 5-28-08, 4-08-08*, 2-26-08, 2-12-08*, 1-23-08*, 1-08-08, 10-16-07*, 9-05-07*, 8-21-07, 12-18-05*) (Scott Kolwitz)

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 3 of 17

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

5-28-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes)

1. Vice Chair Smith and Member Herrera both stated that the applicant has addressed and responded to the DRB's comments.
2. Member Branch commented: a) the barbeque design is acceptable; b) the size of the deck in the front elevation will be somewhat deeper but it is not a significant change from the existing balcony to be of concern; c) the removal of the blue color is an improvement; d) the driveway paving materials should be consistent; and e) it would behoove the applicant to keep up with the painting of the railing to prevent deterioration.
3. Chair Wignot commented: a) the initial project has been scaled back; b) essentially the front elevation will remain the same although the balcony will be slightly deeper and tie in to the carport; c) the loss of the blue color will be of benefit to the overall project; and d) the driveway paving materials should be consistent with the existing paving.
4. Member Brown requested that staff research and report back regarding the preparation of a notice to property owner which would restrict access and use of the carport roof unless for temporary repair and maintenance. She commented that from the initial review of the project she has had some concerns that the project does not improve the streetscape.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, as submitted with the following conditions: 1) the colors shall be called out on the plans; 2) the driveway paving materials shall be consistent; 3) staff shall research and report back regarding the preparation of a notice to property owner, that would be binding for future property owners, which would restrict access and use of the carport roof unless for temporary repair and maintenance and not allow the carport to be used as habitable area or for storage; and continue to June 10, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

- NONE

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 4 of 17

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 37-SB-DRB

Cabrillo Business Park; 6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Preliminary review*. The property includes two screened storage areas and nine buildings totaling 326,490 square feet on a 92.25-acre lot in the Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Buildings 1, 2, 4 and associated improvements, improvements for the private internal drive, and street and frontage improvements to Hollister Avenue and Los Carneros Road as part of the phased build out of the previously approved Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 1 would be a two-story, 80,000-square foot structure and Buildings 2 and 4 would both be two-story, 60,000-square foot structures. Associated improvements for each building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, and parking. New materials consist of concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out, the Cabrillo Business Park would total 946,282 square feet, including 704,600 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. The project was filed by agent Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN. (Continued from 4-22-08, 4-20-04, 3-16-04, 2-17-04*, 1-6-04, 12-2-03) (Cindy Moore)

Applicant request to be continued to July 22, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-22-08 Meeting:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) the applicant is requested to provide a streetscene showing the three buildings lined up along Hollister Avenue because he has some concerns and would prefer making the Building 1 architecture slightly different and not so repetitive of Building 2 and Building 4; b) while he appreciates the curved glass element at the entry he has some concerns having the curved glass element that goes towards the restaurant; c) Building 2 and Building 4 are fairly well done; d) the buildings work with the existing architecture across the street; e) the metal curtain wall forms that lead into the project will be somewhat successful; f) the trellis structure is unsuccessful and needs to be reworked; g) the façade that shows thickness as it turns the corner and turns into the glass element works well; however the wall seems too thin at the corner; h) the lighting plans need to show photometrics and cut sheets; i) expressed concern regarding the water feature at the corner and would prefer a solution that doesn't use water, stating that he believes it is a bad precedent to set in this area; and k) the project is headed in a reasonable direction.
2. Member Wignot commented: a) overall the project is moving in the right direction based on his review of the minutes of the previous review; b) it would be beneficial if reclaimed water service could be used for irrigation, given the size of the property and relative proximity to the reclaimed water mains that are in use at UCSB; c) a water feature at the corner of the intersection may not be appropriate especially if potable water would be used; however the intersection is very busy and could benefit from another type of calming effect, for example, some type of wind sculpture element; d) he appreciates the ingress and egress

