



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, March 25, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 1:30 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:

Scott Branch (Architect), Chair

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Branch at 3:00 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Scott Branch, Chair; Bob Wignot, Vice Chair; Cecilia Brown; Simon Herrera; Chris Messner; Carl Schneider; Thomas Smith.

Board Members absent: None.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Jonathan Leech, Contract Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 25, 2008

Page 2 of 16

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for March 11, 2008

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for March 11, 2008, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the subcommittee met today and that Bill Millar, Parks and Open Space Manager, was present. The discussion included ANSI and ISA specifications for tree pruning, the Tree City USA status, and the street tree and urban forest references in the General Plan. The next subcommittee meeting will be on April 22, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) applications for the DRB are due on April 3, 2008, to fill one licensed landscape professional position and one licensed architect position, both of which will be expiring; 2) staff encourages the DRB to consider that Item M-1 on today's agenda, the Haskell's Landing project, is a fairly large project and to spend time on the review that is proportionate to the size of the project in comparison to time spent reviewing smaller single-family additions; 3) the DRB Bylaws require that a Chair and Vice Chair be designated in April of each year; and 4) the members may wish to discuss the process that was previously considered regarding the Building Official attending the DRB meetings on a quarterly basis.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the applicant for Item H-3, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, requested a continuance to April 8, 2008; and that the applicant for Item I-1, No. 08-018-DRB RV, 6056 Berkeley Road, requested a continuance to April 8, 2008.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-3, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, to April 8, 2008, per the request of the applicant; and to continue Item I-1, No. 08-018-DRB RV, 6056 Berkeley Road, to April 8, 2008, per the request of the applicant.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

- None

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Schneider reported that the subcommittee met today and reviewed Items H-1, No. 08-013-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive; and Item H-2, No. 08-024-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue. He noted that Member Brown was not present.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

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

6860 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-015)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes three buildings totaling approximately 31,800 square feet of industrial building, warehouse, and chemical storage space on a 4.4-acre parcel in the M-RP (Industrial Research Park) zone district. The applicant proposes to install a monument sign at the front of the building. The dimensions of the monument structure would be 8' long by 4'-6" tall with an area of approximately 36-square feet. The sign attached to each side of the monument would be approximately 6'-2" long by 2'-11" tall, with an area of approximately 18-square feet. The non-illuminated signs would have pin-mounted bronze color letters for the building address, pin-mounted bronze colored suite numbers, and pin-mounted aluminum plates with bronze colored vinyl for the tenant names. The CMU monument structure will have 8" by 8" patterns cut into it, and paint to match the building. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 07-191-OSP, -DRB, -CUP, -DPAM. (Last heard on 3-11-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on March 25, 2008:

The plans were presented by staff Brian Hiefield on behalf of Dan Michealsen, property owner, who was not present. He stated that the applicant elected not to make any further changes to the plans with regard to the conditions of Preliminary Approval.

Comments:

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

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

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

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

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Hollister Business Park. The proposed OSP provides for two (2) different types of signs: wall signs and directional/informational signs. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 08-024-OSP; -CUP. (Last heard on 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on March 25, 2008:

The plans were presented by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, and Andrew Brenner, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Steve Rice clarified that there are three Directory Signs that are established for the Overall Sign Program.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling stated that the text for the Overall Sign Plan will be presented at the next DRB hearing. He clarified that a hearing will then be scheduled before the Zoning Administrator after which the item would return to the DRB for Preliminary and Final reviews. He requested that the applicant provide mapping of existing signage and calculations of the square footage of the signage areas for all signage on the parcel.

Comments:

1. There does not appear to be a need for two signs on the activity center building which is a small building. The sign on Page 9 of the plans seems redundant.
2. Member Schneider clarified that the Overall Sign Plan (OSP) should address signs for all tenants on this parcel as well as the signs for Citrix Online. He recommended that the language in the text of the OSP propose that the existing signs for the other existing tenants remain in place, and that there would be some criteria for signs should the other existing tenants change.
3. The Sign Subcommittee recommended that Item H-2, No-08-024-DRB, be continued to April 8, 2008, with the following conditions: a) one of the activity center signs shall be omitted which is the sign on Page 9; b) the text for the OSP shall be provided; c) the OSP text shall propose that the existing signs for the other existing tenants remain in place and include language with criteria for the signs should the tenants change; and d) the applicant shall provide additional pictures and mapping of existing signage, and calculations of the square footage of the signage areas.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-2, No. 08-024-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, to April 8, 2008, with the following conditions: 1) one of the activity center signs on the building

shall be omitted, which is the sign on Page 9; 2) the text for the Overall Sign Plan (OSP) shall be provided; 3) the OSP text shall propose that the existing signs for the other existing tenants on the parcel remain in place and include language with criteria for the signs should the tenants change; and 4) the applicant shall provide pictures and mapping of existing signage and also provide calculations of the signage areas.

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

5730 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property consists of a commercial property for multiple retail tenants on an approximately 8,500-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district (Retail Commercial). The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan for the building. The proposed Overall Sign Plan (OSP) provides for wall signs for individual tenants and for the shopping center. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by David Lemmons of Central Coast Signs, agent, on behalf of Jerry Anderson, property owner. Related cases: 08-028-OSP. (Last heard on 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-3, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, to April 8, 2008, per the request of the applicant.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-018-DRB RV

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

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a 112-unit Planned Unit Development in the DR-4.6 zone district. The applicant proposes to revise their lighting plan on the HOA owned grounds of the subdivision. The project was filed by Robert Young on behalf of The Meadows HOA, property owner. (Last heard on 2-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item I-1, No. 08-018-DRB RV, 6056 Berkeley Road, to April 8, 2008, per the request of the applicant.

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- None

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-059-DRB

5575 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-090-085)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes 14 Housing Authority apartments known as Grossman Homes, as well as management and maintenance offices on a 2.43 acre lot in the Design Residential (DR-20) zone district. The

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 25, 2008

Page 6 of 16

applicant requests a two lot subdivision to subdivide the parcel into two parcels of 2.19 acres (Parcel 1) and .24 acres (Parcel 2), and an amendment to a previously approved Development Plan which would allow the construction of a community center for the residents of the Grossman Homes on Parcel 1, the Miller Community Center, and an additional single-family dwelling, The Braddock House, on Parcel 2. The community center would be 16'3" tall and total 1,536 square feet. The Braddock House would be 16'5" tall and total 2,755 square feet and would be used as a Special Care Facility to provide semi-independent living for up to four (4) developmentally disabled adults. Access is provided via an existing 25' wide driveway from Armitos Avenue. The Goleta Water District and Goleta Sanitary District would continue to provide water and sewer service to the site. Modifications from the requirements of the zoning ordinance are being requested for the number of parking spaces, parking areas setbacks, and landscaping. The project was filed by the County of Santa Barbara Housing Authority, property owner. Related cases: 83-DP-014. (Continued from 2-26-08, 9-18-07, 08-21-07) (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by Jason Rojas, Project Coordinator, County Housing Authority, and John Polanskey, Director of Housing Development, County of Santa Barbara Housing Authority. Jason Rojas reviewed the conditions of approval from the DRB motion at the March 25, 2008, meeting. He stated that the windows will be fixed on the side of the building facing Kellogg Ranch and also provided a copy of the landscape plans with the plant counts which were added by the project landscape architect. He provided a photometrics study with cut sheets showing bollards placed along pathways and in front of the Braddock House, a color chart and a photograph of the existing colors.

Comments:

1. The plans do not document that the windows on the side of the building facing the Kellogg Ranch are fixed windows.
2. The proposed colors do not seem to match existing which is the intent.
3. There is concern that the bollard lighting is shining sideways.
4. Member Brown expressed concern that the lighting around the bollards is very uneven with some light trespass and recommended that the lighting be directed downward and that the foot-candle numbers be reevaluated in another lighting study.
5. Member Brown and Member Wignot expressed concern that there would be a glow above the fence on the southern side facing the Kellogg Ranch project with the proposed lighting plan and that it would not be fair to impose this additional type of lighting particularly with all-night lighting.
6. Member Schneider agreed with the concept of using bollards and keeping the level of the lighting low; however a different bollard fixture needs to be selected with the lighting shielded downward.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-1, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to April 22, 2008, with the following comments: 1) the applicant shall provide a color chip for the doors that matches the color of the existing doors; 2) a notation shall be added

to the plans to document that the two windows shall be fixed that are facing the adjacent Kellogg Ranch adjacent to the southern property line; and 3) a new bollard type light shall be selected that shields the light downward and the applicant shall provide an updated photometric plan showing the light dispersal.

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-030-DRB

7357 Elmhurst Place (APN 073-224-002)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,080-square foot residence and an attached 480-square foot two-car garage on a 5,775-square foot lot in the DR-10 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 100-square foot sunroom addition to the rear of the building. The resulting one-story structure would be 1,660 square feet, consisting of a 1,180-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 480-square foot two-car garage. The project was filed by Ed Martin of Ace Awning, agent, on behalf of Mary Medberry, property owner. Related cases: 08-030-DPAM and 08-030-LUP. (Shine Ling)

Site visits: Made by all members except Brown, Herrera and Schneider.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Ed Martin of Ace Awning, agent, on behalf of Mary Medberry, property owner. Mary Medberry, property owner, stated that there is an existing outside light at the site of the proposed addition and that it is well below the fence level.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot expressed concerns that the proposed addition places the occupancy area closer to the adjacent neighbor, and requested that the applicant provide cut sheets showing that the doorway lamp and the interior lighting are downward-lit so there will not be light shining at night across the fence.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 08-030-DRB, 7357 Elmhurst Place, as submitted, with the condition that the applicant provide cut sheets showing that the ceiling fan lights and the door light will be downward lit; and to continue to April 8, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. 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 currently vacant. The approximately 14.46-acre property is located in western Goleta extending west of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection. The property has a land use designation of Planned Residential, 8 units per acre, and is in the DR-8 zone district.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 25, 2008

Page 8 of 16

The applicant is requesting approval of a vesting tentative tract map, general plan amendments, and final development plan as described below.

Vesting Tentative Tract Map (32,032; 07-102-VTM)

The applicant requests a one lot subdivision of the 14.46-acre parcel for airspace condominium purposes to provide for 102 residential units, associated infrastructure, and common open space.

Final Development Plan (07-102-DP)

The Final Development Plan is a request to allow the construction of a 102-unit residential condominium project totaling 126,376 square feet of building coverage.

General Plan Amendments (07-102-GP)

The project proposes amendments to 10 Goleta General Plan policies and tables. These amendments address issues including: facilitating construction of a new fire station; allowing for a 50-foot development setback from Devereux Creek top of bank; visual resource view corridors; timing implementation of regional traffic mitigations; residential exterior development within areas subject to noise levels of 65 dBA CNEL on Hollister Avenue; and affordable housing inclusionary standards.

Unit and Building Design

Seven residential two-story building types are proposed, arranged around two loop road configurations, accessed from Hollister Avenue on the west, and Las Armas Road on the east. Single family residence (SFR detached) units would have a maximum height from finished floor to roof ridgeline of 24 feet, and Townhouse (T.H., attached) units would have a maximum height of 22 feet. The 2- and 3-bedroom T.H. floor plan to be offered at the market sales category provides for an extra optional bedroom. Building sizes would vary as follows:

Unit Type	Number	Area (square feet)
Single-Family Residence (Three-Bedroom)	47	2,466 - 2,872
Townhouse (Three-Bedroom/Option for Four)	15	2,324
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom/Option for Three)	14	1,492-1,820
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	14	1,364
Townhouse (One-Bedroom)	6	774
Studio	6	566

A total of 66 buildings would be constructed in the following configuration:

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 25, 2008

Page 9 of 16

Unit Type	Number of Buildings
Single-Family Residence	47
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	4
(1) Townhouse (Three-Bedroom) and (2) Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	9
(1) Townhouse (Three-Bedroom) (1) Townhouse (Two-Bedroom) (1) Townhouse (One-Bedroom) and (1) Studio	6

Architecture and Landscaping

The proposed architecture proposed for both detached and attached units is described as a mix of Spanish, Ranch, and Monterey styles.

Perimeter units would be oriented toward Hollister Avenue; no sound wall along the roadway is proposed. Units adjacent to Devereux Creek will be oriented to take advantage of proposed restoration of this biologically sensitive area. All units would have private outdoor areas. Private open space would equal 74,402 square feet (12%), such that total project open space would be 60% of all the project area. 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 and a pesticide- and herbicide-free maintenance program. The 87 eucalyptus and 8 cypress trees over 6-inches in diameter measured at breast height 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 and Parking

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. Decorative paving (2-feet wide on each side) would provide a visual sense of narrowing of paving width to 24-feet, intended to provide a traffic calming effect. A portion of the eastern interior loop adjacent to the proposed open space landscape restoration area would incorporate a "grass-crete" type substructure material that would allow for natural dispersal of native grass seed. This paving material, in addition to interior road width and turning radius, was determined in consultation with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department.

A total of 258 parking spaces would be provided, exceeding the 228 spaces required. All market-rate units would include a private 2-car garage, while affordable-rate units would include a private 1-car garage. Additional uncovered parking would be provided within 200-feet of the affordable units as required by ordinance.

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 25, 2008

Page 10 of 16

Site Preparation

The site would require approximately 105,610-cubic yards of cut and 75,126-cubic yards of fill. Maximum vertical height of cut and fill slopes would be 4 feet. A retaining wall on the northern project boundary would have a maximum 6-foot height.

Utilities

The Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District would provide water and Sewer service to the site. (Cindy Moore & David Stone)

Site visits: Made by all members.

Ex-parte conversations. None.

The plans were presented by Mary Meaney Reichel, project planner, on behalf of Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership, applicant; Katie O'Reilly Rogers, project landscape architect; Mark Scheurer, project architect; and Michael Caccese, with MAC Design Associates, project civil engineer. Mark Scheurer discussed the proposed architecture and site plan stating that the intent is to integrate the multi-family units into a scale and massing that resembles houses rather than bigger block-style buildings, and to design a project that is both neighborhood and pedestrian friendly. Michael Caccese stated that they worked closely with the Fire Department to limit the widths of the road and noted that there is a portion of the road that is only for emergency access and that there is also a secondary access road for emergency use only. He said that permeable pavers are proposed for parking areas and a grasscrete material for the emergency and secondary access roads. Michael Caccese also discussed drainage and water treatment plans that include the use of biofilters and ribbon gutters, stating that the site will continue to drain to the creek. Mary Meaney Reichel stated that the project has satisfied the requirements of the Goleta Water District.

Chuck Lande, project team member, stated that the plans were changed, after meeting with staff and the Fire Department, to add full driveways for many of the units which will provide for additional parking that is not included in the parking count sheet. He said that the CC&Rs will be used to control where the parking occurs and to require parking in garages.

Katie O-Reilly Rogers, project landscape architect, stated that it is important to note that the open space on the project is approximately 60 percent. She presented the proposed plans for landscaping and noted that all of the plants on the plant list were checked against the California Native Plant Society's list of non-invasive plants. She stated that the project will install landscaping in all of the front and back yard areas which will be maintained by the Homeowners Association and that each homeowner will be responsible individually for landscaping the private side yards. She stated that a project-specific acoustic noise study was conducted.

SPEAKERS:

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 25, 2008

Page 11 of 16

Barbara Massey, Goleta, stated that she believes the project does not meet the following two DRB Goals: 1) Goal #1 because it does not ensure that development and building design is consistent with adopted community design standards; and 2) Goal #11 because it does not provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way. She commented regarding the following concerns: a) this project is the same as a project on the site that was denied in 2001 and the changes do not solve the problems (she had a copy of the previous project site plan; b) most of the units do not have driveways and the cars back into the street which is dangerous and reduces the area for residents to park their cars (she noted similar issues in the Winchester Commons development); c) additional parking will be needed on the street; d) most of the streets are not wide enough to park on but people will park in the street which creates a safety problem; e) there is only one entrance in one half of the project; f) there is a noise problem with some of the units too close to the railroad tracks; g) the units are too close to Devereux Creek and should be removed away from the creek by the applicant rather than requesting an exception; h) setbacks are not adequate for the project; i) there are a number of environmental considerations as part of a legal settlement with the Environmental Defense Center (EDC); and j) the project can be viewed from Winchester Commons so views may become an issue.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reviewed the staff report and pointed out issues that the DRB members need to consider.

Overall General Comments of DRB Members:

1. The 60 percent open space area is appreciated.
2. The project seems dense and the site plan is too tight. Suggestions to address the density concerns included: consider deleting one or more units on the west end; consider different groupings of units; consider integrating single-family units with multi-family units; and consider more clusters of multi-family units rather than single-family homes.
3. Concerns were expressed with regard to the homes with east-west orientation that included solar access and landscaping issues. The western edge of the project seems tight on the site plan.
4. A pedestrian path is needed to provide access through the meadow area.
5. Other considerations included drainage, parking, landscaping, pedestrian paths, possible bike paths, circulation regarding trash pick-up, and how to address architecturally the impacts from Highway 101 and passing trains.
6. The architecture can be reviewed after further review of the site plan.
7. The applicant was requested to provide the following items: acoustic study, bio-study, drainage plan, locations of permeable pavers, updated landscape plan, designation of pedestrian paths, irrigation plan, placement and screening plan for check valves, streetscape showing the relationship of buildings to each other, a lighting plan showing street lights along the interior of the project and Hollister Avenue, and solar studies.

