



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, December 9, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

Members:

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

Notices:

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

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 2 of 17

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for November 25, 2008

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

B-4. RDA STOREFRONT FACADE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PRESENTATION

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

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

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

- NONE

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-182-DRB

7127 Hollister Avenue (APN073-440-001 & 073-440-012)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 21,444-square foot commercial tenant space on a 9.3 acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to install two wall signs on the existing tower element, one on the east elevation and one on the north elevation. The 18-foot by 3.08-foot sign will have 24-inch blue letters reading "PACIFIC SALES", and 9-inch red letters reading "KITCHEN, BATH & ELECTRONICS" with a total sign area of 55.44 square feet. The individually pin mounted vinyl channel letters will be internally illuminated with white and red LED bulbs. The project was filed by agent Christian Muldoon on behalf of Islay Investments, property owner. Related cases: 23-SB-OSP; 23-SB-CUP; 23-SB-DP AM01; 23-SB-LUP. (Continued from 11-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 3 of 17

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

11-12-08 Meeting:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommends Preliminary Approval with the conditions that the text be changed to read "PACIFIC SALES" "KITCHEN AND BATH CENTERS", which is the legal name; and that the red LED's shall be removed.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The applicant needs to provide proof that the legal name of the business has been changed to "PACIFIC SALES" "KITCHEN, BATH & ELECTRONICS", before the Land Use Permit could be issued for the proposed name on the sign, to comply with the Overall Sign Plan (OSP); b) the red LED's would need to be eliminated to comply with the OSP; c) the design and concept of the project are fine; and d) in response to a comment by speaker Gary Vandeman, channel letters, which typically are internally illuminated, are allowed, but internally illuminated can signs are discouraged.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-2, No. 08-182-DRB, 7127 Hollister Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) the current legal name of the business shall be used on the wall signs which is "PACIFIC SALES" "KITCHEN AND BATH CENTERS"; and 2) the red LED's shall be removed and the illumination shall be all white LED's; and to continue to December 9, 2008, for Final review.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-186-DRB

6021 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-082-028)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes an approximately 28,000-square foot hotel on a 0.7-acre lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes a change to the faces of three existing signs: a 54-square foot freestanding pole sign, an approximately 109-square foot wall sign, and a 4.3-square foot freestanding directional sign. The signs will be constructed of yellow polycarbonate with a vinyl overlay for graphics. The two faces of the freestanding sign are 9 feet tall by 6 feet wide each, and the face of the wall sign is 33 feet wide by 3.3 feet tall. The two faces of the freestanding directional sign are 25 inches tall by 25 inches wide. An as-built Conditional Use Permit is also requested for the freestanding directional sign. The project was filed by Christian Muldoon of Vogue Signs, agent, on behalf of Van Bivens, secretary for the H. Oliver Dixon Trust, property owner. Related cases: 08-186-CUP, 08-186-SCC, 08-187-SCC, and 08-188-SCC. (Continued from 11-12-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

11-12-08 Meeting:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Recommended that the existing rectangular box sign not be illuminated at night for twenty-five percent of the sign at both ends, so only the middle half of the sign will be lit at night; b) There is too much white space on the rectangular box at both ends; and c) The other proposed signs are fine.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with Member Schneider that there would be too much yellow color illuminated at night on the rectangular box at

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 4 of 17

both ends; and b) Suggested that the yellow color remain during the day but only the logo is illuminated at night.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to continue Item H-3, No. 08-186-DRB, 6021 Hollister Avenue, with Conceptual comments to December 9, 2008, for Preliminary review.

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-148-DRB

5892 Calle Real (APN 069-110-061)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a commercial building occupied by Bank of America. The applicant proposes to install new signage associated with Bank of America, including a new freestanding pole sign (Sign 1), two wall signs (Signs 14, & 15), and two directional signs (Signs 11, & 13). Signage proposed that will not require permits are a sign for disabled parking (Sign 3), glass door signage (Signs 9, & 10), and a Do Not Enter sign to replace the existing sign (Sign 12). The project was filed by agent Steve Stallone on behalf of Bank of America, property owner. Related cases: N/A. (Continued from 11-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