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 5 of 17

- plans for the corner; e) the location and screening for utility boxes and transformers need to be shown on the plans; and f) the plan to locate a restaurant on the corner is appreciated.
3. Member Smith commented: a) the entry off of Hollister Avenue with the two curved wall panels is appreciated; b) he agrees with the comment from Member Schneider that the end wall may need to be slightly thicker; c) the Building 1 architecture should be a little more distinctive, for example with an international style element, than Building 2 and Building 4; d) he does not believe there is a great need for the buildings to have architectural allegiance with the buildings across the street on Hollister Avenue which seem unattractive big-boxes with holes; e) he appreciates the concept of a water fountain feature on the corner, noting that the same water could be re-circulated; and f) requested a little more use of the stone material on the buildings.
 4. Member Brown commented: a) there needs to be some sort of sense of separation between the pedestrians and the roadway traffic on Los Carneros; b) requested the applicant pursue working with the owner of the property next door to provide access to the Kmart property; c) requested that the proposed metal and stone materials be incorporated consistently throughout the site; d) the applicant shall provide a lighting plan; e) suggested consideration of another way to feature the corner rather than a water feature with regard to this era of scarce resources; f) the streetscape should include the façade of the proposed restaurant and its relationship to the buildings next door; g) the opportunity for people to walk and bike throughout the project is a good feature; h) the landscaping plans for many trees is appreciated; i) the path that cars and pedestrians would take to and from the restaurant needs to be clear on the plans; j) expressed appreciation that stormwater issues are addressed and incorporated in the plans; k) requested that the plans show the building elevations integrated with the landscaping, particularly when the restaurant is reviewed; l) suggested that the project provide for recycling of green waste on the site through composting and mulching; and m) expressed appreciation for the thoughtfulness and concern for the community that has gone into the design of the project.
 5. Member Messner commented: a) the performance bonds are needed with regard to the relocation of palm trees; b) the landscape plans need to show that the double rows of Ginkgo trees need to be only male species due to concerns with regard to pollen; c) the plans for street lighting should include lighting outside the parking lot and in connection with the airport; and d) the landscape plans need to conform to the City's current Recommended Street Tree Planting List and planting guidelines with regard to trees in the right-of-ways.
 6. Member Herrera commented: a) the concept of a water feature in the corner is appreciated; b) the landscaping plans with many trees throughout the property is appreciated; c) the drainage plans are fine; and d) the use of reclaimed water on the site would be great.
 7. Chair Branch commented: a) the applicant is requested to provide a streetscene showing how the building integrate on the site; b) he appreciates that the Building 1 architecture relates to Building 2 and Building 4 but suggested some difference in Building 1, for example, in terms of materials and proportions; c) the accent wainscot seems somewhat thin on the bottom; d) the green sea glass is a great element; e) the wing that is protruding seems a little thin and may need to be returned or thickened; f) reclaimed water would be useful on the site being that it is so large; g) the water feature at the corner is attractive but he does have concerns with regard to the water conservation point of view; h) he appreciates

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 6 of 17

the design wherein Building 2 and Building 4 guide into the project; and i) this project is well done and it is clear a lot of time and work has been spent on it.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-1, No. 37-SB-DRB, Cabrillo Business Park, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to June 10, 2008, with comments.

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-007-DRB

6300 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-050-020)

This is a request for further *Conceptual* review of a Marriott Residence Inn proposed to be located on a vacant portion of a parcel located at 6300 Hollister Avenue, between La Patera Lane and Robin Hill Road and is in the M-RP zone district. The project site occupies the westerly 3.79 acres of this larger 10.95-acre parcel, currently developed with the Hollister Center structure, and would be split to create the separate parcel for the hotel development.

The proposed building is an approximately 98,800-square foot, 140-room, extended stay hotel. The proposed hotel is designed in a U-shape configuration around a pool, framed by three building wings, each three stories in height. The main entrance is oriented toward Hollister Avenue with access served from both Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. The proposed architecture is characterized as contemporary Mediterranean with emphasis on smooth stucco finish, accent awnings, wood trellis, cornice moldings and concrete roof tile. The proposed hotel would have an average height of 35 feet, but include certain roof elements that extend to 38.72 feet at the top of certain roof ridges.

A total of 144 parking spaces are required to serve the hotel. A total of 129 surface parking spaces are provided around the building perimeter, with 30 additional spaces that would be provided through the reciprocal parking agreement. The applicant would provide a 6-foot wide sidewalk and 4-foot wide parkway with street trees along Robin Hill Road. Improvements along Hollister Avenue are largely governed by the City of Santa Barbara and have been designed following multiple discussions between the Cities of Santa Barbara and Goleta. The current plans include a meandering 6-foot wide sidewalk and parkway and a landscaped median along the Hollister Avenue frontage that would allow left turns into the proposed site driveway on Hollister Avenue, but prohibit left turns from this new access point. Additionally, the existing transit stop along Hollister Avenue would be improved and possibly relocated.

The applicant seeks an ordinance amendment to create a Hotel Overlay District, and General Plan amendments that would allow the project to have portions in excess of 35 feet high, and an FAR of .59.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 7 of 17

The project was filed by agent Kenneth Marshall of Dudek & Associates on behalf of 6300 Hollister Associates, property owners and RD Olson. Related cases: 07-007-GPA, 07-007-RZ, 07-007-DP, 07-007-TPM (Continued from 6-19-07, 5-01-07) (Laura Bridley)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-19-07 Meeting:

1. The plans are a good improvement. The DRB appreciates that the applicant is working with the DRB and making refinements which make a difference.
2. Site plan: The DRB appreciates the applicant's ability to work with the adjacent property owner, Sares-Regis, to include a meandering sidewalk on the frontages (with City of Santa Barbara consent); and regarding the inclusion of landscaping and outdoor seating/lunch area for employee use on the adjacent property.
3. Request that the compact parking spaces be dispersed and integrated with standard spaces to achieve a better balance throughout the site.
4. Request the use of permeable paving material to the greatest extent possible unless applicant provides reasons why it would not work.
5. The applicant is requested to provide more details at the next level of review regarding how storm water issues will be addressed including functionality of bioswales, location, quantities and hydrologic functions.
6. Building Architecture: The height reduction and stair-stepped elevation at the southeast corner is a big improvement.
7. Member Schneider suggested the applicant further study the graduation in building heights at the southeast corner of the hotel so the roof would have more mass (consider accentuating through raising the window heights and extending roof pitches).
8. Appreciate the changes made to the front entry which now looks better.
9. Consider introduction of landscape pot shelves, or something to add interest, to offset the blank mass of the building walls viewed from Hollister Avenue, and on the corners on the east elevation.
10. Member Schneider said the colors are much improved and work well overall.
11. A suggestion was made to consider changing the material for the trellis columns from stucco to stone to match other stone elements.
12. Chair Branch suggested refinement of the interplay of colors and base materials to reinforce vertical tower elements and trellis columns.
13. Landscaping: The applicant is requested to align the street tree and planting materials with the most recent recommendations from the DRB regarding the recommended street trees and planting guidelines; and to review with the City's Arborist and Open Space and Parks Manager. The landscape plan shall include a detailed accounting of species, size and quantities of all landscape materials, along with planting and irrigation specifications.
14. The landscape plan shall show landscaping proposed for the frontage of the adjacent Sares-Regis parcel and dovetail with the palette of the proposed project.
15. Lighting: The applicant is requested to provide an overall lighting plan for the buildings, parking lots and landscape areas. The fixtures should be shielded and downward facing to prevent "spillage". Applicant is requested to provide an overall lighting plan for buildings, parking lots and landscape areas. Request that applicant employ "Dark-Sky" principles.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 8 of 17

16. Vice Chair Wignot said that the concerns in the letter from J. L. Bartlett, Jr., regarding putting a multi-story building on piles in a former harbor area with no solid bottom support may not be within the purview of the DRB, but requested that the concerns in the letter be summarized in the minutes.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Pierce) that Conceptual review of Item K-1, No. 07-007-DRB was conducted with comments; and that Item K-1, No. 07-007-DRB shall be taken off calendar and forwarded to the appropriate decision-maker.

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-102-DRB

Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road (APN 079-210-049)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is a vacant 14.46-acre property in the DR-8 zone district, located in western Goleta on a parcel extending west of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection.

Proposed structural development includes 102 single family residences and townhouses, including 20 affordable units. Individual units would range in size between 566 and 2,872 square feet. The single-family residences would have a maximum height of 24 feet. The townhouses would have a maximum height of 22 feet. The proposed architecture proposed for both detached and attached units is described as a mix of Spanish, Ranch, and Monterey styles. All units would have private outdoor areas. A total of 258 parking spaces would be provided.

Common open space would total approximately 302,282 square feet (48%) exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated to the City of Goleta, and includes a children's play area and trail, with benches throughout the proposed Devereux Creek restoration area. A conceptual landscape plan includes restoration of the Devereux Creek corridor. The 87 eucalyptus and 8 cypress trees to be removed would be replaced with a total of 282 drought tolerant Mediterranean and native tree species, both ornamental (e.g., Melaluca, London Plane Tree, etc.) and indigenous to the area (e.g., coast live oak and sycamore).

Access to and from the condominiums would be provided from Hollister Avenue and Las Armas Road. A minimum 28-foot wide interior loop is provided on each side of Devereux Creek.

The site would require approximately 105,610-cubic yards of cut and 75,126-cubic yards of fill. A retaining wall on the northern project boundary would have a maximum 6-foot height.

The applicant seeks General Plan amendments to development setbacks from top of bank and visual resource view corridor policies.

The project was submitted on May 8, 2007 by agent Mary Meaney Reichel, Lucon Inc., on behalf of the Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership, property owner. Related cases: 07-102-GP, 07-102-DP, 07-102-VTM. (Last heard on 4-22-08, 3-25-08) (Cindy Moore & David Stone)

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 9 of 17

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-22-08 Meeting:

Overall General Comments of DRB Members:

1. The proposed project is being considered with regard to solving the concerns of the DRB that there are some areas in the site plan that seem too tight.
2. The applicant is requested to address the DRB's comments with regard to the site planning and may provide conceptual responses rather than full floor plans, per the applicant's request.
3. The entry area for the units seems too tight with regard to the units facing the western property line and the multi-family units in upper northeastern area.
4. The addition of a raised boardwalk through the meadow that would provide a pedestrian path is very important and would facilitate the opportunity for the residents to have some interaction with the open space area.
5. The applicant shall provide the detailed plan showing the existing trees and how many will remain, be removed, and be replaced.