Comments of Individual DRB Members:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) the 60 percent open space area needs to be understood and appreciated but some areas in the project seem too tight; b) he has some concerns regarding the orientation of the east-west homes; c) the western edge of the project seems tight with regard to the front of the units and the wall; d) consider pushing back the row of houses along Hollister Avenue, increasing the setback, perhaps removing one or more units (noting that Hollister Avenue is not particularly pedestrian-friendly); e) the northwestern edge seems tight but this may be an issue with the plans; f) consider tree pockets, or other landscape solutions, in addition to the vines that cover the sound wall; g) the conceptual plans to soften the connection with the open space is appreciated but from a functional standpoint consider an option to add a raised walkway through the center of the meadow; h) on the east side, the individual parking spaces do not seem like they are available for general public parking and additional parking needs to be considered, possibly in some groupings; i) the applicant is requested to consider whether bike paths can be accommodated along Hollister Avenue, for example with regard to the highway overpass project; j) reconsider the meandering walkway with regard to the feeling that it is jammed against the curb and provide a feeling of safety for the pedestrians, possibly adding trees or moving the path a few feet away from the curb; k) conceptually, the intent and function of the drainage plan seem appropriate; l) the focus should continue on the site plan at this point; however, the architecture detailing will need to be addressed; m) it would seem logical to create a crosswalk to allow pedestrians to walk to the trail at the Sperling Preserve; n) the applicant is requested to study the circulation regarding trash pick-up.
2. Chair Branch commented: a) overall, the project seems dense; b) the cluster units, particularly against the back of the site, do not seem to have much space and there may be parking problems; c) the design concept of placing the parking strips on the side of the buildings is creative but will probably not be perceived as a place to park for the general public; d) the site density seems tight for the units with the east-west orientation and he has concerns whether landscaping can grow in the east-west side yards; e) the open space area is appreciated; f) a pedestrian path across the meadow would be a key design feature now, otherwise a path will be created by residents; g) the architectural detailing which can be reviewed later should include concerns that some of the balconies seem to be too close and are facing neighbors; and h) in his opinion, it seems like there would be more room on the site for parking and things would not have to be so close together if there were more clusters of multi-family units rather than single-family homes.
3. Member Messner commented: a) the applicant is requested to provide a lighting plan showing the street lights on the interior of the project and along Hollister Avenue; b) a path for access through the meadow needs to be provided; c) expressed concern that there are so few public parking spots available, and those that are available are in isolated areas, that homeowners close by who need more parking will be using these spaces for their own personal use; d) a drip irrigation system is preferred, rather than spray, because the landscaped areas are more narrow, so there won't be too much overflow; e) the applicant is requested to

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 25, 2008

Page 13 of 16

provide an irrigation plan; f) the applicant is requested to consider the creative placement of check valves and provide the plans showing the locations; g) recommended deleting the Creeping Fig vine because it is very invasive and requires a lot of maintenance; deleting the Blue Cape Plumbago because in a small area it would need to be trimmed more which would result in a large thick plant without seeing the flowers; deleting the Melaleuca tree species because of water usage concerns, deleting the Ceanothus Yankee Point species because it does not live very long, deleting the Dwarf Coyote Brush groundcover because it is prone to rot and mildew, and deleting the Eucalyptus tree species; h) agreed with the recommendation to delete the London Plane Tree; i) the Brisbane Box species is fine but I highly recommend the Monterey Cypress tree species. The Monterey Cypress tree flows well with the trees at the golf course across the street. The Monterey Cypress trees will do well in our coastal environment; j) recommended using those species of plants whose roots will act as filters in the drainage areas; k) the City's current Recommended Street Tree Planting List and planting standards will need to be consulted regarding street trees and planting guidelines along Hollister and Las Armas roads; l) the plans will need to reflect root barriers for street trees and sizes for the plantings in new developments. The plans and drawings will need to reflect the current approved planting guidelines for root barriers, street trees, and planting guidelines for new developments; and m) suggested consideration, with regard to vehicular circulation, of a possibly raised low wood bridge above the wetlands and grasslands to allow wildlife and water to move freely below.

4. Member Brown commented: a) agreed with the comments from the DRB members; b) pedestrian paths should be established to direct people and protect landscaping and open space; c) the applicant is requested to provide a streetscape to help understand the relationship of houses to the street and the relationship of each house to one another; d) the project density seems very tight; e) suggested that there may be a way to integrate some of the multi-family units with some of the single-family units to make better use of the space; f) expressed concerns regarding the garage doors opening to the front of the street and the front doors that are located against the fence; g) the front patios facing the street seem awkward; h) expressed concern that there will be noise from the railroad; i) there needs to be a better understanding regarding whether there is personal space for the multi-family units and how it can be accessed; j) there needs to be trees along the back fence and more trees on the site, particularly at the entrance way off of Hollister Avenue; k) the applicant is requested to provide the bio-study and acoustic study; l) the plant list needs to identify the plant species in the native meadow area; m) requested that the centralized mail area be beautified because typically centralized mail delivery points appear too industrial; n) she noted, from her experience living near developments with short driveways, that cars tend to hang off into the street because the driveway lengths are not long enough; o) the applicant is requested to delineate and articulate the pedestrian paths more clearly; p) requested that the applicant provide solar access studies for some of the multi-family homes and for the side yards of some single-family homes; q) suggested that carports might be a solution to some of the car issues which would encourage people to park their cars rather than use the space for storage; r) the landscape plan should include landscaping to screen utilities and address

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 25, 2008

Page 14 of 16

- potential uses such as trash containers and “Mutt Mit” containers for dogs; and s) the architecture is fine but some of the massing will need to be addressed because some of the two-story dwellings are fairly massive and concentrated.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) there needs to be a pedestrian path to connect the east and west which would protect the new plants; b) consider expanding the pedestrian area on the west end, possibly removing one or two units; c) suggested adding a couple of trash cans in the meadows area; d) requested that the applicant show where the permeable pavers will be located; e) anything that can be done to decrease the run-off levels, such as catch basins or pavers, would be helpful because historically there has been flooding from the creek downstream from the site; and e) with regard to drainage, filtering and cleaning the water will be appreciated.
 6. Member Smith commented: a) the concept of separating the front door entry and the vehicle entry is appreciated; b) the architecture is appreciated; c) the density, or scale, seems too tight, as though there is a lot trying to be done; d) the project would feel more comfortable if there were less units; and e) suggested that grouping the units together as duplexes instead of triplexes, particularly for the east-west oriented homes, would allow for sunlight to be reflected into yards and would also create a smoother transition from the multi-family units to the multi-family homes.
 7. Vice Chair Wignot commented: a) it would be useful to know the comments from the previous proposal for the site and what has changed; b) it is important that the drainage not generate any more run-off from the site than what is existing now because it would exacerbate the current situation downstream; c) the site plan seems very tight; d) expressed concern that the architectural plans show windows looking across into a neighbor’s window; e) fewer units would alleviate some of the architectural constraints; f) the units that provide parking space for only one car may not work well and could increase the burden on parking allocated for visitors; g) the path across the open space is a good addition; for an example, consider the boardwalk at the Lake Los Carneros Preserve across an area of wetlands; h) the other paths should remain for public use; i) expressed support for leaving the Eucalyptus trees in the open space; j) agreed with Member Messner that the Melaleuca species is not appropriate for this site; k) expressed concern that there will be impacts on the site from noise and pollutants generated by Highway 101 and the passing trains; l) suggested that that the homes would need to be well engineered to address the potential for a vibration problem from the trains; and m) suggested consideration of design elements that would tie the project with the Ellwood School and with the Barnsdall gas station, which is part of the gateway to Goleta concept and may be restored.

MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Smith 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, to April 22, 2008, with comments.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- None

RECESS HELD: 5:54 P.M. TO 5:50 P.M.

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

The DRB members discussed the concept of the Building Official attending the DRB meetings on a quarterly basis and agreed that there should be an agenda with one or more specific discussion items when the Building Official meets with the DRB, either submitted by the DRB or the Building Official.

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Member Messner announced that he will not be present at the next DRB meeting on April 8, 2008.

O-3. PROJECT APPROVAL v. BUILT SLIDESHOW

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz presented the Project Approval v. Built Slideshow and stated that the intent of the discussion is for the DRB to review the elevations to compare the project after construction with the DRB's vision when approving the project.

DRB COMMENTS:

Signage:

1. Dioji signs
2. Ellwood Mesa monument sign: Member Schneider stated that the sign was constructed very close to the approved plans but the material chosen had a lot of copper in it and has deteriorated making it difficult to read the sign. The signs in the parking lot have been vandalized.
3. Pattaya Restaurant sign: The sign is great. The light intensity is not too bright. The sign is nice and colorful during the day.

Residential Projects:

1. Comstock Homes: The lighting fixtures seem to be placed high. It may be appropriate to request color renderings for review and also include downspouts on the plans. Some features appear different when constructed than shown on the renderings. Member Brown commented: a) the landscaping seems sparse; b) some of the driveways are very short; and c) it would be useful to consider windows and balconies overlooking backyards when reviewing projects. Chair Branch commented that overall this is a handsome project.
2. Willow Creek: The placement of some of the lighting fixtures does not seem appropriate; for example, the light on the left side of the front door, and the fixture over the garage which is too large. The transformers may need better

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 25, 2008

Page 16 of 16

screening. Concerns were expressed regarding the size and placement of check valves.

3. 5610 Cielo
4. 7563 Palos Verdes
5. 612 Rossmore
6. 5740 Alondra
7. 320 N. La Patera Lane: still in construction.

Commercial Projects:

1. Hampton Inn: The color and architectural articulation are good. Member Schneider commented that the yellow is somewhat bright. Member Brown commented that the parking lot on the south side turned out very well.
2. Happy Harry's: The color seems somewhat light. Chair Branch commented that the design seems somewhat symmetrical but is okay.

Landscape Plans:

1. Hampton Inn: There needs to be more consideration regarding placement and screening of check valves. Member Brown commented that the grasslands appear sparse in the San Jose Creek area and suggested using native plants that are more vigorous and bigger. Member Herrera stated that the soil needs to be checked for salt and sodium content which can affect the success of the landscaping.
2. Dioji: Member Messner expressed concern that there needs to be verification that the size of the plantings follow the planting guidelines for all landscape plans.

Lighting Plans:

1. Hampton Inn: The lights on the signs that were installed are different than what was approved.
2. Hollister Center: The lighting plan is successful. The fixture is not very attractive but it is effective.
3. Willow Creek: The lighting details need to be included on the plans.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 7:17 P.M.

Minutes approved on April 8, 2008.



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, April 22, 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:

Scott Branch (Architect), Chair

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Branch at 3:05 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Scott Branch, Chair; Bob Wignot, Vice Chair; Cecilia Brown; Simon Herrera; Chris Messner; Carl Schneider; Thomas Smith.

Board Members absent: None.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner, Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician, Dave Stone, Contract Planner;

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 2 of 18

*Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase (*for Item M-1 only), and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk, .

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for April 8, 2008

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Abstain: Messner) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for April 8, 2008, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Member Wignot reported that the Street Tree Subcommittee met today and discussed items in the General Plan related to the urban forest. He said that the subcommittee will discuss ordinance standards that would be required for attaining Street Tree USA status for subsequent years. Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner stated that the next Street Tree Subcommittee meeting will be on Wednesday, May 28, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) Congratulated Member Schneider and Member Messner on their reappointment to the DRB by the City Council, both for three-year terms. 2) Reported that the correct lighting fixtures which are recessed have been installed in the Hampton Inn parking lot by the applicant. 3) Stated that Member Brown will check the lighting fixtures at the Hampton Inn parking lot and report back.

B-4. CHAIR & VICE-CHAIR ELECTIONS

By consensus, the DRB Members moved Item B-4, Chair & Vice Chair Elections, to be considered at the end of the agenda.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the applicant for Item H-1, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, requested a continuance to May 13, 2008; the applicant for Item L-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, requested a continuance to the next available meeting and plans have been submitted; and the applicant for Item L-2, No. 08-026-DRB, 7859 Rio Vista Drive, requested a continuance to May 13, 2008.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 3 of 18

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, to May 28, 2008, per the applicant's request; and to continue Item L-2, No. 08-026-DRB, 7859 Rio Vista Drive, to May 13, 2008, per the applicant's request.

MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to continue Item H-1, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to May 13, 1008, for review by the full board, not the Sign Subcommittee.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Chair Branch stated that Item F-1, No. 07-206-DRB, will be reviewed by the full DRB on the Consent Calendar because the applicant was not present at 2:30 p.m. today.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-206-DRB

163 Aero Camino (APN 073-070-004)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 16,450-square foot industrial/office building on a 43,560-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to install a liquid nitrogen distribution tank screened with pultruded I-bar cladding. The proposal includes a remodel of the exterior façade including new plaster screen walls, a new entry feature, and framing and plastering over existing vertical supports. The proposal includes replacing the existing onsite sidewalk in front of the building with pavers, and drought resistant planters. New parking striping and curbing are also proposed to improve circulation and access to parking. No additional floor area is proposed with this submittal. The project was filed by agent David Jones with Lenvik & Minor Architects on behalf of Marc Winnikoff, property owner. Related cases: 65-V-025, 65-V-008, 74-DP-024. (Continued from 3-11-08, 2-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

The plans were presented by agent David Jones with Lenvik & Minor Architects on behalf of Marc Winnikoff, property owner.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item F-1, No. 07-206-DRB, 163 Aero Camino, as submitted, with the condition that there will be no exterior light fixtures.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Member Schneider reported that the Sign Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-2, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-211-DRB

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The applicant proposes to install a two sided freestanding entry sign for the Patterson Place Apartments measuring a maximum of 4-feet 4-inches tall by 8-feet wide. The sign area is proposed to be approximately 18 ½ -inches by 7-feet 4-inches for an aggregate of approximately 11 square feet on each side of the structure. The non-illuminated sign shall have aluminum pin mounted flat cut out (F.C.O.) “Burnt Crimson” lettering. The portion of the sign reading “Patterson Place” will have 6-inch high letters, the portion of the sign reading “APARTMENTS” will have 4-inch high letters, and the address portion of the sign will have 4 ½ -inch high letters. The sign would be located approximately 9-feet east of the edge of public right-of-way and approximately 36-feet north of the Patterson Place Apartments entrance. No logos are allowed as part of the sign. The application was filed by agent Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, property owner. Related case: 74-CP-39, 07-211-SCC. (Last heard on 4-8-08*, 3-11-08*, 2-26-08*, 2-12-08*, 1-23-08*, 1-08-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to continue Item H-1, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to May 13, 1008, for review by the full board, not the Sign Subcommittee.

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

5730 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property consists of a commercial property for multiple retail tenants on an approximately 8,500-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district (Retail Commercial). The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan for the building. The proposed Overall Sign Plan (OSP) provides for wall signs for individual tenants and for the shopping center. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by David Lemmons of Central Coast Signs, agent, on behalf of Jerry Anderson, property owner. Related cases: 08-028-OSP. (Last heard on 4-08-08*, 3-25-08*, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on April 22, 2008:

The plans were presented by David Lemmons of Central Coast Signs, agent, on behalf of Jerry Anderson, property owner.

The Sign Subcommittee reviewed the proposed Anderson Building Overall Sign Plan.

Comments:

1. The maximum length of the anchor tenant sign shall be thirty-five (35) percent of the frontage of the building.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 5 of 18

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

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

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

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-

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 6 of 18

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 4-20-04, 3-16-04, 2-17-04*, 1-6-04, 12-2-03) (Cindy Moore)

Site visits: Made by all members:

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by agent Troy White of Dudek and Associates on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner, and the project team members including Russ Goodman and Steve Fedde of Sares-Regis Group; Bob Cunningham and Lauri Romano, project landscape architects; Don Donaldson, project civil engineer; and the project architect.

The project team presented the project history, the project and specific buildings and road infrastructure, and proposed landscape design. Russ Goodman commented that for approximately fifty years the project site served as the headquarters for Delco. Mr. Goodman stated that the objective is to turn this site into first-class, modern business park of high flexibility to service the needs of the high-tech and office industrial community, outwardly focused, landscaped, and taking advantage of a numerous features and constraints on the site. He said that the plans include restoring, enhancing and expanding the large wetlands area, as well as providing a park area in another area and trails for the benefit of the public.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: 1) 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 that the size of the

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 7 of 18

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 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 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.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 8 of 18

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 the design wherein Building 2 and Building 4 guide into the project; and i) this project is well done and it 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.

RECESS HELD FROM 4:50 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

K-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-059-DRB

5575 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-090-085)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes 14 Housing Authority apartments known as Grossman Homes, as well as management and maintenance offices on a 2.43 acre lot in the Design Residential (DR-20) zone district. The applicant requests a two lot subdivision to subdivide the parcel into two parcels of 2.19 acres (Parcel 1) and .24 acres (Parcel 2), and an amendment to a previously approved Development Plan which would allow the construction of a community center for the residents of the Grossman Homes on Parcel 1, the Miller Community Center, and an additional single-family dwelling, The Braddock House, on Parcel 2. The community center would be 16'3" tall and total 1,536 square feet. The Braddock House would be 16'5" tall and total 2,755 square feet and would be used as a Special Care Facility to provide semi-independent living for up to four (4) developmentally disabled adults. Access is provided via an existing 25' wide driveway from Armitos Avenue. The Goleta Water District and Goleta Sanitary District would continue to provide water and sewer service to the site. Modifications from the requirements of the zoning ordinance are being requested for the number of parking spaces, parking areas setbacks, and landscaping. The project was filed by the County of Santa Barbara Housing Authority, property owner. Related cases: 83-DP-014. (Continued from 3-25-08, 2-26-08, 9-18-07, 08-21-07) (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by John Polanskey, Director of Housing Development, County of Santa Barbara Housing Authority; and Jason Rojas, Project Coordinator, County Housing Authority. John Polanskey responded to the DRB comments from the previous review on March 25, 2008, as follows: 1) provided a color board showing that the proposed color matches the existing color; 2) provided the floor plan and south elevation that now show that the two windows shall be fixed facing the adjacent Kellogg Ranch, along with a notation on the floor plan and elevation; 3) provided a cut sheet showing the proposed bollard light fixture with a louvered

element that shields the light downward; and 4) provided an updated photometric plan.

John Polanskey, Director of Housing Development, County of Santa Barbara Housing Authority, stated that he discussed the project today with Reilly Pollard, neighbor, who was in attendance at the meeting earlier because he was unclear regarding project's status in the process. John Polanskey stated for the record that the applicant will meet again with interested neighbors once the final construction plans are substantially completed prior to the next DRB review. John Polanskey also said that the applicant is committed to continue to work with the City with regard to concerns regarding the neighborhood park, particularly related to street parking. He noted that parking problems have not been mitigated due to police presence.

Comments:

1. The applicant's time and work with the DRB on this project are appreciated.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-2, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to grant Preliminary Approval, as submitted, and continue to June 24, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

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 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)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, to May 28, 2008, per the applicant's request.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-026-DRB

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,180-square foot residence and an attached 462-square foot two-car garage (with a permitted partial garage conversion of 168 square feet) on a 6,534-square foot lot in the DR-4 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 623 square feet in additions (114 square feet on the first-floor and 509 square feet on a new second-floor). The resulting two-story structure would be 2,265 square feet, consisting of a 1,803-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 462-square foot two-car garage (with a permitted partial garage conversion of 168 square feet). This proposal is consistent with the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by Tony Xiques of Dexign Systems, agent, on behalf of Robert Andre, property owner. Related cases: 08-026-LUP. (Last heard on 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-2, No. 08-026-DRB, 7859 Rio Vista Drive, to May 13, 2008, per the applicant's request.

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-043-DRB

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

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

Site visits: Made by all members except Herrera.

Ex-parte conversations: Member Messner stated that he has not had contact with the applicant recently but he has trimmed the applicant's trees in the past years, not recently.

The plans were presented by Donald Sharpe, architect, on behalf of Cambridge Drive Community Church, property owner.

Comments:

1. The applicant is requested to show the plans for the porch cover element that connects to the existing building.
2. The proposed lighting should be fine because it is underneath the porch but the applicant needs to submit lighting plans for review.
3. Member Schneider commented that while the bat and board material adds some character, the style is foreign to the other elements on the site.
4. Member Wignot commented that the office doorway on the southeast elevation would benefit from the larger overhang on the eastern side of the building.

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

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. 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 currently vacant. The approximately 14.46-acre property is located in western Goleta extending west of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection. The property has a land use designation of Planned Residential, 8 units per acre, and is in the DR-8 zone district.

The applicant is requesting approval of a vesting tentative tract map, general plan amendments, and final development plan as described below.

Vesting Tentative Tract Map (32,032; 07-102-VTM)

The applicant requests a one lot subdivision of the 14.46-acre parcel for airspace condominium purposes to provide for 102 residential units, associated infrastructure, and common open space.

Final Development Plan (07-102-DP)

The Final Development Plan is a request to allow the construction of a 102-unit residential condominium project totaling 126,376 square feet of building coverage.