11-12-08 Meeting:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The existing monument sign works well; b) He suggested that the new corporate colors be applied to the existing monument sign instead of adding a pole sign; c) He is not in favor of the proposed pole sign; d) Reducing the size of the wall signs by fifty percent would be adequate, particularly with the red background; e) Signs #9, 10, 11 and 13 are fine; and f) The recent removal of banner signs on the site is appreciated.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) He agreed with Member Schneider that the new corporate colors should be applied to the existing monument sign instead of adding a pole sign.
3. Member Branch commented: a) If the existing monument sign remains, the size of the wall signs could each be reduced by fifty percent; b) The existing monument sign and the proposed wall sign are at the same eye level, and approximately the same size; and c) Pole signs are not favored.
4. Member Messner commented: a) The red background on the signs seems to be overbearing on the bank wall corners and too repetitious.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to continue Item H-4, No. 08-148-DRB, 5892 Calle Real, to December 9, 2008, with the following Conceptual comments: 1) Sign #1 Pylon Sign: apply the new corporate colors to the existing monument sign instead of adding a pole sign which is not favored; 2) Wall Signs #14 and 15: reduce the wall signs by fifty percent; 3) The monument and wall signs shall have an opaque background with push-through letters, and only illuminate the copy and logo at night; 4) Signs #9 and 10: the door vinyl signs are fine as submitted; 5) Sign #11: the directional ATM sign at the canopy is fine as submitted; and 6) Sign #13: the directional exit sign is fine as submitted.

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 5 of 17

H-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-203-DRB

6780 Cortona Drive (APN 073-150-027)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 15,600-square foot commercial property on a 54,014-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to install a 12.8-square foot wall sign with red letters ranging in height from 16.8-inches to 23.3-inches. The registered trademark sign will read "DUPONT" surrounded by an oval seal. The non-illuminated sign will be ¾-inches thick pin mounted ½-inch off the wall. The project was filed by agent Harry Vant-Erve with DuPont Displays, on behalf of Weatherby Enterprises, property owner. Related cases: 08-203-SCC. (Brian Hiefield)

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-171-DRB

351 S. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue (APNs 065-090-022, -023, -028)

This is a request for *Final* review of a new application for the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital which proposes to improve its existing facilities in order to comply with State Senate Bill 1953, a law requiring the seismic retrofit and/or upgrading of all acute care facilities. Existing development consists of a 93,090-square foot hospital and a 41,224-square foot Medical Office Building (MOB).

The applicant proposes to replace the hospital with an entirely new facility and demolishing the old hospital building, resulting in a total of 152,658 square feet, a net increase of approximately 59,568 square feet. The existing MOB located north of the hospital is also proposed to be replaced and will be demolished, resulting in a total of 55,668 square feet, a net increase of approximately 14,444 square feet.

Parking to serve both the hospital and MOB uses will be redeveloped on both sites and a temporary construction parking area including 377 spaces is proposed across South Patterson Avenue in the northwestern portion of the parcel known as the "Hollipat" site.

Phased construction is planned through 2011 in a manner that will continue to provide all existing medical services to the community.

The hospital, MOB, and a portion of the Hollipat parcels have a General Plan Land Use Designation of Office & Institutional. The hospital parcel has a Hospital Overlay. The remaining portion of the Hollipat parcel has split land use designations of medium and high density residential. The zoning for the hospital, MOB, and a portion of the Hollipat parcel is Professional & Institutional (PI). The remaining portion of the Hollipat parcel has split zoning of Design Residential, 20 and 25 units per acre. The MOB parcel and a portion of the Hollipat parcel have a Design Control Overlay and the southern portion of the hospital parcel has the Approach Zone Overlay. The project was filed by agent Suzanne Elledge on

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 6 of 17

behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 07-171-OA, 07-171-DP. (Continued from 11-25-08, 7-8-08, 6-24-08, 5-28-08, 5-13-08*, 2-12-08, 01-23-08, 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