Comments of Individual DRB Members:

1. Member Brown stated that the applicant has not shown a response to suggestions made by the DRB at the previous meeting to address the concerns that the project seems too tight and dense. She said that these suggestions were made to provide some more room on the lots and more variation. She further said that the suggestions included integrating some of the units, repositioning some of the products, and placing a multi-family unit on the southwest corner where there is a little more space; not necessarily changing the number of units.
2. Member Brown commented: a) some variation in the architecture would be appreciated; b) expressed concern that if a wall is built on the western property line, the front entrances of the units would be next to the wall; c) the design concept of being greeted by garages in the front and walking around to the back is not favorable and should be addressed; and d) expressed concern regarding the short driveways since pedestrians would end up walking in the street because they can't walk on the sidewalk.
3. Member Smith commented: a) expressed concern that there is not enough space between the front door and the edge of the property line with regard to the units facing the railroad on the eastern side; b) expressed concern that a couple of units appear to be "short-changed" with respect to private open space on the site plan; c) suggested considering the concept of joining together two of the single-family two-story units, thereby sharing one wall, so the adjacent yards would still be the same size but the apparent distance from the neighbor would be farther away, and the back-to-back yards would provide the possibility for ambient sunlight; d) expressed concern that the parabolic elements shown on the elevations for Plan 1B and Plan 2B do not work well architecturally with the roof element which resembles California Craftsman style, and suggested possibly changing the craftsman eave elements to a style that would fit better or removing the arched elements on the exterior of the house and adding

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 10 of 17

- something with more of a craftsman style; and e) the design of the triplexes looking like duplexes is very creative;
4. Chair Branch commented: a) his concerns regarding density are relative to the execution on the site plan and not in actual number; b) the design concept and variation in style of the multi-family units is appreciated; c) expressed concern that the single-family units are all two-story buildings and seem too crowded together, particularly with regard to shading and lack of sun in some yards for a fair amount of time throughout the year; d) suggested consideration of possibly decreasing the size of some of the second stories of the single-family houses by half of the footprint, or replacing some of the single-family houses with a multi-family unit to address the concern that the single-family homes appear cluttered; e) the setbacks from the street and the concept of bringing the parking in from the back side are appreciated; and f) idea is to join the grassland.
 5. Member Schneider commented: a) the rear alley-loaded design concept works well along Hollister Avenue, along Los Armas Road, and facing the open spaces; but the design appears too tight when jammed up against the western property line and in the upper northeastern area with the multi-family units which is a tight space; b) he would not want to rely on potential landscaping to address the concerns regarding the entry area on the units facing the western property; c) he does not have as much concern regarding the two-story single-family units and the shadow study showing that some yards would have limited direct sunlight, noting that there could be some light reflection from units that are next door; d) he supports the addition of a raised boardwalk through the meadow which appears to be contingent upon discussion between the applicant and the Environmental Defense Center; e) parking is lacking on the eastern side and needs to be addressed with a better solution; and f) the western side has significant visitor parking.
 6. Member Wignot commented: a) expressed concerns with regard to the potential for people to park along Los Armas Road on both sides because the eastern side doesn't have enough parking spaces, and when the property to the east is more fully developed that parking will be compromised; b) it does not appear that there is the ability to park a full-length sedan or truck in the short driveways; and c) he does not have enough information to know if the proposed project is essentially the same as the previous project or if it is a substantial improvement.
 7. Member Messner commented: a) the DRB comments from the last meeting on March 25, 2008, also need to be addressed; and b) he stands by his comments at the last meeting.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road, with comments, to June 10, 2008.

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

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 11 of 17

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 5-13-08, 4-08-08*, 1-23-08*, 11-06-07*, 10-16-07*, 8-21-07, 7-17-07; 5-02-06) Related case: 05-037-DP. (Rosemarie Gaglione; Laura Bridley)

Applicant request to be continued to July 22, 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 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

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 12 of 17

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 13 of 17

Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines

Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)

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

Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)

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

Design Review Board Procedures

Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)

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

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

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

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 14 of 17

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

Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 15 of 17

Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

Conceptual Review

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

Information required for conceptual review includes:

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

Preliminary Review

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

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

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 16 of 17

Final Review

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

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

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

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

Revised Final

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

Multiple Levels of Approval at a Single Meeting

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

Presentation of Projects (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.3)

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

Public Testimony (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.4)

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

Design Review Board Agenda

June 10, 2008

Page 17 of 17

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

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

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

Appeals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.8)

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