General Plan Amendments (07-102-GP)

The project proposes amendments to 10 Goleta General Plan policies and tables. These amendments address issues including: facilitating construction of a new fire station; allowing for a 50-foot development setback from Devereux Creek top of bank; visual resource view corridors; timing implementation of regional traffic mitigations; residential exterior development within areas subject to noise levels of 65 dBA CNEL on Hollister Avenue; and affordable housing inclusionary standards.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 12 of 18

Unit and Building Design

Seven residential two-story building types are proposed, arranged around two loop road configurations, accessed from Hollister Avenue on the west, and Las Armas Road on the east. Single family residence (SFR detached) units would have a maximum height from finished floor to roof ridgeline of 24 feet, and Townhouse (T.H., attached) units would have a maximum height of 22 feet. The 2- and 3-bedroom T.H. floor plan to be offered at the market sales category provides for an extra optional bedroom. Building sizes would vary as follows:

Unit Type	Number	Area (square feet)
Single-Family Residence (Three-Bedroom)	47	2,466 - 2,872
Townhouse (Three-Bedroom/Option for Four)	15	2,324
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom/Option for Three)	14	1,492-1,820
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	14	1,364
Townhouse (One-Bedroom)	6	774
Studio	6	566

A total of 66 buildings would be constructed in the following configuration:

Unit Type	Number of Buildings
Single-Family Residence	47
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	4
(1) Townhouse (Three-Bedroom) and (2) Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	9
(1) Townhouse (Three-Bedroom) (1) Townhouse (Two-Bedroom) (1) Townhouse (One-Bedroom) and (1) Studio	6

Architecture and Landscaping

The proposed architecture proposed for both detached and attached units is described as a mix of Spanish, Ranch, and Monterey styles.

Perimeter units would be oriented toward Hollister Avenue; no sound wall along the roadway is proposed. Units adjacent to Devereux Creek will be oriented to take

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 13 of 18

advantage or proposed restoration of this biologically sensitive area. All units would have private outdoor areas. Private open space would equal 74,402 square feet (12%), such that total project open space would be 60% of all the project area. 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 and a pesticide- and herbicide-free maintenance program. The 87 eucalyptus and 8 cypress trees over 6-inches in diameter measured at breast height 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 and Parking

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. Decorative paving (2-feet wide on each side) would provide a visual sense of narrowing of paving width to 24-feet, intended to provide a traffic calming effect. A portion of the eastern interior loop adjacent to the proposed open space landscape restoration area would incorporate a "grass-crete" type substructure material that would allow for natural dispersal of native grass seed. This paving material, in addition to interior road width and turning radius, was determined in consultation with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department.

A total of 258 parking spaces would be provided, exceeding the 228 spaces required. All market-rate units would include a private 2-car garage, while affordable-rate units would include a private 1-car garage. Additional uncovered parking would be provided within 200-feet of the affordable units as required by ordinance.

Site Preparation

The site would require approximately 105,610-cubic yards of cut and 75,126-cubic yards of fill. Maximum vertical height of cut and fill slopes would be 4 feet. A retaining wall on the northern project boundary would have a maximum 6-foot height.

Utilities

The Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District would provide water and Sewer service to the site. (Last heard on 3-25-08) (Cindy Moore & David Stone)

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase stated that he read the minutes from the previous review and it was his understanding that the DRB members were very concerned regarding the density of the project, which he referred to as compaction. He said that he would be speaking in broad parameters and that he wanted to provide some information with regard to the dialogue between staff and the applicant. He stated that maximizing open space was encouraged by staff with regard to the overall approach, in particular on Hollister Avenue, the coastal setting and view corridor. He said that staff thought the groves were lovely and this was

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 14 of 18

seen as a sort of gateway piece. He said that he has seen this type of development product in other locations in gateway pieces throughout the State. He stated that he likes the layout and that the reason he likes it for this particularly property is that there are no walls per se and it tries to maximum the open space side. He stated that this type of architecture was encouraged from the perspective of open space and trying to maximum open space. He also stated that it was seen as good overall balance. He noted that it is the role of the DRB to review the project with the applicant to determine if the design is a good fit.

Member Brown commented that the DRB expressed its appreciation regarding the project's open space. She stated for purposes of clarification that there were suggestions made by the DRB with regard to making the project look less dense internally, for example, combining some of the units or repositioning products where there was more space. She believes that the DRB liked the architecture but there were some suggestions made that would help the overall site planning.

The plans were presented by Chuck Lande, and other project team members including Mark Scheurer, project architect; Katie O'Reilly Rogers, project landscape architect; and Mary Meaney Reichel, project planner, on behalf of Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership. The plans included shadow studies.

Charles Lande, project team member, explained their philosophy regarding how they approached the project with consideration of the land, the community and efforts to create a balance with the neighborhood integration and open space. He said that these innovative home types which provide a balance between lot coverage and living area have been built in numerous locations and are appreciated by the residents. He stated that the project team considered some of suggestions made by the DRB in terms of site planning but one of the concerns in combining the buildings was that there would be too much mass along Hollister Avenue. He clarified that there is no solid wall separating the project on the western property line, and apologized that he made a mistake at the last meeting when he stated that there was a solid sound wall.

Mark Scheurer, project architect, discussed the proposed floor plans, private open spaces and yards.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, stated that she believes this project is a little change from the 2001 project that was rejected. She expressed concern that the project has too many units, too narrow streets, substandard driveways, too few parking spaces, and insufficient environmental setbacks. She also made the following comments: a) the streetscape does not show the interior street which will have an alley-like appearance with parking spaces and garages; b) she believes that most of the studies for the Residences at Sandpiper were done in 2001 and are no longer valid given the length of time that has passed; c) she believes that the environmental review of the site needs to be sufficient and specific, not general; d) from her experience, there are parking problems associated with narrow streets in a residential development which can also be hazardous at busy times; and f) from her observation of the elevations, the units look like two-story boxes with a little ornamentation.

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 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

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 16 of 18

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 concerned 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

- NONE

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA (CONTINUED TO END OF THE AGENDA)

B-4. CHAIR & VICE-CHAIR ELECTIONS

Member Schneider nominated Vice Chair Wignot for the position of DRB Chair.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to elect Vice Chair Wignot to the position of DRB Chair.

Member Brown nominated Member Smith for the position of DRB Vice Chair.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to elect Member Smith to the position of DRB Vice Chair.

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Vice Chair Wignot requested a future agenda item to discuss the appropriateness of the Director of Planning and Environmental Services speaking to the DRB on behalf of an applicant today prior to the beginning of Item M-1.

After discussion regarding the request by Vice Chair Wignot, an agenda item was scheduled for May 28, 2008, for a discussion amongst the DRB members. Member Brown and Member Schneider stated that after the discussion it may be appropriate for the Chair to speak with the Director of Planning and Environmental Services on behalf of the DRB.

Member Brown requested a future agenda item to discuss the DRB subcommittees.

After discussion, an agenda item to discuss DRB subcommittees was scheduled for May 28, 2008, rather than May 13, 2008, because two members indicated they will be absent from the May 13th meeting.

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Chair Branch announced that he will volunteer to stay on the Consent Calendar Subcommittee.

Vice Chair Wignot suggested that it would be appropriate to have the expertise of an architect on the Consent Calendar.

Member Wignot announced that he will not be present at the DRB meeting on May 13, 2008.

Member Brown announced that she will not be present at the DRB meeting on May 13, 2008.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz expressed appreciation on behalf of staff to Member Messner and Member Schneider for their service on the DRB and reapplying for continued service. He congratulated Member Wignot on his election to the position of Chair and Member Smith on his election to the position of Vice Chair, and thanked Member Branch for his service as Chair and Member Wignot for his service as Vice Chair for the past year.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 18 of 18

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz announced that the City of Santa Monica is conducting an Expo on alternative building materials at the Santa Monica Civic Center on April 25 and 26, 2008.

Member Herrera announced that he is involved in a project to send two soccer teams of children under sixteen years old to an international soccer tournament in Mexico in June and that the children have been participating in activities to raise funds in the community, for example, by mowing the grove by the train station, and also volunteering for community service such as beach clean-up.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 6:47 P.M.

Minutes approved on May 13, 2008.



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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
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)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Wignot at 3:00 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Bob Wignot, Chair; Thomas Smith, Vice Chair; Scott Branch; Cecilia Brown; *Chris Messner; and Carl Schneider. *Member Messner entered the meeting at 3:07 p.m.

Board Members absent: Simon Herrera.

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 2 of 13

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Laura Bridley, Contract Planner; David Stone, Contract Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for May 28, 2008

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Abstain: Schneider; Absent: Herrera, Messner) to approve the Design Review Board meeting minutes for May 28, 2008, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Member Wignot reported that the next Subcommittee meeting will be held on June 24, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) there have been no Planning Commission or City Council actions related to DRB items since the last DRB meeting; and 2) in response to a DRB request, staff is in the process of compiling the number of individual sign permits and overall sign plans that have been reviewed by the DRB since the City's incorporation as well as technical information with regard to documents that would need to be changed if there is an interest in the creation of a different sign committee.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT

No speakers.

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the applicant for Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 37-SB-DRB, Cabrillo Business Park, 6767 Hollister Avenue, requested a continuance to July 22, 2008; and the applicant for Item N-1, DRB Permit No. 05-037-DRB, Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange, requested a continuance to July 22, 2008.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera), to continue Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 37-SB-DRB, Cabrillo Business Park, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to July 22, 2008, per the applicant's request; and to continue Item N-1, DRB Permit No. 05-037-DRB, Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange, to July 22, 2008, per the applicant's request.

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 3 of 13

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he met with the applicant and Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz today and reviewed Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive.

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)

Consent Calendar Review Speaker:

Julie Dyer, neighbor, expressed concern with regard to smoke from the proposed fire pit and Bar-B-Que. She believes the smoke is air pollution and needs to be considered by the City with regard to future impacts on the neighborhood.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz advised the speaker that her concern is outside the jurisdiction of the DRB, but it will be considered during the Land Use Permit process for this project.

ACTION: Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he met today with the applicant and Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz and reviewed the plans for Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, 05-095-DRB, that the applicant complied with the conditions of approval that the colors

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

shall be called out on the plans and that the driveway paving materials shall be consistent; and further reported that Final approval was granted as submitted.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz clarified that the recommendation from the DRB for a notice to property owner, which would restrict access and use of the carport roof unless for temporary repair and maintenance, will be considered as a condition of approval during the Land Use Permit process. He stated that the applicant has agreed with the concept and that staff will report back to the DRB at a future meeting during the Planning Director's Report on the status of the DRB recommendation for a notice to property owner.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

- NONE

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

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)

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 5 of 13

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera), to continue Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 37-SB-DRB, Cabrillo Business Park, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to July 22, 2008, per the applicant's request.

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.

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-

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 6 of 13

GPA, 07-007-RZ, 07-007-DP, 07-007-TPM (Continued from 6-19-07, 5-01-07) (Laura Bridley)

Laura Bridley, Contract Planner, provided an overview of the staff report. She provided photographs of the story poles which were installed by the applicant.

The plans were presented Tony Wrozek, R.D. Olson Development, and members of the project team including Gene Fong, project architect; Robert Schmidt, Penfield & Smith, project civil engineer; Jane Gray, Dudek and Associates; and Katie O'Reilly Rogers, project landscape architect; on behalf of 6300 Hollister Avenue, property owners and R.D. Olson. Tony Wrozek stated that the major revision to the project as a result of the last Planning Commission review was the relocation of the front southeast wing from the Locus 1 area to the rear of the project at the northwest corner of the site. He stated that the room count remains the same and the square footage is slightly reduced. Gene Fong, project architect, stated that the story poles were installed to reflect the finished grade. In response to a question from Member Brown, he clarified that the building was not designed to support the sign that is shown on the front elevation of the plans. Robert Schmidt, Penfield & Smith, stated that a can and will serve letter has been received from the Goleta Sanitary District on the basis of whether a lift station will be modified and moved. Katie O'Reilly Rogers, stated that the proposed landscaping palette has not changed since the previous review. She pointed out that the projects' archaeological consultant, David Stone, requested that no landscaping that has roots greater than two feet be planted in the southeast corner. She clarified that the proposed sidewalk material is the standard for the City of Santa Barbara, although it may be possible to add some color.

SPEAKER:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, commented: a) the dumpster space should be somewhat larger with regard to the number of rooms; b) the dumpster and the transformer along Robin Hill Road need to be shown in the west elevations; c) requested clarification regarding whether the heights of the story poles are above finished floor or finished grade; d) suggested that the proposed signs be considered with anticipation of future activity; e) the project looks better with the movement of the mass from the southeast corner to the northwest corner; f) the size of the building is marginally bigger when compared with the building size in April, 2008; g) there are procedures that need to be followed if an American flag is flown on the flagpole, noting that there are certain circumstances when is required; h) the front elevation looks fine and the other three elevations appear industrial and fairly plain but are acceptable considering the building is located in an industrial area; and i) he believes there needs to be consideration that the size of the building is too big for the neighborhood and community, and needs to be somewhat scaled back.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) the removal of the southeast portion of the building is a good change and it addressed some concerns at the previous review; b) the overall mass, bulk and scale is fine, noting that when he visited the story poles today he observed that the three-story portions are set quite a ways back

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 7 of 13

- from Hollister Avenue; c) expressed concern that there are some landscaping restrictions at the southeast corner, suggesting consideration of the use of vines, and also the possibility of planting bigger entry trees near Hollister Avenue, to help soften the southeast corner; d) suggested consideration of adding some type of Chumash cultural and/or educational element, noting that the lobby area may open up to the open space area; e) for an example of a cultural element, there is a strip along a building at UCSB that he recently viewed while riding his bike; f) screening plans for the dumpster will need to be provided at some point; g) suggested consideration of the use of some enhanced materials for the sidewalks; and h) overall, the project is fine.
2. Member Brown commented: a) expressed appreciation that the applicant installed story poles that are very detailed and which give a good indication of the size, bulk, scale and height of the building; b) the new site plan is much better, and the changes are appreciated, but she believes that the building seems large amongst its neighbor buildings and needs to fit in a little better, particularly with the building to the east; c) with regard to the building height, she would like to see some of the height of the highest gable taken out; d) requested consideration of incorporating some design elements from the Chumash culture; e) expressed her support with regard to the eastern wall of the lobby looking out into a landscaped area; f) the dumpster area may need to be bigger if there is a need to incorporate recycle bins; g) the utility and backflow devices will need to be restudied and shown on the site plan; and h) it appears that the awnings are a design element rather than for shading purposes, particularly for the northern elevation.
 3. Member Branch commented: a) pushing back the southeast corner of the building helps the project although its unfortunate that trees can't be planted there; b) encouraged the applicant to explore incorporating some form of cultural homage with regard to the archaeological site; c) there is a better articulation of the architectural forms as viewed when passing by the site, and the courtyard with the pool provides for some articulation; d) the building is big; however, it is located in an area that affords the size; e) when looking at the south elevation, the proposed building is higher than the adjacent building, but it is a different style and there is a fair amount of space between the buildings; f) the gable at the porte cochere and where the sign is located seem somewhat bare, and suggested consideration of a treatment to help the roofline not be so bare, such as a rake that throws a shadow, although it is not consistent with the architectural style; and g) with regard to the southeast corner, the renderings do not show that a roof is probably the same pitch as the rest of the building, and suggested studying that this roof pitch be steeper which would show more roof tile.
 4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) moving the front wing from the southeast corner to the northwest corner is appreciated; b) the size, bulk and scale of the project is fine; c) agreed with Member Branch's comments with regard to the roof on the southeast corner; d) agreed with Member Schneider's comments with regard to the lobby opening up to the open space area, and suggested mirroring the locations of the sales and administration offices with the meeting rooms; e) he has not heard that the Chumash have used stone materials but possibly sandstone walls would be appropriate; and g) agreed with comments made by Member Schneider and Member Branch.

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 8 of 13

5. Member Messner commented: a) the irrigation backflows as well as the main backflows and other equipment need to be screened, located out of the way, and shown on the plans; b) suggested consideration of solar power, noting that there are rebates especially for commercial projects; c) the pull-out for the bus stop is important to facilitate the flow of traffic; and d) observed that moving the sign from the front top of the building to the porte cochere area would have the illusion of the building being smaller instead of the sign being up high and bringing attention upward, although the signs are shown for informational purposes only at this review.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) suggested possible consideration that the building sign could potentially be relocated to the third floor of the eastern portion of the south elevation under a gable, and possibly that gable roof could be eliminated entirely and just have a hipped roof in that location; therefore, all of the projected roofing would be hipped; b) the east elevation, wrapping around to the south, seems very bland with the present color scheme, and suggested that some kind of color change be made to make the building appear less institutional; for example, adding a darker color in the recessed areas; c) the west elevation, wrapping around to the south, is much more interesting because of the use of different colors and stone; d) suggested that the porte cochere be extended southward to provide protection from rain and more shade on the south edge; e) suggested that the height of the porte cochere be lowered, stating that the height seems higher than needed; and f) the building sign seems very prominent and could be understated or relocated, although the signs are shown for informational purposes only at this review.

ACTION: There being no objections, Chair Wignot stated that Conceptual review of Item M-1, No. 07-007-DRB, has been concluded and that the item will be taken off calendar to continue through the process.

RECESS HELD: 4:17 P.M. TO 4:25 P.M.

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

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 9 of 13

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)

The plans were presented by the project team including Mark Scheurer, project architect; Katie O'Reilly Rogers, project landscape architect; and agent Mary Meaney Reichel, Lucon, Inc., on behalf of the Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership, property owner. Mark Scheurer explained the changes that were made in response to the previous DRB review and presented a conceptual site plan. He also provided conceptual floor plans for a new design for attached single-family units in a duplex building along with reference imagery samples of the attached single-family homes.

SPEAKER:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, stated that the redesign which now attaches the single family units is very helpful for providing more air and sunlight, and is a big step forward. However, he believes that the project is very dense for the property, and requested that consideration be given to getting a project that is good rather than "less bad". He still believes there needs to be a defined pathway between homes on the east and the west portions of the site for residents to move back and forth.

In response to a question from Member Brown regarding whether there could be a bridge and path across the open space in the center of the site on the southerly portion to connect the east and west portions, agent Mary Meaney Reichel stated that there is a pedestrian bridge and walkway that is currently proposed along the northern property line. Mary Meaney Reichel clarified that when the original project was submitted to the County, there was a walkway and pedestrian bridge proposed in the general location in question on the site plan; however, during the review process there was much interest by staff and the public that the bridge and path be relocated to the northern property line, which was done in response by the applicant.

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 10 of 13

Charles Lande, the Chadmar Group, stated that the applicant has presented a proposal with regard to the location of the bridge and path and that if the DRB has a recommendation to change the proposal, the DRB may suggest a recommendation for consideration.

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller stated that staff recommends that the DRB make comments and/or recommendations regarding items of DRB interest. If the recommendations affect planning and/or environmental issues, these would be sorted out during processing.

Mary Meaney Reichel stated that the applicant's intention is that the plans submitted for today's review would meet the requirements for Conceptual review.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that staff recommends that the applicant provide the architecture plans for DRB comments with regard to both aesthetics purposes and neighborhood compatibility which will be helpful as the project moves forward for environmental review. He stated that typically this type of information is provided at the Conceptual level for larger projects.