11-25-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Typically, 30-foot lighting standards spaced far apart in parking lots are not acceptable because there would be hot spots and darker areas in between; therefore, he suggested that the height of the lighting standards be lowered, possibly adding some more standards; b) Requested the applicant consider creative treatments for the islands, even though the parking lot is temporary; c) Consider adding pots in the islands which would act as barriers and block vehicles from running into lighting standards, as well as break up the mass of asphalt; d) Consider placing holes for live plants in pots to be placed in the islands; and e) Requested the applicant provide details in terms of color and materials with regard to the pervious pavement.
2. Member Branch commented: a) Agreed with Member Schneider's suggestion to lower the height of the lighting standards and add more standards; b) Agreed with Member Schneider's suggestion to consider adding pots with holes for plantings in the temporary parking lot as a temporary solution for the parking lot, stating that it would hopefully be economical; c) Requested the applicant provide details with regard to the color of the permeable paving and the materials; and d) A decision by the DRB with regard to the temporary parking lot is part of the process needed to help move the hospital and MOB project forward.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Requested that the applicant provide a full explanation of the site drainage plan including the drain pipe underneath the permeable materials; and b) There needs to be a better treatment other than paint for the islands, even though the parking lot is temporary.
4. Member Brown commented: a) Agreed with comments from Member Schneider, Member Brown, and Vice Chair Smith; b) Requested that the applicant provide a photometric plan, lighting details and cut sheets showing fully-shielded lighting; c) If Cobra Head lighting is used, she noted that it is possible to place a shroud around the fixture, which is a more effective type of lighting; d) Requested that consideration be given to a treatment for the islands that is more decorative and natural rather than a barrier; for example, possibly consider a boulder, although a tree would be her preference; e) Requested the applicant provide information with regard to calculations used to determine the purpose, need, and function of the proposed drain pipe underneath the pervious pavement; and f) Recommended that signage be placed that will encourage pedestrians to use the crosswalks and discourage pedestrians from walking across the median.
5. Member Messner commented: a) Suggested the applicant consider planting the Guadalupe Palm species in the islands in the parking lot, which would grow well, to serve as a sort of barrier, noting that this species is a fixture in the area.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) Suggested that approximately one-half of the ADA parking spaces, which are located near Hollister Avenue, be placed at the south end of the temporary parking lot near the temporary crosswalk, noting that the crosswalk near Hollister Avenue seems to be serving the Medical Office Building (MOB) and the other proposed crosswalk to the south seems to be serving the hospital; b) The applicant is requested to provide a photometric study and lighting cut sheets showing whether fixtures are compliant with dark sky

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 7 of 17

principles or need to be shielded; c) The apartments to the east may be impacted by the lighting, which needs to be addressed; d) Suggested placing a crosswalk at the middle of the temporary parking for people who would want to cross the street; e) The plans for the painted islands will not provide protection for the lighting poles; f) The lighting pole in the middle of the parking area is not protected and seems to need some type of stanchion or an island; g) There should be signage advising the public that the parking lot is for hospital and MOB use only; and h) The Existing Tree Disposition Plan, which identifies every tree on the hospital site by number, is very useful.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera) to grant Preliminary Approval of the portion being reviewed of Item K-1, No. 07-171-DRB, 351 S. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) The applicant shall provide more explanation of the site drainage including the system underneath the permeable materials; 2) The applicant shall provide the lighting plan, photometrics, and cut sheets for the lighting fixtures, and consider lowering the 30-foot poles; 3) The applicant is requested to consider treatments of the island in the parking lot; and 4) The applicant shall consider the suggestion to move some of the ADA parking from the area near the crosswalk at Hollister Avenue to the area at the south end of the temporary parking lot near the proposed crosswalk; and to continue the item to December 8, 2008, for Final review.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

7388 Calle Real (APN 077-490-043)

This is a request for *Preliminary* 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 10-14-08, 7-08-08) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

10-14-08 Meeting:

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

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 8 of 17

- parking 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 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

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 9 of 17

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.

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.

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-145-DRB

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* 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 Phase 4 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 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.

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 10 of 17

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. (Continued from 10-28-08, 09-23-08*, 08-26-08) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

10-28-08 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) The landscape palette, which is very thoughtful, is appreciated. b) The applicant is requested to research and present plans with regard to providing additional landscaping for screening to address concerns from the neighbors to the east; and c) The flowers from the Pineapple Guava species are edible.
2. Member Branch commented: a) Suggested considering some sort of screening for the neighbors to the east, for example, up to the sill height of the windows, rather than seeing a completely unobstructed yurt.
3. Member Messner commented: a) Suggested planting approximately three or four trees in front of each yurt for screening property to the east, which would hide the yurts somewhat and yet leave some of the area open and provide for morning sunlight, rather than planting trees across the entire length along the east side.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with Member Messner's suggestion to screen a portion of the eastern side, in front of each yurt, rather than the whole length; b) Suggested, for evaluation, whether adding low screening material, such as shrubs, near the kitchen and bathroom trailers, towards the lower part of the property, would screen the view from the neighbors to the east while being low enough not to obstruct the view from the labor camp to the farm.
5. Chair Wignot commented: a) The applicant is requested to bring photographs showing the view of the labor camp from the neighbors to the east. b) The neighbors to the east may bring in photographs showing their views of the site which will be useful.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 08-145-DRB, 598 North Fairview Avenue, to December 9, 2008, with the following comments: 1) The applicant shall research and consider additional landscaping to address what needs to be done to affect some shielding of the project for the neighbors to the east; and 2) The applicant shall provide cut sheets for the proposed landscape lighting.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-194-DRB

5755 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-122-001)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes an approximately 1,000-square foot retail commercial building a 912-square foot gasoline fueling station canopy, three double-sided fueling dispensers, and a car storage lot on a 25,000-square foot commercial property in the C-2 and C-3 zone districts. The applicant proposes new blue and white aluminum fascia panels for the fueling station canopy and the service station façade. No new floor area or other structural development is proposed. The project was filed by Harwood White, agent, on behalf of John Price of Goleta Properties LLC, property owner. Related cases: 08-194-LUP. (Continued from 11-25-08) (Shine Ling)

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 11 of 17

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

11-25-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed blue color is overbearing for its location in Old Town and the bright color doesn't seem to comply with Goleta Heritage District Architecture & Design Guidelines; b) Suggested consideration that the band would be mostly white with a blue stripe, so that the dominant color is not blue, for both the building and the canopy; and c) The depth of the canopy is fine.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The sign would be more handsome and stand out more with the color arrangement suggested by Member Branch; b) The applicant's efforts to spruce up the site are appreciated; c) Old Town is a unique area and the applicant's efforts and flexibility to adhere to the Old Town guidelines as much as possible would be appreciated; and d) It would be better for the DRB to provide direction with regard to the appropriateness of landscaping when the applicant presents the landscape plans for the rear portion of the site because it seems that it would be problematic for the applicant to install landscaping at this time.
3. Member Messner commented: a) From his experience, once the weather has affected a bright color over time, typically the brightness will become more dull with a matte appearance.
4. Chair Wignot commented: a) The consensus of the DRB seems to be that the proportion of the proposed blue color being used is excessive and would need to be scaled back in quantity.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider; Absent: Herrera) to continue Item L-1, No. 08-194-DRB, 5755 Hollister Avenue, to December 9, 2008, with the following comment: 1) The applicant shall study the quantity of cobalt blue being proposed.

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-199-DRB

454 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-090-013)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes three commercial/industrial buildings totaling 49,756 square feet of floor area on a 7.95-acre site in the PI zone district. The applicant proposes a 550-square foot addition to the office building at the front of the property. Covered arcades are also proposed on the north, west, and east elevations, and a new plaster façade treatment is proposed on all elevations. A new trash enclosure would be located near the southeast corner of the building, and a new landscaping plan is proposed. New colors would consist of olive green, rose, and beige. The project was filed by Ed Lenvik of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Somera Patterson LLC, property owner. Related cases: 08-199-SCD; -LUP. (Shine Ling)

L-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-202-DRB

6991 Scripps Crescent (APN 073-181-008)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,230-square foot single-story residence, a 471-square foot 2-car garage, and a pool on an approximately 9,100-square foot lot in the DR-10 zone district. The

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 12 of 17

applicant proposes a 90-square foot addition to the residence. An approximately 120-square foot as-built trellis would also be part of the scope of this permit. The resulting one-story structure would be 1,791 square feet, consisting of a 1,320-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 471-square foot two-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by David Varesio, property owner. Related cases: 08-202-LUP. (Shine Ling)

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

- NONE

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 13 of 17

Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines

Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)

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

Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)

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

Design Review Board Procedures

Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)

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

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

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

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 14 of 17

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

Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 15 of 17

Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

Conceptual Review

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

Information required for conceptual review includes:

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

Preliminary Review

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

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

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 16 of 17

Final Review

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

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

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

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

Revised Final

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

Multiple Levels of Approval at a Single Meeting

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

Presentation of Projects (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.3)

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

Public Testimony (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.4)

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

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 17 of 17

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

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

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

Appeals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.8)

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