Overall General Comments of Majority of DRB Members:

1. The applicant is requested to provide a full site plan and conceptual landscaping and architectural plans. (An aerial photograph is requested for reference purposes.)
2. The applicant is requested to address all DRB comments including previous reviews.
- 3, The applicant is requested to address the DRB recommendation that a raised boardwalk and path be added through the open space area in the center of the site, noting that this is a strong recommendation by a majority of members.
4. The DRB strongly recommends that the fire road on the west side of the eastern cluster goes through in order to provide a loop for vehicular access.
5. The DRB expressed appreciation for the changes made by the applicant which are a good improvement for the project.

Comments of Individual DRB Members:

1. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) expressed appreciation for the changes in the arrangement of the structures with regard to the design, layout and groupings, which are very creative.
2. Member Branch commented: a) the changes make the project much better; b) expressed appreciation that the plans now show that the guest parking is more obvious as a guest parking situation; c) suggested studying whether it is possible to move the units so that guests could park in the depth of the driveway for units that are far enough away from the parking clusters; d) strongly recommended that the fire road on the west side of the east cluster goes through to provide a loop for vehicular access; e) strongly recommended that there is a bridge through the center of the open space, which has been suggested previously by the DRB; and

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 11 of 13

- f) pulling back the plans will read well from Hollister Avenue and provide space between the units which will allow for the change of architectural styles.
3. Member Brown commented: a) agreed with the comments from Vice Chair Smith and Member Branch; b) expressed appreciation that the project feels more like a community and a neighborhood; c) even though the units are attached, the idea of separating living areas from the attached units is appreciated; d) the new site plan is much more interesting; e) the increased open space is appreciated; f) the side-loaded garages are great because it allows for more of a welcoming presentation of the house and front door/patio area; g) increasing the size of driveways to a full size is recommended; h) a pedestrian bridge and walkway connecting the east and west portions of the project through the open space area would be useful and important; i) she looks forward to reviewing the architecture style and liked the last design that was submitted; j) she supports the building concepts which she believes would work, particularly the attached single-family conceptual floor plans; k) with the buildings located opposite one another, there may be privacy issues to consider; l) while sound walls do provide a function, there is more of an open feel without having a sound wall; and m) the sidewalks will need to be shown with the landscape plans.
 4. Member Schneider commented: a) the changes are a great improvement in the site plan, including not having the entries in the back side along the western property line, and the project is moving in a good direction; b) it is critical that an elevated boardwalk be allowed across the open space area to connect the east and west portions of the site and provide access; c) the proposed bridge and path along the northern property line should remain for access purposes as well as the addition of a boardwalk across the center open space area; d) the fire road on the west side of the east cluster should go through in order to provide a loop for access, however, the pavement treatment should be different for the portion of the road through the open space area that acknowledges the road runs through an open space area; e) the other fire access road should have pavement material such as Grasscrete that would blend with the landscape but indicate the road would only be used for fire access; f) the single-access point for vehicles on the east works well particularly with the view of the open space when entering the site; g) suggested that some landscaping be added to soften the view at the west entrance which currently has two parking spaces and a garage; h) the turn-in garages, particularly the dual turn-in garages, work very well; i) expressed some concern regarding parking and suggested lengthening the driveways when possible to provide for guest parking; j) the photographs provided have full-length driveways, not short driveways; k) the architecture should be reviewed during Conceptual review; l) the applicant is requested to provide a aerial photograph of the larger area for reference purposes; and m) requested that staff address the issue with regard to the City's plans for Las Armas Road.
 5. Member Messner commented: a) the fire road on the west side of the east cluster should go through in order to provide a loop for access, and suggested adding some type of thick wood bridge for the portion of the fire road across the open space area that would blend well with the bridge and walkway which is requested to be located across the center open space area and would allow passage underneath; b) strongly supported an elevated boardwalk across the open space area to connect the east and west portions of the site; c) suggested that lawn be

possibly added in the areas between the two buildings that may be used by children for play; d) the use of the appropriate tree species, sizes and heights, needs to be considered to facilitate the flow and ambience of the project site; e) suggested considering the use of the large square style pavement in some of the areas between the homes, which is shown in the first photograph in the conceptual site plan document; and f) the utility boxes, backflows and irrigation check valves should be screened and shown on the landscape plan.

6. Chair Wignot commented: a) agreed with the DRB members that the layout presented today is an improvement from the plan that had more single-family residences; however, he still has some problems, particularly with the traffic circulation pattern and parking; b) with regard to parking, it does not appear that there is the ability to park a full-length sedan or truck in the short driveways and the on-street parking appears to be limited for full-size vans or pick-up trucks; c) not allowing the road to go through on the western end of the eastern portion of the site would be awkward for deliveries and trash collection trucks, and would result in constraints for vehicle users; and noted that he prefers two access points off of Las Armas Road; d) the traffic circulation on the eastern portion needs to be improved, and the western traffic circulation is marginally better; e) he commented in general that he believes there are a lot of people in an area that has limited egress in the event of an emergency, for example, if there was a need to evacuate, and noted that this project would be one of the closest residential projects to Venoco, although this may not be within the purview of the DRB; f) he does not understand why public opposition with regard to adding anything in the middle of the open space area has not been put on the table; and g) suggested consideration that a sound wall may be needed along Hollister Avenue.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera) to continue Item M-1, No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road, with comments, to July 8, 2008, with the comments from this meeting and the previous DRB reviews.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

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

Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange

This is a request for further *Advisory* review. The proposed project includes the removal of the existing Cathedral Oaks Road/Hollister Avenue/US Highway 101 bridge over U.S. Highway 101 and bridge over Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and the construction of new bridges to align with the existing terminus of Cathedral Oaks Road. The proposed overcrossing (US Highway 101) and overhead (UPRR) bridges would accommodate a 12-foot vehicle lane in each direction, one 12-foot center left turn pocket lane/median, 5-foot shoulders/bike lanes in each direction, and a 6-foot sidewalk located on the west side. The project was filed by Caltrans, in association with the City of Goleta. (Last heard on 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)

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Approved

June 10, 2008

Page 13 of 13

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera), to continue Item N-1, DRB Permit No. 05-037-DRB, Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange, to July 22, 2008, per the applicant's request.

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Chair Wignot requested a future agenda item for general discussion regarding site constraints and impacts this has on a proposed development's density.

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Vice Chair Smith announced that due to a change in plans he will be able to attend the DRB meeting on July 8, 2008.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 5:31 P.M.

Minutes approved on July 8, 2008.



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, July 22, 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)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Wignot at 3:00 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Bob Wignot, Chair; Thomas Smith, Vice Chair; *Scott Branch; **Cecilia Brown; Simon Herrera; Chris Messner; and Carl Schneider. *Member Branch exited the meeting at 8:30 p.m. **Member Brown exited the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Board Members absent: None.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Planning

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 2 of 21

Technician; Rosemarie Gaglione, Capital Improvement Program Manager; David Stone, Contract Planner; Laura Bridley, Contract Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for July 8, 2008

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Abstain: Schneider) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for July 8, 2008, as submitted.

***MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Herrera and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Abstain: Schneider; Absent: Branch, Brown) to reconsider approval of the Design Review Board Minutes for July 8, 2008, with regard to Item M-1, No. 04-226-DRB, and approve the minutes as amended. *(Note: This item was considered during Agenda Item O. Discussion Items).**

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the Street Tree Subcommittee met today and discussed the Urban Forestry Management Plan and Nursery Standards. He said that the Subcommittee continued the following items to the next meeting which will be at 2:00 p.m. on August 26, 2008: Nursery Standards and Items in the General Plan Related to the Urban Forest.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) the Planning Commission reviewed the Rincon Palms Hotel project on July 21, 2008, and recommended approval of the project to the City Council; and 2) on August 18, 2008, and September 15, 2008, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., joint meetings of the Design Review Board and the Planning Commission will be held to discuss building intensity standards.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported that the applicant for Item F-1, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, requested a continuance to September 23, 2008.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item F-1, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to September 23, 2008, as requested by the applicant.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 3 of 21

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-059-DRB

5575 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-090-085)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes 14 Housing Authority apartments known as Grossman Homes, as well as management and maintenance offices on a 2.43 acre lot in the Design Residential (DR-20) zone district. The applicant requests a two lot subdivision to subdivide the parcel into two parcels of 2.19 acres (Parcel 1) and .24 acres (Parcel 2), and an amendment to a previously approved Development Plan which would allow the construction of a community center for the residents of the Grossman Homes on Parcel 1, the Miller Community Center, and an additional single-family dwelling, The Braddock House, on Parcel 2. The community center would be 16'3" tall and total 1,536 square feet. The Braddock House would be 16'5" tall and total 2,755 square feet and would be used as a Special Care Facility to provide semi-independent living for up to four (4) developmentally disabled adults. Access is provided via an existing 25' wide driveway from Armitos Avenue. The Goleta Water District and Goleta Sanitary District would continue to provide water and sewer service to the site. Modifications from the requirements of the zoning ordinance are being requested for the number of parking spaces, parking areas setbacks, and landscaping. The project was filed by the County of Santa Barbara Housing Authority, property owner. Related cases: 83-DP-014. (Continued from 6-24-08*, 4-22-08, 3-25-08, 2-26-08, 9-18-07, 08-21-07) (Cindy Moore)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item F-1, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to September 23, 2008, as requested by the applicant.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

- NONE

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-136-DRB

7410 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-064)

This is a request for *Revised 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 original project consisted of exterior building improvements and a new landscape plan on the eastern parcel of the HBP. The applicant now proposes to enclose an aluminum canopy structure adjacent to the

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 4 of 21

Employee Activity Center building. The proposed enclosed space would have a floor area of 2,423 square feet. The height of the new enclosure would be 14'-9". Materials for the enclosure would consist of aluminum framing and glass. 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: 08-136-LUP RV. (Shine Ling)

Site visits: Made by all members.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. He stated that the gym equipment contractors have advised that they could not guaranty the equipment if it was not enclosed. Therefore, the applicant now proposes to enclose an aluminum canopy structure adjacent to the Employee Activity Center building.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Revised Final approval of Item I-1, No. 08-136-DRB, 7410 Hollister Avenue, as submitted.

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

CHANGE ORDER OF AGENDA

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to change the order of the agenda to consider Discussion Item O-1 Separate Sign Committee Letter Review/Discussion.

RECESS HELD: 3:19 P.M. TO 3:21 P.M.

CHANGE ORDER OF AGENDA

There being no objections, Chair Wignot changed the order of the agenda to consider Item L-1, No. 08-108-DRB, 475, Camino Laguna Vista.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

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

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 5 of 21

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 6-10-08*, 4-22-08, 4-20-04, 3-16-04, 2-17-04*, 1-6-04, 12-2-03) (Cindy Moore)

Site visits: Made by all members.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller provided new information regarding the project which was originally approved by the City Council in May, 2007, after several Conceptual reviews by the DRB. She stated that after implementation of the project, the applicant has recognized that for market reasons it is necessary to reconfigure some of the footprints along Hollister Avenue and has applied for a Development Plan Amendment for this purpose which is being processed by staff. The reconfiguration will not increase the net square footage of the project. The purpose of the review today will be to consider the proposed reconfiguration for the implementation phase for Buildings 1, 2 and 4.

The plans were presented by Troy White, with agent Dudek, and the project team members, on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC, property owner, including Steve Fedde and Russ Goodman of the Sares Regis Group; Derek Kitigashi, project architect; Don Donaldson, project civil engineer; and Lauri Romano and Bob Cunningham, project landscape architects. Troy White stated that the applicant is committed to respecting the wetlands to the greatest extent regarding the sidewalk plans along Los Carneros.

Documents: Chair Wignot stated that an e-mail was received from Gary Vandeman dated June 9, 2008, suggesting that the applicant commit to the removal of any invasive Pampas Grass located on the property.

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the current proposed location for the Goleta Water District backflow preventer is the preferred location, noting that the equipment would be pushed back as far from the curb as possible, and that the current location shown is in the realm of forty feet; b) the backflow preventer equipment should be landscaped; c) requested that the applicant provide more details regarding the lighting plan, including cut sheets and lighting elements; and d) requested a better understanding with regard to the poles with the lighting standards.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) suggested that the water feature be pulled back and not so far into the parking lot; b) expressed support for the proposed

location for the backflow preventer equipment; and c) the changes are fine and the project is looking very nice.

3. Member Branch commented: a) the boldness of the cobalt blue color is appreciated and the muted blue color is not attractive; b) agreed with Member Schneider's recommendation to move the water feature into the center of the landscape element; c) agreed with the DRB members' suggestion to move the water backflow preventer equipment as far off from the street as possible.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) agreed with previous comments from members with regard to the location of the backflow preventer and moving the water feature; b) expressed appreciation for the changes on the Hollister Street frontage on Building 1, stating that the building is very nice and pays some homage to the original Delco Building located up the street by having the building step, and with the glass wrapping the corners.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with DRB comments recommending moving the backflow preventer from the sidewalk and relocating the water feature; and b) the building design is appreciated.
6. Member Messner commented: a) noted that he believes that the water fountain does not necessarily need to be brought into the center, stating that he would prefer off-center; and b) the bus stop needs to have a pull-out for the bus to facilitate traffic flow.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) the project continues to move in a very good direction; b) the changes respond to the DRB comments from the previous meeting; c) recommended that the applicant refer to the City's current Recommended Street Tree List with regard to planting trees in the right-of-way; d) the suggestion that some of the existing palm trees be re-located to the median on Hollister Avenue would not comply with the City's recommended list; e) expressed support for the public comment suggestion removal of the pampas grass; e) agreed with the DRB comments supporting the location shown for the backflow preventer; and f) the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-1, No. 37-SB-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, with comments; and to continue to September 23, 2008, for Final review on the Final Calendar by the full DRB.

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-108-DRB

475 Camino Laguna Vista (APN 077-422-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,576-square foot residence and an attached 423-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,250-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 179.5 square feet in additions on the first-floor as well as to permit an as-built 205-square foot patio cover. The resulting 2-story structure would be 3,383.5 square feet, consisting of a 2755.5-square foot single-family dwelling with an attached 205-square foot patio cover, and an attached 423-square foot 2-car garage. All materials used for this project aside from the doors, windows, and exterior lighting are to match the existing residence. Details of new doors and new exterior lighting can be found within

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 7 of 21

the plan set. The project was filed by agent Martha Gray on behalf of Stacey & Alex Matson, property owners. Related cases: None. (Brian Hiefield)

Site visits: Made by all members except Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, Smith.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Stacey & Alex Matson, property owners,

Comments:

1. Chair Wignot commented: a) the scale on the east elevation needs to be checked because there is a possible error; b) some of the elevations were difficult to discern because some features were not shown, for example the chimney and bay window are not shown on the west elevation; c) the arched window on the east elevation seems out of proportion and too big for the space; for example, possibly the gable peak should be higher so there is more space.
2. Member Branch commented: a) overall, this is a nice project, it is not ostentatious and will fit with the neighborhood; b) suggested studying the arched windows on the east elevation which seem out of proportion with the mass; and c) the roof of the bay window appears odd with no eaves.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) agreed with comments made by Members Branch and Wignot; b) the Palladia window on the east elevation should be restudied, for example, consider two bays for the window underneath the arch with a wider window, with some kind of thicker separation, so the arch looks like it is coming down on something that supports it, which would be more in proportion (raising the plate higher than ten feet would seem odd); and c) the project is tucked within the footprint.
4. Member Schneider commented: a) agreed with comments by Members Branch, Smith and Wignot; b) the drawings need to show the patio cover in the rear; c) he does not have a concern regarding the square footage.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 08-108-DRB, 475 Camino Laguna Vista, as submitted with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall restudy the proportions of the new front windows; 2) the applicant shall potentially study the roof over the bay window of the dining room; 3) the patio cover in the rear shall be added to the elevations; and 4) the applicant shall provide landscape plans for Final review; and to continue to August 12, 2008, for Final review on the Final Calendar by the full DRB.

RECESS HELD FROM 4:43 P.M. TO 4:48 P.M.

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 *Conceptual* review. The project site is undeveloped. The applicant proposes a new 8,184-square foot, three-story Islamic Center. The

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 8 of 21

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 Wahiduzzaman, Mukhtar Khan and Ken Mineau as owner representatives. Related cases: 03-051-CUP, 03-051-DP. (Last heard on 6-24-08*, 5-28-08, 4-8-08*, 2-12-08*, 01-23-08*, 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz distributed plans that were submitted as of July 9, 2008, which were available for review by members of the public. He stated that the applicant would like to submit a revised set of plans today that the public has not had a chance to review.

Ken Mineau, owner representative for the Islamic Society of Santa Barbara, applicant, and property owner, stated that the revised plans have some minor changes that include the addition of details on the site plan with regard to parking for clarification, and the addition of trees and a driveway; however, both plans are essentially the same.

The DRB members decided to review the revised plans submitted today by the applicant, based on the applicant's description of the minor revisions.

Chair Wignot stated that a set of the plans submitted today by the applicant are available in the Council Chambers for review by the public.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 9 of 21

Ex-parte conversations: None reported since the last meeting.

The plans were presented by Ken Mineau, and Mukhtar Khan, as owner representatives for the Islamic Society of Santa Barbara, applicant and property owner. Ken Mineau provided an historical review of the project plans. He stated that since the last DRB meeting there was a work session with Fermina Murray and Ronald Nye, of the Goleta Valley Historical Society, and the neighbors at the Stow House. He said the participants believe that the school house image with the rustic vernacular and gabled ends was reminiscent of the Stow House style. He noted that the neighbors preferred a style that was simpler in massing. One of the results of the meeting was that all of the residence square footage was moved from the second story to the first floor. Ken Mineau also stated that the proposed plans are within all of the setbacks, that the parking requirements are met, and the orientation meets the Islamic Center requirements. He clarified that the northernmost section where the kites travel would remain open. The building would be nestled back into the trees. The parking lot would be permeable and would blend as it moves toward Stowe Park. The applicant plans to meet again with the representatives from the Goleta Valley Historical Society with regard to architectural finishes. Mukhtar Khan clarified that the residence is needed so that someone can be onsite who would facilitate the Islamic requirements for a sacred space. He stated that the most anticipated need for parking would be on Fridays from 1:15 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.

Documents: E-mail from Craig Geyer, dated July 21, 2008, expressing concerns regarding number of parking spaces and the method used to calculate parking requirements. The letter also expresses concern that the project is too big for the site and that no reciprocal parking agreement has been accommodated.

Speakers:

Ronald Nye, architectural historian and former president of the Goleta Valley Historical Society, stated that he continues to have concerns regarding the size, bulk and scale of the building at the location which is adjacent to an historic and architectural preserve. He also has strong concerns regarding the viewscape when exiting the freeway moving north towards Los Carneros Road, and the stylistic compatibility with the rural architectural tradition of Goleta. He stated that the style in this particular area is almost completely gabled and has organic materials such as stucco siding and board and bat in the older buildings. Having reviewed the revised plans and talking with the project architect, he is pleased with the direction of the project moving towards a more vernacular look that may be more compatible with the surrounding existing built environment. He looks forward to viewing more drawings and elevations. He clarified that he would prefer a board and bat material; however, a natural-looking material and color would be acceptable. i

Joe Kovach, Goleta, representing himself and his wife, Geri, stated that along with a number of residents in the Lake Los Carneros Tract, they question the overall size of the project in relation to the size of the lot. He asked questions with regard to traffic circulation and whether a traffic signal would be installed. He stated that it seems that

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 10 of 21

42 parking spaces would not be adequate for the project, stating that they would need to be parking for visitors. He also expressed concern regarding parking in the dirt.

Norma Geyer, Goleta, stated that her concern from the beginning of the project has been parking and that from her research, she believes 42 parking spaces are not enough. As a resident approximately three blocks away, she said that there is overflow parking in her neighborhood when there are events at the Stow House. She conducted a small research at the former meeting location and was told by a neighbor that there approximately 70 persons would attend who were allowed to park both in the front and back lot which had 58 spaces, and that once the lot was filled they would park on Aero Camino. She and her husband counted 75 people entering the current meeting place last week. She strongly recommended that the City's parking ordinance be followed which requires one parking space for every thirty feet of auditorium. She believes that if all the square footage of the building was counted, the total would be 4,295 s.f. which would require 143 parking spaces by ordinance. For example, she believes that the County counts the square footage for the prayer area, lecture hall, dining hall, meeting room and entry court.

Craig Geyer, Goleta, expressed concern regarding parking, stating that the size of the lot is not adequate for the size, bulk and scale of the building. He presented the following results from his research monitoring the current meeting site for four weeks: 5/30/08 75 persons 62 cars; 6/06/08 79 persons 67 cars; 6/13/08 72 persons 60 cars; and 6/20/08 68 persons 63 cars. He believes that with regard to the parking ordinance, all public gathering space needs to be taken into account, and at a minimum, 111 parking spaces would be needed. He does not think it is appropriate to add a building to this location that does not provide adequate parking. He noted that no reciprocal parking agreement has been accommodated. He believes that the viewscape when exiting the freeway is an issue with regard to the building. Also, he believes that the present proposed location of the building seems to be more appropriate.

Comments:

General Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the revised plans are an improvement; b) the idea of blending the project with the trees and the preserve is appreciated; c) a small percentage of square footage should be reduced; d) possibly consider consolidating some of the spaces in the building to reduce the size; e) the applicant is requested to provide elevations and show the view of the project when driving up Los Carneros; f) suggested planting grasses in the parking area; and g) conjunctive use parking may be required further in the review process by the decision-makers.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) the building has been reduced and lowered since the original review; b) the applicant needs to provide elevations for review; c) the one-story element and proposed massing seems to be workable and will help soften the project to the Calle Real side; d) the applicant's work with Fermina Murray and Ronald Nye has been positive; e) the proposed forms, including the

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 11 of 21

- expression of the octagon to the east, are good; f) the applicant should have the discretion with regard to proposed materials such as board and bat, or plaster; and g) conceptually, the project is moving in as best direction as possible for the site.
3. Member Branch commented: a) the reduction of the building from a three-story structure to two-stories addressed his initial concern regarding the overall massing of the project; b) the revised site plan with the one-story element to the street, and the building tucked into the trees and away from the kite flight path is the best solution; and c) the parking issue will need to be resolved by staff - for example, there has been public input with regard to the criteria, and the DRB should base its review on staff's recommendation.
 4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) the reduction in height of the building is appreciated; b) the revised site plan seems to work; c) the changes in the style with the gable end at one side, which still incorporate the octagonal shape in the rear; are fine; d) expressed some concern regarding the discrepancies with regard to parking criteria and methodology; and e) the building itself is moving in a good direction but the applicant needs to provide elevations and more details.
 5. Member Herrera commented: a) the two-story structure is appreciated rather than the three-story design; b) he appreciates that the building is now moved closer to the trees and suggested selecting a color that would blend in better with the trees and landscaping; and c) recommended a bioswale to filter the water coming from the parking lot before it enters the preserve area.
 6. Member Messner commented: a) he has concerns about parking problems with regard to Finding 20; b) he believes that an updated, not outdated, traffic study is needed; c) he also has some concern with regard to Finding 18 because of safety issues that relate to parking and busy traffic; and d) the reduction in height of the building is appreciated.
 7. Chair Wignot commented: a) agreed with DRB comments in favor of the reduction of the building's size, bulk and scale; b) moving the mass from the southwest corner to the southeast corner is a better position for the building; c) the schoolhouse vernacular style is more compatible with the neighborhood; d) suggested selecting colors that are similar to the existing adjacent commercial building that are more earth-tone and would help the building blend with the neighborhood; e) the location of the trash and recycling receptacles, and utilities, need to be provided by the applicant; f) the traffic study needs to be updated along with review of the parking situation, which is very important; g) if parking is adequate now, it seems like some sort of reciprocal agreement will be needed in the future if the number of members increases; h) suggested consideration with regard to whether the businesses on adjacent properties have parking needs until the end of the day on Fridays; and i) there seems to be a tight situation for motorists to move in and out of the parking spaces at the southwest corner in front of the building.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, to August 26, 2008, with the applicant to provide elevations and respond to comments.

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 6-10-08, 4-22-08, 3-25-08) (David Stone)

Ex-parte conversations: Member Schneider reported that he met with Mark Scheurer, project architect, since the last review meeting, relative to architectural style.

The plans were presented by agent Mary Meaney Reichel, Lucon Inc., on behalf of the Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership, property owner. She stated that since the last meeting, the plans have been revised by the applicant per the DRB comments. She discussed a sheet that she prepared listing all comments from the last three DRB hearings, and pointed out how the comments were addressed. She stated that there are also a few items from the DRB reviews that will be addressed as

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 13 of 21

the project moves forward, such as drip irrigation vs. spray, tree sizes and species, tree pockets, screening of utility boxes, mutt mitts, mail boxes, bike path along Hollister Avenue, and completion of the lighting plan. She stated that that applicant intends that the information presented today is sufficient for Conceptual review to allow the project to move forward with the processing.

Mary Meaney Reichel presented and discussed a document entitled “Haskell’s Landing, Goleta, California, Chadmar Group, Scheurer Architects”, which was submitted by the applicant on July 15, 2008. Highlights from the presentation and the document included:

- a. Aerial photograph showing the project site as it related to surrounding properties.
- b. Revised Site Plan showing a continuous driving surface regarding the fire safety link with an alternative paving. Permeable pavers will be used in ancillary guest parking spaces as well as in the duplex configuration and motor court design. The emergency egress surface material will be grasscrete for identification purposes. The two parking spaces at the western entrance were relocated, and the western entry area is now landscaped.
- c. Building Type Plan.
- d. Project Summary regarding unit counts and size.
- e. Open Space Plan.
- f. Pedestrian Circulation Plan showing the proposed pedestrian path linking the east and west side with a pedestrian bridge, and retaining the existing pedestrian path along the northern property line.
- g. Parking Plan showing that more parking was provided on the east side. Also, some units were moved to provide an opportunity for residents to park on the driveway; however these numbers are not utilized with regard to compliance for parking. Mary Meaney Reichel stated that the code requirement is exceeded for parking on this site. Permeable pavers would be used in motor court areas.
- h. Solar Shading Study (showing four timeframes during the year).
- i. Duplex configuration elevations showing streetscape along Hollister Avenue.
- j. Duplex Homes and Floor Plans showing private yards and parking. The balconies will face the front and back of the homes to allow maximum privacy and provide for outdoor space on the second floor.
- k. Multi-Family Homes and Floor Plans showing conceptual architecture. Mary Reichel pointed out that the parabolic window on the front elevation of Building 11-B is a mistake that was intended to be removed in response to a previous DRB comment. It is not being carried forward in the design.

David Stone, Contract Planner, stated that the City has identified preliminary conditions for improvements to the eastern frontage of this project on Las Armas Road, including curb, gutter, and a cul-de-sac. These would be refined as the project review process continues, but it would appear that public parking would be accommodated on Las Armas Road adjacent to the project site.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 14 of 21

Speakers:

Dr. Ingeborg Cox, Goleta, read into the record a letter she submitted dated July 22, 2008, stating that she is concerned that the project has problems that will impact the health of its inhabitants. She expanded on her concerns with regard to excess noise and diesel exhaust, and fire and medical emergency response. She believes that Las Armas Road should be a major egress road and should be wider to take the overflow parking. Also, a current noise study for this project should be done as traffic has increased. She provided an article from the Air Pollution Control District entitled “Living Near Freeways Harms Children’s Lungs”, and an newspaper article concerning the safety of streets in Goleta due to narrow lanes.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, stated that during the project review timeframe, the size of a single family home has increased from 2,800 s.f. to 3,050 s.f., which is an increase of 250 square feet, and that the total square footage of the units has increased 3,050 square feet. With regard to a picture that was provided by the applicant which indicates narrow street widths promote slower and safer driving, Barbara Massey commented that this particular picture shows an area in Winchester Commons which, from her experience, does not slow traffic. She stated that when people park their vehicles on the street in this area, there are safety problems with regarding to emergency vehicles and pedestrians, and it is also unattractive. She recommended careful consideration of the proposed plans.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, commented that the recent Solar Shading Studies submitted by the applicant show that more air and sunlight are provided for the units in the revised plans. He believes that the units are very large and close together, and requested reconsideration regarding the density of the project.

Comments:

1. Member Herrera commented: a) the plans for the permeable pavers throughout the property is a big improvement since there are no bioswales for drainage; and b) the plans to combine the paths throughout the open space area is appreciated.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) the site plan is fine with the improvements; b) the continuous drive on the eastern loop should visually fit in with the open space landscaping by using similar or appropriate landscape materials, as opposed to the landscaping near the homes; c) the addition of landscaping at the western entrance, replacing two parking spaces, is more attractive; d) the pedestrian path and bridge connection is much appreciated; e) the Las Armas Road issue will need to be resolved by Community Services staff which will hopefully address grade problems and provide some form of on-street parking; f) the ribbon driveways that are long enough to allow parking, and the courtyards, will work well; g) the motor court design might function as parking from a short-term standpoint; h) the architecture for Building 2-C front is a Tuscan style which seems too formal; i) with regard to the overall architectural style, suggested moving away from the red roof tile architectural style to a style that is more agrarian which would fit more with Goleta and be somewhat different from The Bluffs project across the street; and j) recommended accepting the St. Augustine style, changing

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 15 of 21

the Monterey style roof to a shake style roof, changing the Rustic Farm House style roof to a flat tile roof; and eliminating the Spanish style red-tile roof altogether, changing the style to something that is more agrarian with a shake roof or board and bat style.

3. Member Branch commented: a) the site plan is improved and works relatively well; b) the extension of Las Armas Road, which would allow the street to be usable, would be good for the project; c) suggested that there are some two-story planes in the architecture that should be broken up; d) recommended changing the roof materials for the Monterey style from the red tile to something more agrarian which would be different from The Bluffs project across the street; and e) the St. Augustine style is fine.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) concurred with the comments from Members Branch and Schneider with regard to the Monterey style architecture; b) changing the roof material to shingle on the Monterey style would tie more with the St. Augustine style; c) suggested varying the roof materials; d) architecturally, the two-story vertical areas are not a concern because there are some designs with articulation; e) the revised plans showing the units combined together is helpful; and f) the pedestrian pathway through the center open space area and the changes with regard to parking are appreciated.
5. Member Messner commented: a) recommended that the openings at the entryways be widened on both ends to accommodate traffic entering and exiting; particularly with the center divider; b) the color tones of St. Augustine blends well with the landscaping; and c) expressed concern that the red roof tiles seem to pop-out, and suggested flat tiles and colors that blend.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) the applicant has provided a great amount of information for review; b) he pointed out that there is a potential need for some sort of sound wall along Hollister Avenue, particularly for the homes along the western end of the complex, with regard to the proposed new Highway 101 crossing and on-ramp, and proposed projects in the area; c) in his opinion, the roof elevation that is projecting out appears odd with regard to the Monterey style; and d) requested the applicant provide an aerial photograph showing a simulation of the revised project with the roads and buildings to compare with adjacent project; and e) requested staff report back on: a) potential plans to relocate the Venoco monitoring station with regard to the project; and b) if the proposed Las Armas frontage improvements would provide for public parking opportunities.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown) that Item M-2, No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road (APN 079-210-049), shall move forward to the Planning Commission with Conceptual comments, and that Item M-2, No. 07-102-DRB, shall be continued to August 26, 2008, for an in-progress DRB review with regard to the architectural styles, and for the applicant to provide an aerial photograph showing a simulation of the proposed project with the roads and building to compare the layout with the existing adjacent projects.

RECESS HELD FROM 7:00 P.M. TO 7:07 P.M.

M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-217-DRB

7760 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-057)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The applicant proposes to construct a 70,510 square foot senior assisted living facility on a 2.94 acre property with a General Commercial (C-G) land use designation and Industrial Research Park (M-RP) zoning. The facility would accommodate a maximum of 99 elderly residents. There would be a total of 44 employees with a maximum of 24 employees for daytime staffing.

The structure would be two stories with a maximum height of 34'2" and include a covered porch at the entrance, a large central courtyard and a barbeque terrace. The architecture is reminiscent of the agricultural tradition of Goleta with exterior finishes consisting of horizontal and clapboard siding and the use of stone veneer on the entry, retaining walls, and chimney. The proposed color palette includes yellow, tan, red, and white trim accents. All mechanical equipment would be screened in mechanical wells. The project would maintain the existing Venoco Offsite 30-foot Meteorological Station previously permitted to monitor air quality downwind of the gas processing plant.

Proposed landscaping includes trees planted along the property lines and the use of drought-tolerant plantings along the walking paths and patios, as well as butterfly and kitchen gardens. Approximately 14 trees would be removed from the site, but larger trees along the southern and eastern perimeters would be preserved.

Access would be provided from two driveways on Viajero Drive, with the existing curb cut on Hollister Avenue removed. A 20-foot emergency Fire Department access consisting of grass crete would be provided around the building on the northern and eastern portions of the site. Two parking lots with a total of 48 parking spaces would serve the front and rear of the site. The project proposes to eliminate a private road easement along the eastern portion of the site, and the abandonment by the City of a small portion of Viajero Drive so that the easement is consistent with the constructed road.

Estimated earthwork quantities include 9,400 cubic yards of cut, 800 cubic yards of fill, with 8,600 cubic yards of export.

The project was filed by agent Harwood White on behalf of Mariposa, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 07-217-RZ, -DP, -MCUP, -RMM. (Cindy Moore)

Site visits: Made by all members.

Ex-parte conversations: Member Schneider reported a very short discussion with agent Harwood White.

The plans were presented by agent Harwood White on behalf of Mariposa, LLC, property owner, and Jay Blatter, project architect. Mr. White stated that the vision of the property owner is to create a senior care facility to serve a need that is pressing in the community. One of the critical criteria in the applicant's determination of a project to replace the existing storage facility was compatibility with the adjacent school. He

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 17 of 21

stated that most units would have shared bathing facilities which would reduce construction and maintenance costs, which would translate into a lower monthly cost, but with a rich offering of communal facilities. Harwood White stated that the applicant believes the project shows good cause for a finding that would need to be made by the decision-maker to revise the floor area ratio for this project.

Jay Blatter, project architect, provided an overview of the proposed project and site plan issues. He stated that the project is registered LEED for Home project. With regard to consideration of the floor area ratio issue, he believes there should be consideration that an assisted living home facility provides space for communal amenities and cannot be compared to an apartment structure.

The landscape plans were presented by David Black, project landscape architect. He stated that the primary objective is to buffer the frontage along Hollister and Viajero Drive adequately with enough landscape massing to screen the parking areas from the street. He said that the landscape plans also attempt to mitigate the visual impact of the buildings from Ellwood School next door.

Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) overall, the project is fine and this type of facility is well needed in the community; b) the water feature is appreciated and it would be nice to have a water feature with sound located in an area where it can be enjoyed by the residents; c) the photovoltaics do not need to be hidden, in his opinion; d) suggested use of water reclamation with regard to irrigation and the LEED certification process; e) suggested adding corbels underneath the pop-outs on the north elevation; f) the dormer vents seem a little large, suggesting the addition of a little more mass on the sides of the vent; g) the elevations need to show more details regarding the eaves, fascia and exposed rafter tails with regard to the porch at the entry; and h) on Sheet A3.2, he has some concern regarding the recessed four windows in the form, on the east elevation.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) the project is fine; b) suggested that the dormer vents would relate better with the pop-out element below if they were bigger; and c) in his opinion, the Venoco monitoring station appears industrial and needs a little more study.
3. Member Herrera commented: a) the name of the facility, Mariposa, is appreciated because the project is located so close to the butterfly preserve; b) the use of permeable materials is good; c) a noise wall between the school and the facility would be beneficial; and d) there is a reclaimed water line that runs under the street which may be useful for the facility.
4. Member Messner commented: a) encouraged the use of photovoltaics for solar power; b) suggested consideration of improving the layout with regard to providing better traffic flow for trash vehicles and other utility vehicles; c) recommended that the bus stop provide a pull-out from the street to help with the flow of traffic; d) suggested consideration of the installation of a windmill for energy, or some other method, with regard to the Venoco monitoring station; e) the design for compatibility and transition with Ellwood School is appreciated;

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 18 of 21

5. Member Schneider commented: a) the applicant's choice of this type of facility that is needed in the community is commendable; b) the site plan works relatively well; c) in his opinion, due to the nature of the use of the facility, although the site may have less open space, the ability to provide more rooms and amenities may be more beneficial; d) suggested consideration with regard to the lighting needs and proposed usage along the fire road and service entry, for example, lights may disturb residents sleeping at night; e) the permeable materials and meandering walk are appreciated; f) conceptually, the architecture is quite good, with the agrarian nature of the board and bat style; g) in his opinion, from an historical standpoint, the horizontal lap siding and the board and bat materials work well together, and the shingles may be out of character and not needed based on the colors which would simplify the design; h) agreed with Member Branch's comment with regard to the dormer vents, suggesting that the proportions be resolved or possibly consider removal; i) agreed with Member Branch's comment with regard to the corbels on the north elevation; j) suggested that the form on the east elevation with the four recessed windows is an odd form and should be flush; k) the building masses well to the street with the parking and landscaping in front; l) the Teka lighting fixture works well; m) the colors work well and the wrap-around porches are appreciated; and n) although he understands the applicant's solution to try to integrate the Venoco monitoring station within the project, he would prefer that the station be located off-site; however this is not within the purview of the DRB.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) there is a definite need for this project in the community and the site is appropriate; b) he supports the applicant's application for a higher floor area ratio on this site because the project provides a good cause benefit for the community; c) there will be a noise factor on the northwest corner from delivery and service trucks, which is not a good aspect of the layout; d) details need to be provided with regard to the location and screening of utility boxes; e) drainage details need to be provided by the applicant; f) suggested consideration of the new solar power systems that would be an integral part of the roof design; g) recommended that it would be of benefit for the applicant to make the exterior more fully fire-proofed, and expressed concern that the design has so much exposed wood under eaves; h) requested information regarding the disposition of the existing street lights on Hollister Avenue; and i) requested design details for the transition area to the Ellwood School with regard to sidewalks and the area where parked cars are exiting.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown) that Conceptual review was conducted of Item M-3, No. 07-217-DRB, 7760 Hollister Avenue, with comments, including the comment that the DRB would support the applicant's request for a revision of the floor area ratio requirements for this project based upon good cause for community benefit; and that Item M-3, No. 07-217-DRB, be taken off calendar for processing

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

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

Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange

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

The landscape and slope paving plans were presented by the Caltrans project team. Paul Martinez, Caltrans project manager, stated that construction of the project is scheduled to begin in July, 2009, with completion in of the construction in January, 2012, followed by a planting period for three years. Chris Babb, Caltrans project engineer, provided an over of the features of the project

Laura Bridley, Contract Planner, clarified that the interchange project has been approved and that the purpose of today's hearing is for Advisory review of the final design drawings for context.

David Emerson, project landscape architect, discussed the landscape plans and addressed comments from the last DRB review. The majority of the shrubs have been changed to the *Toyon* species in response to a DRB comment recommending more of a variation. He stated the Eucalyptus species were not removed, noting that the U.S. Highway 101 Design Guidelines refer to the preservation of specimen Eucalyptus trees for thematic and historical consistency and also recommends the use of Eucalyptus trees as a unifying skyline tree. With the Monarch butterfly preserve and the strong presence of Eucalyptus trees nearby, he believes it would be appropriate to keep some Eucalyptus trees, although the DRB may provide further comment.

Valerie Moore, Caltrans, Structures Aesthetics Unit, presented the slope paving plans with variations of the City's logo and surface treatments. She provided an aerial view of the proposed overhead with the simulated proposed designs.

Comments Regarding Landscaping:

1. Member Messner commented: a) expressed his preference for the removal of the Eucalyptus species and suggested replacement with Cypress trees which would provide an attractive gateway, noting that the site is near the ocean and there are existing Cypress trees.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 22, 2008

Page 20 of 21

2. Chair Wignot commented: a) suggested that the City consider using similar planting materials used by Caltrans at the Cathedral Oaks/Hollister Intersection for consistency; and b) suggested the City consider using reclaimed water for irrigation, if possible.

Comments Regarding the Slope Paving and Design:

1. Member Schneider expressed support for the proposed logo, with the rebar rip-out texture, and with no color which would make the maintenance easier.
2. Chair Wignot commented: a) a smooth surface around the design is not desirable because of the potential for graffiti; b) some sort of texture around the logo would be preferred; and c) the colored logo is attractive but there are concerns with regard to long-term maintenance.
3. Member Messner commented: a) the cobblestone texture appears too busy in relation to the logo; and b) the rip-out texture is the only texture example that would be appropriate because it is so subtle it would blend.

STRAW VOTE:

How many members would support the recommendation made by Member Schneider to support the proposed logo design?

Members Voting Affirmative: Herrera, Messner, Schneider, Smith, Wignot. (5).

Members Not Voting Affirmative: None (0).

Members Absent: Branch, Brown (2).

STRAW VOTE:

How many members would support approving a monotone for the logo, without the color?

Members Voting Affirmative: Herrera, Messner, Schneider, Smith, Wignot. (5).

Members Not Voting Affirmative: None (0).

Members Absent: Branch, Brown (2).

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Branch, Brown) to approve using the rebar rip-out texture for the logo, with details to be determined with regard to the amount of the depth of the texture for the logo, and the amount of texture in certain areas of the logo to help read the logo, for Item M-3, No. 07-217-DRB, Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange.

MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Herrera, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Branch, Brown) to approve the proposed landscape plan for Item M-3, No. 07-217-DRB, Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange, with the condition that the proposed Eucalyptus trees be replaced with Cypress trees.

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. SEPARATE SIGN COMMITTEE LETTER REVIEW/DISCUSSION

(Discussion Held After Item I-1)

Comments Regarding Draft Letter:

1. Chair Wignot suggested the following amendments to the draft letter: a) the letter should include a subject line, for example, Changing Sign Appeal Point; b) the first letter in the words in the phrase “sign applications”, which appears several times in the letter, should either be both lower case or capitalized for consistency; and c) the language in the last sentence in the fourth paragraph on the first page of the letter should be changed from “signs” to “sign applications”.
2. Chair Wignot stated that the letter captures the essence of what the DRB members believe needs to happen with regard to sign applications.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to accept the draft letter prepared by Member Schneider as amended with the changes recommended in Chair Wignot’s comments; and that Chair Wignot and Member Schneider shall sign the amended letter and forward it to the City Council with copies to the staff members noted.

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

No requests.

O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Member Messner announced that he will have an art show with his photographs at the Faulkner Gallery in Santa Barbara, with the opening reception on August 7, 2008.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 9:30 P.M.

Minutes approved on August 12, 2008.



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, August 26, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 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)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Wignot at 3:00 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: *Bob Wignot, Chair; Thomas Smith, Vice Chair; **Cecilia Brown; Scott Branch; Simon Herrera; Chris Messner; and Carl Schneider. *Chair Wignot exited the meeting at 5:10 p.m. **Member Brown exited the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Board Members absent: None.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 26, 2008

Page 2 of 13

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Laura Vlk, Associate Planner; Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician; David Stone, Contract Planner; Diana White, Assistant Engineer; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for August 12, 2008

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Abstain: Brown) to approve the Design Review Board minutes for August 12, 2008, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Chair Messner reported that the Street Tree Subcommittee met today and discussed Nursery Standards, Items in the General Plan Related to the Urban Forest, and Urban Forest Management Plan Update. The next Subcommittee meeting will be on September 23, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that staff appreciates the DRB members' participation in the joint workshops between the Planning Commission and Design Review Board on Building Intensity Standards on August 18, 2008. The format at the next workshop on September 15, 2008, will provide for more interaction between the Planning Commission and DRB members.

Chair Wignot commented that his impression of the workshop on August 18th was that more time was needed for interaction than the amount allocated on the agenda.

Member Brown commented that some of the concepts presented by staff at the workshop were new for some members and that staff will probably provide information to help understand the concepts at the next workshop. She agreed with Chair Wignot that the workshop needs to be longer than one and one-half hours.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) The Planning Commission reviewed the Citrus Village project, 7388 Calle Real, on August 25, 2008, and continued the hearing to September 8, 2008, to allow the applicant to restudy and respond to concerns. 2) Staff has researched and determined that when there is a basement located below a building in a project, the basement structure is defined where the building footprint is located with regard to setbacks.

Member Schneider stated that the discussion of FARS with regard to basements needs to be brought up at the workshop on building intensity standards.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 26, 2008

Page 3 of 13

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

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

Member Brown requested that Item O-1 Sign Compliance Discussion be removed from the agenda.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported that no requests for continuance have been received. There being no objections, Item O-1 Sign Compliance Discussion was removed from the agenda.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Member Branch reported that he reviewed the plans for Item F-1, No. 08-082-DRB, 7526 Calle Real, with Planning Technician Brian Hiefield, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-082-DRB

7526 Calle Real (APN 079-121-005)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 5,300-square foot church on a 74,052-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 177-square foot covered entry and demolish an existing 247-square foot carport roof. The existing mansard roof parapet on the front facade will be replaced with a new sloped roof to tie in with the proposed covered entry. The existing windows will be replaced with new wood windows. A new colored concrete patio is proposed beneath the new covered entry, and minor repairs will be done to existing concrete walkways to improve accessibility. New lighting will consist of three (3) wall sconces along the front façade and two (2) hanging pendant lights beneath the proposed covered entry. There is no new habitable square footage proposed. The project was filed by agent Thomas Hashbarger on behalf of El Camino Presbyterian Church, property owner. Related cases: 68-CP-43; 08-082-LUP. (Continued from 8-12-08, 7-08-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Consent Calendar Action on August 26, 2008:

Consent Calendar Member Branch reviewed the plans with Planning Technician Brian Hiefield, and granted Final Approval of Item F-1, No. 08-082-DRB, 7526 Calle Real, as submitted.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown reported that the Subcommittee reviewed Item H-1, No. 08-125-DRB, 7020 Calle Real, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 26, 2008

Page 4 of 13

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-125-DRB

7020 Calle Real (APN 077-155-003)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 2,984-square foot 24'-6" high produce market currently under construction with an herb garden and associated landscaping on 0.53 acres in the CN zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 26.25-square foot halo light LED wall sign with 14" high pin mounted aluminum green lettering and a yellow background. The 2" deep lettering will be attached to a 4" deep metal box affixed to the produce market's front fascia above the entry. The project was filed by agent Hesh Ghorbanzadeh on behalf of Happy Harry's LLC, the property owner. Related cases: 46-SB-LUP; 08-125-SCC. (Continued from 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Action on August 26, 2008:

The Sign Subcommittee met with Planning Technician Brian Hiefield, and reviewed the plans.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Abstain: Schneider) to grant Final Approval of Item H-1, No. 08-125-DRB, 7020 Calle Real, as submitted with the condition that the green color shall match the color of the trim.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-141-DRB

6325 Lindmar Drive (APN 073-005-021)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 27,927-square foot industrial/manufacturing building, 20,276-square feet of courtyards, loading docks and parking, an as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage/water treatment enclosure/addition, and 23,535-square feet (32%) of landscaping on a 73,616-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a mechanical courtyard in the existing courtyard between buildings A and C, construct two new mechanical roof wells (one on building B and one on building C), permit the aforementioned as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage area on the west side of

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 26, 2008

Page 5 of 13

building A, permit an as-built parking lot on the east side of buildings B and C (which requires the removal of 1,167-square feet of landscaping), alter the loading area on the west side of building A, abandon an existing driveway on the north side of the property, remove equipment from the front yard setback for re-location into the proposed mechanical courtyard, remove an unpermitted parking lot storage area on the southwest side of the property, and re-locate equipment from the side yard (along the south property line) setback. All materials used for this project are to match the existing buildings with the exception of new lighting, which will be Lamps Plus bronze, 9" high outdoor dark sky tube lights. The project was filed by agent Bruce Burke on behalf of James L. Bartlett, property owner. Related cases: 07-141-DP AM01; 07-141-LUP. (Laura Vlk)

Site visits: Made by Members Branch and Wignot.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by agent Bruce Burke on behalf of James L. Bartlett, property owner, and by Robert Thompson, project engineer.

Comments:

1. The addition of trees in the front would be nice and would soften the building.
2. The colors need to be called out on the plans.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 07-141-DRB, 6325 Lindmar Drive, with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall provide a landscape plan that includes the addition of trees on the eastern elevation and northern elevation; and 2) the colors shall be called out on the plans; and to continue for Final review on the Final Calendar on October 14, 2008.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-059-DRB

55 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-007)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 37,721-square foot commercial building on an approximately 84,942-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to install a 1,500-gallon liquid nitrogen distribution tank at the southwest corner of the property. The project was filed by agent Dave Jones on behalf of Bermant Development Company, property owner. Related cases: 08-059-SCD, -LUP; 06-065-SCD, -LUP; 91-DPF-014; 79-DP-014. (Brian Hiefield)

Site visits: Made by Members Branch and Wignot.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by agent David Jones on behalf of Bermant Development Company, property owner.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 08-059-DRB, 55 Castilian Drive, as submitted, and continue to September 9, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

RECESS HELD FROM 3:35 P.M. TO 3:40 P.M.

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 *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 Wahiduzzaman, Mukhtar Khan and Ken Mineau as owner representatives. Related cases: 03-051-CUP, 03-051-DP. (Last heard on 7-22-08, 6-24-08*, 5-28-08, 4-8-08*, 2-12-08*, 01-23-08*, 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that staff has not reviewed the plans that were presented at today's hearing. He clarified for the record that the project is not located in a flood plain.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 26, 2008

Page 7 of 13

The plans were presented by Ken Mineau and Mukhtar Khan as owner representatives. Ken Mineau stated that the plans that he presented today are illustrative and also include elevations that show the trees more illustratively. He stated that the biology report is in the process of being amended.

Diana White, Assistant Engineer, responded to questions with regard to traffic circulation and access

Speakers:

Craig Geyer, Goleta, summarized his comments, stating that he believes the project is too large for the site and does not comply with the purpose of the PI zone district. He said that parking is his main concern, stating that he believes the prayer area space should include the meeting room, dining and lecture hall and foyer in addition to the auditorium space, which would then require 130 parking spaces. He stated that from his review of the late submittal with the footprint comparisons, the lot is much smaller than the other projects, even if the footprint is similar. He commented with regard to the plans submitted last week: a) the building location encroaches into the side and rear setbacks; b) the parking spaces encroach into the front and side yard setbacks; c) the parking spaces show more than the allowed number of compact parking spaces; d) pavement is required for uncovered parking areas and driveways; e) the plans do not comply with requirements for parking lot design and maneuvering; f) the plans do not comply with landscape screening requirements for parking areas which require a 5-foot wide planted area or solid fence; and g) expressed concern regarding the two driveways on Los Carneros.

Norma Geyer, Goleta, commented: a) a member of the public discovered that the Lutheran Church is further than 500 feet from the project area, therefore, the code will not allow reciprocal parking; b) parking should not be allowed in the dirt lot at the Lutheran Church because it is not a parking lot and is close to sensitive habitat; c) the applicant needs to establish the number of its members and consider where they will park; d) she believes the design of the project is going to be based on the number of parking spaces required; and e) in the future, each project in this neighborhood should provide for its own parking.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, requested that consideration be given to whether this project will work at this site. He suggested that the underground parking would provide more parking spaces. He commented that information submitted at the meeting needs to be available for review before the meeting.

Lou Ventura agreed with comments by speaker Craig Geyer. He stated that his main concern is that the building is too big for the site and will generate impacts on Calle Real from traffic entering and exiting the project. He expressed concern that ample parking will not be provided, noting that underground parking may be a solution.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 26, 2008

Page 8 of 13

Joe Kovach, Goleta, stated that local residents have expressed concerns regarding the project and have requested that the size, bulk and scale of the building be compatible with its surroundings. He commented that information should have been presented at the initial meeting to provide clarification with regard to many unknowns. He stated that the owners of approximately 240 nearby homes were not notified by mail of the project. He suggested that a demonstration of one of the prayers with regard to the sound level would be useful information if the project moves forward.

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the architecture has improved a lot; b) the biological report has not yet been completed for review at this point; c) the process would have been helped by having final information with regard to issues that need to be addressed; and d) the applicant has been very patient.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) he appreciates the design and how the project fits in with the elevations; and b) he could support moving the project along.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) the massing, location of the building, and architectural design work very well, noting that there are some details that need to be worked out; b) the proposed use for this site would have less impact than some other possible uses; and c) information is needed regarding the biological resource study and traffic study before the project can move forward.
4. Member Branch commented: a) the project is looking good at this point in the process, noting that there is the understanding that there is still information that needs to be clarified which may cause a potential change in the project plans.
5. Chair Wignot commented: a) suggested the applicant consider reciprocal parking with the owners of the parcel to the southeast.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, to September 23, 2008, with comments, and with the expectation that the biological report will be available.

RECESS HELD FROM 4:55 P.M. TO 5:05 P.M.

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.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 26, 2008

Page 9 of 13

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 7-22-08, 6-10-08, 4-22-08, 3-25-08) (David Stone)

Contract Planner David Stone stated that his memorandum to the DRB dated August 15, 2008 provides responses to the two issues of concern identified during the July 22, 2008, meeting: potential curb-gutter and future public parking on Las Armas Road; and potential relocation of the Venoco Met Air Monitoring Station.

Diana White, Assistant Engineer, responded to questions with regard to public parking on Las Armas Road and Community Services Department preliminary conditions required to improve Las Armas Road to city standards.

The revised project plans were presented by agent Mary Meaney Reichel, Lucon Inc., on behalf of Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership, property owner. She summarized changes that were made in response to comments from the last meeting which are shown on updated elevations in the booklet entitled "Haskell's Landing, Goleta, California, Chadmar Group, Scheurer Architects Project #0104". She stated that a note was added by the architect that specific colors and stone types and patterns will be presented for consideration at Preliminary DRB review. A variety of color palettes will be provided for review which will stay with muted and earth-tone shades. She stated that the parking plan on Page 6 of the booklet shows that enclosed project parking and street parking spaces added together exceeds Zoning Ordinance requirements, and that the 40 driveway guest parking spaces exceed the addition to the ordinance requirement. She stated that a project sound study was provided to staff that recommends constructing a sound wall on the north side and west side of the property line to mitigate train/US Highway 101 and future Fire Station

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 26, 2008

Page 10 of 13

noise sources respectively. She clarified that the sound study took into account the US 101 Overpass Improvement project as part of the future ambient baseline noise levels that would potentially impact project residential receptors.

Comments:

1. Chair Wignot commented: a) he believes the project would benefit by sound walls, along Hollister Avenue as well as the western and northern boundaries, and that not providing sound walls along the roadway would be a disservice to the people living in the buildings; b) noted that the proposed overpass project across Highway 101 and the railroad tracks will be adding more traffic; c) expressed concern that even if the Zoning Ordinance standards would be met, he believes that the proposed onsite parking is inadequate, noting that overflow parking would be limited to a portion of the Las Armas Road; and d) the aerial photographs showing the project overlay are informational.
2. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with Chair Wignot that a sound wall along Hollister Avenue should be provided. He asked if 10-foot wide sidewalks were required on both sides of Las Armas Road, as a narrower sidewalk could provide for additional parking area.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) with regard to the multi-family style, the duplex appearance is appreciated; however, he suggested adding some subtle changes and variations in the color and trim to show some differentiation on the building, rather than the design on Page 10 of the booklet which appears consistent throughout the building; b) requested that the "S-tile" be removed from the roof plans; and c) expressed some concern with regard to whether there has been consideration regarding the new Highway 101 overpass project which will be close to the site.
4. Member Branch commented: a) suggested that the applicant consider where there might be room to add a couple of extra turf-block parking spaces for guests, for example, in the project's northwest corner, noting that every additional parking space would help; b) the Beach Bungalow style is heading in the right direction; c) expressed concern that the multi-family Rustic Farm House and Monterey architecture looks like large single-family buildings; d) requested that the applicant restudy the stone façade treatment on the Rustic Farm House style, which currently provides too massive an appearance. He suggested possibly not filling in the entire gable form with stone, but instead using this material as more of a wainscot element; e) expressed disappointment that the red-tile roof designs, including the "S-tile" roofs, were not completely removed; and f) requested that the plans show how the use of two different colors for differentiation on the multi-family buildings will look like two different buildings, like on the cover of the project materials provided, which is the preferred direction.
5. Member Schneider commented: a) expressed concern that the "S-tile" roofs were not removed from the elevations in response to the previous DRB hearing, stating that these should be flat tiles; b) requested that the drawings that are presented for Planning Commission review show removal of the "S-tiles"; c) requested that the plans show the number of possible parking spaces on Las Armas Road; d) it may be useful to conduct a study to find creative ways to address potential additional parking on Las Armas Road, although it would not be critical to the

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 26, 2008

Page 11 of 13

overall project; e) wanted to know if there would be a connector road from other project site areas to the east (Diana White, Assistant Engineer, said that this was possible, but not planned at this time); and f) questioned whether additional landscaping would be possible on Las Armas Road (Diana White said yes, though it might not be the standard City design for a 60-foot ROW).

6. Member Brown commented: a) requested that the landscape plan provide an understanding of the walls extended throughout the duplex and triplex units throughout the site showing their location, relationship, size and height (agent Mary Reichel responded that these walls are 4.5 to 5.0 feet high); b) requested that the landscape plan clarify the internal pedestrian linkages particularly with regard to access from the potential public parking on Las Armas Road; c) agreed with Member Branch's comments that the stone appears heavy and overdone on the Rustic Farm House style, which may be more appropriate on bigger houses on bigger lots, that are not so close together; d) the Beach Bungalow architecture style, which appears light and airy, is innovative for the area and appreciated; e) requested the applicant consider Member Schneider's recommendation to remove the "S-tile" from the plans; and f) wondered if angle parking was possible on Las Armas Road (Diana White, Assistant Engineer, responded that angle parking would not be possible given the configuration of the road).

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Wignot) to continue Item M-2, No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road, to October 14, 2008, with comments; and that the applicant shall provide only elevations showing responses to comments.

M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-145-DRB

598 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-090-052)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The subject property consists of 12.29 net acres and includes agricultural operations, an existing farmhouse, a produce stand, and a bathhouse/restroom in the AG-I-5 zone district. Vehicular ingress/egress is provided by a 16-foot (to be upgraded to 20-foot) wide gravel driveway from Stow Canyon Road, and through the City's adjacent library parking lot. A modification was granted to require a total of 19 designated parking spaces on the property. Minor amounts of grading would be required to facilitate building pads and the installation of utilities.

To be in compliance with 08-111-CUP, the applicant proposes to move the existing farm labor camp from its present location near the avocado orchard to a development envelope along the existing driveway near the farmhouse in Phases 4 & 5 as follows:

Phase 4 – (To be completed by July 1, 2009):

- Terminate use of existing farm labor camp site and remove all structures; relocate occupants to temporary or permanent residential units in approved building envelope.
 - Temporary units would consist of up to five (5) yurts meeting code requirements and Design Review Board review for precise location and landscaping, with an option to substitute mobile homes. Cooking and

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 26, 2008

Page 12 of 13

sanitary facilities would consist of a mobile kitchen, restroom, and shower units and/or individual built-in kitchens and bathrooms, all connected to the Goleta Sanitary District system.

- Permanent housing would consist of up to five (5) modular, stick-built, relocated houses or other City-approved permanent housing as approved by the Design Review Board.
- Construct access improvements as required by the Fire Department.
- Provide additional on-site parking.
- Construct the sewer line.

Phase 5 – (To be completed by July 1, 2013):

- Final permitting and construction of permanent housing. Permanent housing would consist of modular, stick-built, relocated homes or other permanent housing, as approved by the Design Board Review, for up to five (5) units of farm worker housing.
- The farm labor camp would include restroom and kitchen facilities within each of the housing units fully connected to public water and sewer line systems.
- Remove and replace all interim housing units with permanent housing. Use of kitchen and restroom/shower trailers (if any) is discontinued.
- Retain the bathhouse/restroom as a demonstration facility.

The project was filed by agent Steve Welton of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services on behalf of Center for Urban Agriculture at Fairview Gardens, property owner. Related cases: 08-111-CUP; 08-145-LUP. (Scott Kolwitz)

Site visits: Made by all members except Schneider.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by agent Steve Welton of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services on behalf of Center for Urban Agriculture at Fairview Gardens, property owner, and Victor Schumacher, project architect. Steve Welton requested that the review includes direction with regard to the suitability of the location and the layout.

Comments Regarding Phase 4:

1. Member Branch commented: a) the project helps keep the small agricultural element in the community.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) the lighting plan should follow dark sky principles, which should be documented; b) the applicant is requested to provide landscaping plans showing the right size and species for appropriate screening, which should be documented; and c) the goal of the project is commendable.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) the applicant needs to provide more details with regard to lighting and landscaping.

Comments Regarding Phase 5:

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 26, 2008

Page 13 of 13

1. Member Branch commented: a) recommended incorporating sustainability elements into the project, for example, solar, photovoltaic, wind, and water reclamation elements.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) the concept and the intent of the grouping plans are fine; b) his concerns at this point would be lighting and screening which will be considered further along in the process; and c) spoke in support of incorporating sustainability elements and alternative building materials into the project, which would be useful and educational, if within the budget constraints.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to continue Phase 4 of Item M-3, No. 08-045-DRB, 598 North Fairview Avenue, to September 23, 2008, for Conceptual/Preliminary review; and to continue Phase 5 of Item M-3, No. 08-045-DRB, to September 23, 2008, for Conceptual review; and that Phase 5 be assigned a separate planning permit number.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. SIGN COMPLIANCE DISCUSSION

Member Brown requested that the item with regard to Sign Compliance Discussion be withdrawn from the agenda. There being no objections, Item O-1 Sign Compliance Discussion was removed from the agenda.

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

No requests.

O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Vice Chair Smith announced that he will not be present at the DRB meeting on September 9, 2008.

Member Brown announced that she will not be present at the DRB meeting on September 23, 2008.

Member Messner announced that he may not be present at the DRB meeting on September 23, 2008.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 6:40 P.M.

Minutes approved on September 9, 2008.



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, October 14, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

**GOLETA CITY HALL – 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)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Wignot at 3:00 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Bob Wignot, Chair; Thomas Smith, Vice Chair; Cecilia Brown; Scott Branch; Simon Herrera; Chris Messner; and Carl Schneider.

Board Members absent: None.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 2 of 18

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for September 23, 2008

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Abstain: Brown, Schneider) to approve the Design Review Board minutes for September 23, 2008, as submitted.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the next meeting will be on October 28, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that in response to the DRB request at the last meeting, staff reviewed the completed project at Taco Bell on Fairview Avenue and determined that the landscape plans were followed as approved with the exception that the height of the base stump for the palm tree in front of the middle of the center window was slightly less than the approved height.

Member Messner stated that he had thought that the approved plans showed that the approved plans showed the palm tree in the middle of the center window would be located off center for aesthetics. Chair Wignot stated that he agreed with Member Messner's recollection with regard to the location of the palm tree; however at this time it does not seem appropriate to require the applicant to move the palm tree. Member Brown commented in support for the completion of projects as approved.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) He clarified that staff reminds applicants on a regular basis of the requirements and information requested that needs to be provided for review at the DRB meetings. 2) An appeal to the Preliminary Approval of the project at 7837 Langlo Ranch Road was received and a DRB member will need to be designated to attend the Planning Commission hearing. 3) The Planning Commission reviewed the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital project on October 13, and recommended to the City Council approval of the hospital and direction for the DRB to restudy the entrance and lobby, and their relationship to the parking lot, and the multiplicity of building materials used. 4) The final joint workshop between the Planning Commission and DRB on Building Intensity Standards will be held on October 20, 2008. 5) The City's Public Works yard has moved and will now be located onsite at the Cabrillo Business Park. 6) The City Council will review the Rincon Palms Hotel and the Marriott Residence Inn projects on October 21, 2008. 7) Staff is in the process of preparing recommendations for consideration by the City Council with regard to revisions of the DRB Bylaws, in particular with regard to signage review.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 3 of 18

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the applicant for Item No. J-1, No. 07-141-DRB, 6325 Lindmar Drive, requested a continuance to November 25, 2008; and the applicant for Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, requested a continuance to November 12, 2008.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item J-1, No. 07-141-DRB, 6325 Lindmar Drive, to November 25, 2008, per the applicant's request; and to continue Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, to November 12, 2008, per the applicant's request.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he met today and reviewed the plans with agent R. Brian Nelson on behalf of Jeff and Michelle Liephardt, property owners, and that Final Approval of Item F-1, No. 06-054-DRB, 7295 Butte Drive, was granted as submitted.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 06-054-DRB

7295 Butte Drive (APN 077-103-003)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 1,663-square foot residence and an attached 473-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,035-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 741-square feet in additions, consisting of a 264-square foot 1st floor addition, and a new 477-square foot second story. This proposal also includes a 186-square foot porch on the first floor. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,877 square feet, consisting of a 2,404-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 473-square foot 2-car garage. This proposal meets the maximum allowable floor area guideline for this property, which is 2,437.7 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. New materials consist of sepia brown wood fascia and beams, paint colors swiss coffee, salsa, and autumn wheat, and presidential, shadow grey, 40-year, composition shingles. The project was filed by agent R. Brian Nelson on behalf of Jeff and Michelle Liephardt, property owners. Related cases: 06-054-LUP; 07-143-APP; 07-198-APP. (Continued from 09-23-08, 09-09-08, 07-03-07, 06-05-07) (Laura Vik)

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on October 14, 2008:

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch met today and reviewed the plans with agent R. Brian Nelson on behalf of Jeff and Michelle Liephardt, property owners. The applicant provided the cut sheets for the proposed lighting fixtures, and noted the

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 4 of 18

make and model of the fixtures on the plans. Final Approval of Item F-1, No. 06-054-DRB, 7295 Butte Drive, was granted as submitted.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown reported that the subcommittee met today with Assistant Planner Shine Ling and Craig Minus of the Towbes Group, agent for Sumida Family Limited Partnership, and the project team; and reviewed the Conceptual plans for Item H-1, No. 08-131-DRB, 5505-5585 Overpass Road and 5410 Hollister Avenue.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-131-DRB

5505-5585 Overpass Road & 5410 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-330-011 & 071-330-012)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes the approved Sumida Gardens Apartments development, which will contain 9 buildings totaling 194,448 square feet on approximately 10.26 acres in the DR-20 zone district. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Sumida Gardens Apartments development. The proposed OSP provides for five (5) different types of signs: monument and identification signs; directional signs; pool signage; parking signage; and miscellaneous signage. The OSP would specify the design and maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign. A total of 20 sign types are proposed. Sign materials generally consist of wood, aluminum, and acrylic. Sign colors are generally ivory, gold, beige, brown, red, and green. Some signs are proposed to be internally illuminated. The project was filed by Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, agent for Sumida Family Limited Partnership, property owner. Related cases: 08-131-OSP; -CUP. (Continued from 9-09-08*, 8-12-08) (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on October 14, 2008:

The Sign Subcommittee reviewed today with Assistant Planner Shine Ling and Craig Minus of the Towbes Group, agent for Sumida Family Limited Partnership, and the project team including Ron Wilkinson of Vogue Sign Company; Item H-1, No. 08-131-DRB, 5505-5585 Overpass Road and 5410 Hollister Avenue.

Comments: (Conceptual review of the applicant's response to the following comments from the meeting of August 12, 2008, as follows:)

1. The photograph and proposed landscape plans were provided and reviewed.
2. Proposed illumination for the off-site monument sign: Acceptable as submitted.
3. Off-site monument sign: The applicant shall restudy: a) the letter heights; b) the line spacing; and c) improving the proportionality fit on the face of the sign to address the concern that there was a significant amount of white space.
4. On-site monument sign: The applicant shall restudy: a) the letter heights; b) the line spacing; and c) improving the proportionality fit on the face of the sign to address the concern that there was a significant amount of white space.
5. Front entry directory sign: Acceptable as submitted.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 5 of 18

6. On-site directory signs (open space at the base): Acceptable as submitted.
7. On-site directory signs: Acceptable as submitted.
8. Entrance: The height of the rental office sign shall be reduced so that the portion of the sign with the words "Rental Office" will remain and the additional height of the sign will be cut down (which will include the removal of the words "Sumida Gardens Apartments" and removal of the picture of the palm tree).
9. Model number signs: Acceptable as submitted.
10. Address plaques for buildings and address plaques for units: Acceptable as submitted.
11. Pool signage: Acceptable as submitted.
12. Parking signage: Acceptable as submitted.
13. Miscellaneous Signage: Acceptable as submitted.
14. Any other proposed signs: Will need to be presented for review.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION: There being no objections, Item H-1, No. 08-131-DRB, 5505-5585 Overpass Road and 5410 Hollister Avenue, was continued with comments to November 12, 2008, for Preliminary review.

Chair Wignot commented, in general, that the City's Sign Ordinance, as well as Overall Sign Plans, should reflect lighting guidelines.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-141-DRB

6325 Lindmar Drive (APN 073-005-021)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 27,927-square foot industrial/manufacturing building, 20,276-square feet of courtyards, loading docks and parking, an as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage/water treatment enclosure/addition, and 23,535-square feet (32%) of landscaping on a 73,616-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a mechanical courtyard in the existing courtyard between buildings A and C, construct two new mechanical roof wells (one on building B and one on building C), permit the aforementioned as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage area on the west side of building A, permit an as-built parking lot on the east side of buildings B and C (which requires the removal of 1,167-square feet of landscaping), alter the loading area on the west side of building A, abandon an existing driveway on the north side of the property, remove equipment from the front yard setback for re-location into the proposed mechanical courtyard, remove an unpermitted parking lot storage area on the southwest side of the property, and re-locate equipment from the side yard (along the south property line) setback. All materials used for this project are to match the existing buildings with the exception of new lighting, which will be Lamps Plus bronze, 9" high outdoor dark sky tube lights. The project was filed by agent Bruce Burke on behalf of James L. Bartlett, property owner. Related cases: 07-141-DP AM01; 07-141-LUP. (Continued from 08-26-08) (Laura Vlk)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item J-1, No. 07-141-DRB, 6325 Lindmar Drive, to November 25, 2008, per the applicant's request.

J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-075-DRB

7090 Marketplace Drive (APN 073-440-013)

This is a request for *Final* review. The development includes 475,487 square feet of commercial development with 2,490 parking spaces on approximately 49 acres over 7 parcels in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 7,770-square foot addition to an existing 24,017-square foot building previously occupied by CompUSA and to eliminate 31 parking spaces. The entry would be relocated from the east elevations' northern end to the center of the building, and a car stereo installation bay would be created on the southern elevation. The resulting total onsite development would include 483,257 square feet, and the 1-story structure would be 31,787 square feet. Available parking throughout the entire shopping center would be reduced from 2,490 to 2,459 parking spaces with a reduction from 177 to 146 parking spaces located on this parcel. Parking stall sizes are proposed to remain in their current modified configuration. A total of 12 Bradford Pear trees, 3 Brisbane Box trees, and 1 Tipu tree are proposed to be removed, but 17 comparable trees are proposed to be planted. Minor alterations to drive aisles and lighting are also proposed. New materials include a storefront/entry with a kynar finish/clear anodized aluminum, "Solar Gray" glazing, new metal doors to be painted to match the adjacent surfaces and new bollards with either an unspecified finish or to be painted Ben Morre #343 "Bright Yellow." All other materials (including lighting and landscaping) for this project are to match the existing commercial property. The project was filed by Kimberly A. Schizas on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 95-SP-001, 95-DP-026, 96-EIR-3, & 08-075-DP AM. (Continued from 9-23-08, 9-09-08, 8-12-08) (Natasha Heifetz Campbell & Scott Kolwitz)

The plans were presented by Kimberly A. Schizas on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. She presented the elevation sheet that has been updated with lighting cut-sheet information. She stated that the applicant found a different lighting fixture that is much nicer and comes closer to matching. She clarified that the project landscape architect will attempt to save and reuse as many of the existing trees as possible, noting that if it is not possible to plant the trees elsewhere, she would like to plant the trees at Girsh Park.

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) He expressed appreciation that the applicant researched and found a better lighting fixture in response to the DRB's comment.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The applicant's response is appreciated; and b) This is an example that there are full cut-off fixtures available with fine aesthetic characteristics.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item J-2, No. 08-075-DRB, 7090 Marketplace Drive, as submitted.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-045-DRB

5484 Overpass Road (APN 071-220-033)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 5,780-square foot shop building, a 1,362-square foot office building, a 18,835-square feet of unenclosed materials storage (a portion of which – in the southwest corner of the property – is as-built), an as-built 640-square foot storage unit, and two unused fuel pumps and associated underground fuel tanks on a 84,070-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 2,961-square foot, two story office addition, and a new trash enclosure. This application also includes a proposal to permit the aforementioned as-built outdoor material storage area and storage unit, and to re-configure the site's parking areas. All materials used for this addition are to match the existing office building with the exception of the proposed lighting, which would be the Capri Mini by The Plaza Family. The project was filed by agent Joseph H. Moticha on behalf of Randy Douglas, Tierra Contracting, Inc., property owner. Related cases: 07-045-DP AM01, 07-045-LUP. (Continued from 09-23-08*, 09-09-08) (Laura Vlk)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, to November 12, 2008, per the applicant's request.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-087-DRB

266 Spruce Drive (APN 079-530-027)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,061-square foot residence and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,968-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 1,734 square feet in additions, consisting of a 159-square foot first floor addition, a 325-square foot new second story, and a 1,250-square foot basement. The resulting 2-story structure with basement would be 4,245 square feet, consisting of a 3,795-square foot single-family dwelling with basement and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage. As the proposed project exceeds 3,000 square feet of habitable square footage, a third enclosed parking space would be required per Ordinance No. 03-05. When the basement is included, the proposed habitable square footage would be 3,795 square feet which exceeds the maximum allowable floor area (FAR) guidelines for this property, which is 2,642 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. When the basement square footage is removed, the proposed habitable square footage would be 2,545square feet, which is within the maximum allowable FAR guidelines for this property. A total of 629 cubic yards of cut for grading is proposed for construction of the basement. All materials used for this project are to

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 8 of 18

match the existing residence aside from new doors, windows, and exterior lighting as shown on plans. The project was filed by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. Related cases: 08-087-LUP. (Continued from 09-23-08*, 9-09-08*, 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

The plans were presented by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. He stated that the applicant has decided not to construct a second story addition. He proposed that thirty percent of the basement square footage be counted towards the FAR, stating that the resulting FAR would meet the maximum allowable floor area guidelines for the proposed project.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that it would be appropriate for the DRB to consider the following issues with regard to the project review: 1) whether it is acceptable for the proposed project to exceed the maximum allowable floor area (FAR) guidelines; 2) whether the project is acceptable as proposed with a two-car garage; and 3) whether there is support for the proposed setback modification in the front yard with regard to the basement. He stated that the DRB Conceptual comments will be forwarded to the Zoning Administrator review.

Documents: Letter from Michael Ray, dated September 2, 2008, providing further comments for the record.

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) He does not believe that the basement space should be counted as habitable space or included in the floor area; b) He would support the project with a two-car garage; c) He would support the setback modification; and d) Suggested consideration of the Notice To Property Owner (NTPO) process.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) He would support the concept that only a certain percentage of the basement square footage would apply to the FAR; b) Although the basement does not add to the visible mass, bulk and scale of the project; it adds usable square footage which needs to be considered with regard to the requirement for a third enclosed parking space, particularly because the threshold is exceeded significantly; c) He would support the setback modification; and d) He would encourage this type of development with a basement concept.
3. Member Branch commented: a) He would support the setback modification, stating that he believes the setback stops at the ground level; b) Suggested counting the amount of space in the basement that would be legally habitable, from a Building Code standpoint with regard to light and ventilation, to determine what would be considered as habitable. c) A letter was received from a neighbor, dated September 2, 2008, expressing concern that parking is a problem in the area; d) From the standpoint that the project square footage would exceed the 3,000 square foot requirement significantly with the addition of habitable space in the basement, there should be a third parking space to comply; and e) The project design is a creative solution.
4. Member Brown commented; a) She would support the setback modification; b) The issue with regard to FARs does not seem to apply because FARs relate to the

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 9 of 18

- visual aspects of development; c) The design is a creative solution but parking is the main problem when considering the building intensity on the site; and d) The ordinance requirement for a third enclosed parking space needs to be considered.
5. Member Messner commented: a) Declined to state whether he would support the setback modification; and b) The total square footage in the basement should be counted as habitable space.
 6. Member Herrera commented: a) He would support the setback modification; and b) He expressed concern with regard to the potential for an increase in habitable space in the basement that would impact parking in the neighborhood.
 7. Chair Wignot commented: a) He would support the setback modification; b) He could not make the finding that the proposed project would provide for sufficient parking; c) He agreed with Member Branch's suggestion to count the amount of space in the basement that is legally habitable, from a building standpoint, to determine the floor area; and d) In general, suggested consideration of the Notice To Property Owner (NTPO) procedure for project reviews.

General Summary of Comments:

1. With regard to FARs, a) three members would support the concept that a percentage of the basement square footage would count towards the FAR; b) two members do not believe that the square footage of the basement is applicable towards the FAR; c) one member would support counting the total square footage of the basement; and d) one member did not comment.
2. The majority of members would not support a modification to the ordinance requirement for a third enclosed parking space.
3. The majority expressed support for the setback modification.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to take Item L-2, No. 08-087-DRB, 266 Spruce Drive, be taken off calendar, with comments.

RECESS HELD FROM 4:30 P.M. TO 4:40 P.M.

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-159-DRB

7390 Calle Real (APN 077-490-041)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property comprises a Community Shopping Center and includes two retail commercial and office buildings (approximately 6,250 square feet and 8,300 square feet) and a gasoline fueling station facility with an approximately 625-square foot canopy on a 1.05-acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to install a new above-ground Healy clean air separator tank for the gasoline fueling station facility. The tank would be placed within a new 42-square foot metal enclosure painted to match the beige color of the building. The enclosure would be 10 feet tall. Air breather piping would extend from the top of the tank to a *minimum* height of 18" above the roof of the building. The air breather piping would match the height of the existing vent risers. No habitable floor area is proposed. The project was filed by Luke Snyder of Quality Project Management, agent, on behalf of Eleni Pertsulakes, property owner. Related cases: 08-159-LUP. (Shine Ling)

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 10 of 18

Site visits: Made by all members except Brown and Schneider.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Luke Snyder of Quality Project Management, agent, on behalf of Eleni Pertsulakes, property owner. He stated that the proposed enclosure would be fully enclosed with a door for accessibility. He noted that the proposed system is an extension of the existing vent system and is designed to help capture and collect vapors from the underground storage tank that otherwise enter the atmosphere. He stated that the enclosure design is fairly standard with regard to other sites throughout the State.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling stated that the applicant will need to revise the site plan to reflect the gas station, the 7-Eleven store, and the strip mall to the back. He noted that the landscape requirement for the zone district is for not less than 5 percent of the net lot area to be landscaped.

Speaker:

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, commented that the end unit in the northeast corner of the strip mall located in the back of the site plan has historically been a bar and is currently a bar and grill business. She expressed concern that some of the patrons of the bar and grill may be drinking and smoking, and may not pay attention or ignore the "No Smoking, Flammable Vapors" signage. She requested information regarding the enforcement and consequences.

Luke Snyder, applicant, stated that the tank, which can be considered flammable, meets State requirements that it must be fully enclosed within a fire-rated enclosure if it is not located at least ten feet away from all building and property lines. He stated that the project is reviewed by other local agencies that include the County Fire Department, Fire Department Haz Mat Division, County Air Pollution Control District, and the Building Department. He clarified that the proposed equipment is required by a State-mandated program and must be installed by April 2009.

Comments:

1. Chair Wignot commented: a) He suggested that the applicant consider that the location and/or orientation of the plug on the tank may need to be changed to better facilitate drainage, servicing and maintenance with regard to the location of the tank within the enclosure; b) He provided the applicant with information he found on the internet regarding the Healy clean air separator tank that discusses normal operation and draining procedures, for reference; c) The proposal, which would add another vent riser in addition to the two existing risers would be a step forward in minimizing the amount of hydrocarbons that are released into the atmosphere; and d) It appears unlikely that there would be vapors at the ground level if the system is functioning as designed.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) He spoke in support of the applicant's plans to paint the two bollards, located in front, a bright yellow color, which is in contrast with the color of the building and will draw the motorists' attention.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-159-DRB, 7390 Calle Real, as submitted, and continue to October 28, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

L-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-169-DRB & 08-170-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual/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 M-RP and M-S-GOL zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Buildings 12A and 12B and associated improvements as part of the phased build out of the Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 12A would be a one-story, 10,000-square foot structure and Building 12B would be a one-story, 7,500-square foot structure. Associated improvements for each building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, and parking. New materials consist of metal, concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out the Cabrillo Business Park as proposed to be amended would total 948,782 square feet, including 707,100 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: 08-107-DP AM, 08-039-LUP, 08-040-LUP, 08-041-LUP, 08-042-LUP, 08-160-LUP, 08-119-LUP, 08-025-LUP, 07-144-MC, 07-236-MC, 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN. (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by agent Troy White, Dudek, on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC, property owner, and members of the project team including Steve Fedde, Sares-Regis Group; Derek Kitabayashi, project architect; Don Donaldson, Penfield and Smith, project civil engineer; and Lauri Romano and Bob Cunningham, project landscape architects, both of Arcadia Design. Derek Kitabayashi presented the architecture plans for Building 12A and Building 12B, the lighting plans, and the site plan. Lauri Romano presented the landscape plans. She stated that the paving, the design and patterning are designed to help draw people from the main parking area into the site. Troy White stated that the DRB previously reviewed and the overall grading and drainage plans for the site during review of the prior application for Building 1 and Building 2, and that Preliminary Approval was granted.

Speaker:

Bill Shelor, Goleta, requested that consideration be given, during the planning process, to incorporate the use of photovoltaic panels on the roofs of the new structures. If this is currently not economically feasible, he suggested the applicant research whether it is possible to design the project with a pre-designed rooftop arrangement so that it can be easily retrofitted in the future to add panels.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 12 of 18

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) He appreciates that the buildings are oriented towards Hollister Avenue because it brings activity to the street; b) From a landscaping standpoint, the continuation of the circular plaza works fairly well, and the landscaping works well to connect to the parking lot; c) The proposed water fountain at the entry should remain, however he would support removing the second water feature; d) The metal cap element needs to be studied; e) The trellis element between the two sections of the building would work well; e) The architecture seems very bland on the east elevation of Building 12 B, facing Los Carneros Road after turning the corner, and should have a better design statement because this is the signature corner of the project; and f) On the south elevation, there needs to be some architectural enhancement to reinforce the location of the walkway portion of the building.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The metal cap elements do not seem appropriate and should be removed; b) The concept of the sandstone curving is appreciated. Also appreciated is the gradient effect of the glazing with the lighter color at the bottom and graduating to darker at the top; c) He supports addressing the overall concepts of green roof architecture and photovoltaics in the plans; d) Suggested considering that the west side on Building 12A would be designated as the back of the building; e) The proposed landscape plan is appreciated, including the multi-layered texture between the hardscape and softscape; and f) Requested that amenities be provided to facilitate use of the outdoor plaza area for outdoor eating and for musical performances; for example, install electrical outlets for musical instruments.
3. Member Brown commented: a) The lighting fixtures should be mounted with the light facing downward; b) The lighting needs to be addressed to make sure it is sufficient for the pathway; c) The light needs to be appropriate depending on its intended use, for example outdoor dining and pathways; d) Consider adding large trellises and vines for relief along the south side of Building 12A; e) The landscaping which appears rich and robust is appreciated; f) There needs to be enough chairs provided and outdoor places for people to sit and enjoy the open space even if people bring their lunch; and g) The view of the mountains from the outdoor area is important to many people.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Overall, the project is fine; b) The landscape plan is appreciated; c) The metal cap element seems ambiguous and should be removed; d) The secondary water feature should be retained on the south side; e) The south elevation architecture needs to be enhanced particularly to reinforce the walkway portion of the building; f) The architecture on the east elevation of Building 12B, facing Los Carneros, needs to be enhanced; and g) He appreciates that the setback widens as one approaches the intersection.
5. Member Messner commented: a) Overall, the landscape plan is appreciated, including the groundcovers; b) The tree species located around Building 12A need to be called out on the plans; c) Requested that one or two more Monterey Cypress trees be added on the Los Carneros Road side for balance; for example, in front of Building 12 to tie in with the other two trees, forming a triangle; d) Both water features should be retained; e) Vines on the trellis would be fine considering there will maintenance for the landscaping; f) Suggested that consideration be

given with regard to some type of street art; for example, placing figurines at certain locations; g) The applicant will need to follow standards with regard to root barriers; and h) There are new cost breaks associated with photovoltaic applications.

6. Member Herrera commented: a) Recommended that the plans include as many permeable pavers as possible; b) The landscape plan is very good; and c) The two water features are appreciated.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) He believes the whole design should be flipped so that parking and service areas are located between Hollister Avenue and Building 12A and Building 12B; and the food court areas are located to the south in the current parking area, which would address his concern that the people in the outdoor area would be subjected to the hustle and bustle of traffic, especially during noontime; b) The metal cap element should be removed; c) The east elevation of Building 12B and the south elevation of both buildings need some treatment to relieve the blandness; d) Recommended that provisions be built into the current design for future photovoltaics and green roof applications; and e) The applicant is requested to provide a rendering of the intersection of Hollister Avenue and Los Carneros Road, looking southwest towards the project, that would illustrate the amenities and the plans for screening.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-4, No. 08-169-DRB and 08-170-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to November 12, 2008, with comments.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 04-226-DRB

7388 Calle Real (APN 077-490-043)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The project has been increased by two units following the Planning Commission hearing on September 8, 2008. The revised project includes a Final Development Plan for 12 condominium units totaling 20,952 square feet, including two affordable units, associated infrastructure, and common open space on approximately .94 acres in the DR-12.3 zone district. Five residential unit types are proposed within three, three-story structures (Buildings A-C) arranged along the eastern portion of the site. The buildings would have a maximum height of 34 feet 3 inches and would each contain four attached units consisting of three, three-bedroom units and one two-bedroom unit. The units in Building A would range from 1,043 square feet to 1,463 square feet. The units in Buildings B and C would range from 869 square feet to 1,512 square feet. Access to the site would be via Calle Real. Parking would include 12 one-car garages at 248 square feet each and 24 parking spaces, for a total of 36 spaces. The project was filed by Detlev Peikert, representing 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner. Related cases 04-226-TM, -DP. (Last heard on 7-08-08) (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by Lisa Plowman, planning manager, Peikert Group Architects; Detlev Peikert, representing 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner; and April Palencia, project architect. Lisa Plowman stated that in response to review by the Planning Commission, the applicant has prepared refined conceptual plans for

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 14 of 18

review by the DRB. She clarified that this project is a State bonus density project under State law. Detlev Peikert discussed the details with regard to the revised plans including the Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, and Sections. He provided an aerial photograph showing how the development is configured on the site, and existing footprints of the adjacent condominium; and also photo simulations showing the view of the project from Calle Real.

Senior Planner Cindy Moore stated that the Planning Commission continued the public hearing on this project to November 10, 2008, to allow time for the DRB to respond to the revised plans.

Documents: Letter from Karen Lovelace, Goleta, dated October 14, 2008, Re: October 14, 2008, DRB Agenda Item M-1, 7388 Calle Real, AKA "Citrus Village".

Speakers:

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, discussed the history of previous development plans for the site and expressed concern that the current DR-12.3 zone district would allow the potential for a very high Floor Area Ratio (FAR). She expressed her concerns which included: a) In comparison to adjacent development, this project is way out of scale; b) There would be too much development on the site; c) The items in the landscape plan appear too crammed together; d) The existing landscaping along the east side of the property is not within the control of the project and is located on an elevation approximately five feet lower than the site. e) The landscaping along the west side between the commercial and residential properties would not be adequate; f) The drainage plan shows that the lot slopes between Building A and Building B, and the lot slopes between Building B and Building C, which is not conducive to providing a comfortable open space; g) The lot is located in a drainage basin area; h) The craftsmen design is not appropriate for this site and will stand out; i) Suggested an architectural style that blends in better, with a lower height; j) Recommended story poles for this project site; k) She noted that the Planning Commission did not review the specific details of the revised plans which were provided by the applicant at this review; and m) Requested the DRB make sure the project is compatible with the neighborhood.

Bill Shelor, Goleta, appreciates that the revised plans will include affordable housing units, stating that the plans are an improvement over the previous plans. He said he is always concerned regarding the potential loss of mountain views. He expressed concern regarding the proposed building height and requested that story poles be installed that fully gauge the visual impact. He questioned whether the trees that are proposed to be located in the front of the buildings will eventually obscure the third levels.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) He understands that including affordable units is desirable, noting that the site plan appears somewhat dense based on the number of units. b) While he understands the desire to add additional parking

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 15 of 18

- spaces, he suggested considering whether it would be more efficient to use one or two parking spaces for a central trash collection area for all units rather than requiring each unit to place bins along the road on collection day and to store bins in each garage; c) The proposed architectural character of the design is fine and works relatively well, noting that it is a friendly style and would be better than trying to match adjacent styles; d) The roof on Building A is softened by keeping the unit a two-bedroom unit, and it softens Building A facing Calle Real quite well; e) He suggested that the northern rear unit in Building C be changed to a two-bedroom unit, softening the roof form, which will address his concern that Building C appears to loom over the adjacent Brookside Condominiums to the north.
2. Member Branch commented: a) He agreed with Member Schneider's suggestion to change the northern unit to a two-bedroom unit to help soften the building mass adjacent to the condominium development; b) He acknowledged the need for a centralized trash collection methodology with regard to the concern that there will be a large number of individual trash cans set out for trash collection; c) He cannot support the reduction of parking spaces, noting that parking is important for this particular site which has no street parking; d) The proposed architecture is a style that would help accommodate a third story; and e) The architectural style is fine, stating that it may be counter productive to try to match existing styles.
 3. Member Brown commented: a) There should be a way to find space on the site for recycling and trash collection purposes without reducing parking; b) The placement of the utilities, which makes a difference in the appearance of the final product, needs to be shown on the plans and reviewed; c) In her opinion, the proposed architecture style appears somewhat too stylized; d) Details such as fences will need to be reviewed at the appropriate review level; e) Moving the units away from the west property line is appreciated; and f) In general, infill site are difficult with regard to project development and review.
 4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The proposed plans for twelve units seem to try to place too much development on this site; b) He believes that an eleven-unit project would be more appropriate for the site; c) A centralized trash collection area would be beneficial; d) A central mail area may be beneficial; e) He agreed with Members Schneider and Branch that softening the architecture on Unit 12 on the north elevation is needed; and f) Moving the units away from the west property line is appreciated.
 5. Member Messner commented: a) He expressed concern that the Unit 12, with the three-story element, will appear to tower up over the adjacent property; and agreed with the DRB comments to consider softening the architecture; b) Story poles may be useful; and c) The site plan appears tight; and suggested finding ways to reduce this; for example consider a centralized trash collection area and centralized location for mail.
 6. Member Herrera commented: a) He suggested reducing the number of units from twelve to eleven; and b) Suggested that an area near the tot lot, located between the first garage and catch basin, be considered for the location of a central trash area.
 7. Chair Wignot commented: a) It would be beneficial to erect story poles that would show the dimensions of the buildings, particularly the height of Building C in the back; b) He expressed concern with regard to circulation, for example, visitors who park on the west side of the property would need to walk along a foot path to the

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 16 of 18

east side of the property to enter the units; c) He suggested splitting the garages into two two-car garages with a central alley and gates which would allow visitors to enter the residences from the yard, and also allow the residents to keep their trash containers inside the yard and place them out on collection day; d) He recommended that numbered parking spaces be assigned for each unit and be located as close to the unit as possible; e) Visitor parking spaces should be designated and labeled for use by visitors; f) He requested that a walkway be added along the north side, between Unit 12 and the property line, and also along the south side, between Unit 1 and the detention basin, if there is room; and g) He agreed with DRB comments suggesting that the mass of Unit 12 in Building C be scaled back, noting that there is a large window in Unit 12 looking down into an adjacent yard.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, stated that the DRB comments were very constructive; including the following suggestions: a) change Unit 12 to a two-bedroom unit to soften the architecture to the north; b) explore possible solutions to create a central trash area; c) consider splitting the garages into two two-car garages, (if there is room); and d) consider adding walkways or stepping stones along the south and north side of the site. He said that reducing the number of units from twelve to eleven would not be possible at this time without losing one affordable unit.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 04-226-DRB, 7388 Calle Real, with comments, to December 9, 2008.

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).

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 17 of 18

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 8-26-08, 7-22-08, 6-10-08, 4-22-08, 3-25-08) (David Stone)

The plans were presented by agent Mary Meaney Reichel, Lucon Inc., on behalf of the Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership, property owner, and Mark Scheurer, project architect. Mark Scheurer stated that he met with DRB Member Schneider and Member Branch who provided good suggestions during the revision process. He presented and discussed the document entitled, "Haskell's Landing, Goleta, California, October 2008 Revisions".

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The revisions are very good; b) He appreciates that the rendering on the front cover of the document is back in the plans; and c) The concept of having a toolbox and mixing certain parts is appreciated.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The California architecture design is reflective of the area's unique living styles both current and past, and more appropriate than European architecture; b) The revisions will make a difference and the applicant's efforts are appreciated.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The revisions are much-appreciated; b) The three architectural styles work very well together; and c) Removing the "S-tile" is a big improvement.
4. Member Branch commented: a) The revisions are a vast improvement and present a creative solution for the site; and b) He has reservations with regard to the relationship of the awnings on the buildings.
5. Member Messner commented: a) The revised plans are good.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) The revised plans are an improvement and the project is very attractive.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) The appearance of the Coastal architecture design elevations, shown on page 7, would benefit by being an earth-tone color rather than white. b) Suggested that the chimney shrouds be smaller and appropriate in scale; and 3) Recommended that steps be taken to address fire concerns when designing the roofs and selecting materials.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 18 of 18

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to take of calendar with comments Item M-2, No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Aramas Road, to be forwarded for Planning Commission review.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. DENSITY DISCUSSION

There being no objections, Chair Wignot stated that Item O-1, Density Discussion, will be continued to October 28, 2008.

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Member Brown requested that staff schedule an agenda item to conduct a year-end review of selected projects that were completed during this year.

O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Member Herrera expressed concern that there is an overgrowth of trees where South Patterson Avenue intersects the bike path at Maria Ygnacio Creek which obstructs the motorists' view of the bike path area.

Chair Wignot stated that this area along South Patterson Avenue is within the County's jurisdiction. He will send an email to County staff advising of the situation.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 7:45 P.M.

Minutes approved on October 28, 2008.