

ATTACHMENT 4

ADDENDUM DATED MARCH 18, 2009

**ADDENDUM
DATED MARCH 18, 2009
TO THE CITRUS VILLAGE PROJECT
FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (007-MND-004)
CASE NO. 04-226-TM, -DP
7388 CALLE REAL, APN 077-490-043**

A. LOCATION

The Citrus Village project site is located at 7388 Calle Real (APN 077-490-043). The property includes 0.94 acres situated near the northeast corner of the intersection of Calle Real and Ellwood Station Road in western Goleta.

B. BACKGROUND

Mitigated Negative Declaration

A Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (Draft MND) was prepared by Envicom Corporation under contract to the City of Goleta for the originally proposed 11-unit project. The Draft MND was circulated for public review between December 21, 2007 and January 22, 2008. A Final MND was prepared by Envicom Corporation under contract to the City of Goleta and was released on August 15, 2008.

The project was subsequently revised to delete requested General Plan Amendments to Land Use Element Policy LU 1.10, Multifamily Residential Development; the Land Use Element Table 2-1, Allowable Uses and Standards for Residential Use Categories; and the Conservation Element Policy CE 10.3, Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management. Two affordable units were also removed from the proposal, reducing the total unit count to nine market rate units, thereby eliminating the request for application of State Density Bonus Law and the associated granting of concessions related to the provision of affordable units. Site drainage was modified based on the revised site plan.

City of Goleta Planning Commission Review

On August 25, 2008, the Planning Commission reviewed the revised nine unit project and voted to continue the item to September 8, 2008, with direction to the applicant to submit a redesign which addressed concerns related to, among other things, affordable units, compatibility with adjacent uses, lighting, and parking. At the September 8, 2008 hearing, the Planning Commission directed the applicant to move forward with consideration of a 12 unit alternative plan, to include review by the Design Review Board (DRB) with the ability for the applicant and DRB to consider a 10 unit alternative plan if the 12 unit alternative plan is found to be problematic during the review process, and continued the item to the November 10, 2008 Planning Commission hearing. At the November 10, 2008 hearing, the Planning Commission expressed support for moving the 12 unit alternative plan forward with direction to install story poles at the site and continued the item for further review at a special meeting of the Planning Commission on January 26, 2009. At the January 26, 2009 hearing the item was taken off calendar to be rescheduled at a later date because the story pole installation had been delayed. Story poles were installed onsite from January 27 to January 29, 2009.

The current 12 unit proposal includes two moderate income affordable units and a request for application of State Density Bonus Law including one concession.

C. ADDENDUM

The revised project is reviewed in this addendum to the Final MND as per California Environmental Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15164. CEQA Section 15164 allows an addendum to be prepared when only minor technical changes or changes that do not create new significant impacts would result. Based on analysis contained herein, an Addendum is considered the appropriate environmental review for this project. This conclusion is based on the fact that all previously identified impacts will remain the same. There are no new significant impacts (i.e. no new Class I or Class II impacts) or an increase in severity of previously identified impacts (i.e. a Class III impact has not become a Class II or Class I impact; a Class II impact has not become a Class I impact). State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 provides that an addendum need not be circulated for public review, but can be included in, or attached to, the Final MND. The Guidelines further provide that the Planning Commission must consider the addendum together with the Final MND prior to taking action to approve the project.

D. REVISED PROJECT

The originally proposed 11 unit project has been revised as follows:

1. General Plan Amendment: the proposed General Plan Amendments (04-226-GPA) to Land Use Element Policy LU 1.10, the Land Use Element Table 2-1, and the Conservation Element Policy CE 10.3 have been deleted. The proposed change to LU 1.10, Multifamily Residential Development, is not necessary, as the applicable land use designation for the subject property is Planned Residential; LU 1.10 simply does not apply to the subject property. The proposed change to Table 2-1, Allowable Uses and Standards for Residential Use Categories, regarding standards for building intensity, has been deleted as a result of the City's adoption of changes in June 2008 to make such standards recommended and to allow changes to the standards based upon a finding of good cause (Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Track 2 Amendments). The proposed change to CE 10.3, Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management, has been deleted as a result of the City's adoption of changes to the policy with approval of the Village at Los Carneros project in February 2008.

2. Final Development Plan: The total number of units has been increased to 12 including two moderate income affordable units. The associated application of State Density Bonus Law to the project includes a request for a concession granting relief from the required private outdoor space to allow approximately 10%-15% of the gross floor area of the residence served, rather than the 20% required. Based on the revised site plan for 12 units, site drainage has been modified to allow for detention of the stormwater runoff difference from the pre-development condition to the post-development condition for a 25-year storm event. Finally, with the revised layout, the Fire Department no longer requires a road naming and the units would have Calle Real addresses.

The revised project continues to include the following applications:

Vesting Tentative Tract Map (04-226-TM):

Per proposed Tentative Tract Map 32,027, the project would include a one lot subdivision of the 0.94-acre property for airspace condominium purposes. The proposed map is attached.

Final Development Plan (04-226-DP):

The revised project includes a request to allow the construction of 12 residential condominiums within three 3-story structures arranged along the east side of the property and oriented towards the Brookside residential condominium development to the east (Buildings A-C). The maximum height would be 33'6". Each unit would include a detached 248 gross square foot single car garage separated from the rear of each unit by private open space areas that range from 150-180 square feet. The total structural development including garages would be 20,772 gross square feet. The total building footprint would be 9,752 square feet (24% of the site). The project site plan depicting the layout of the proposed development is shown on Sheet A1.

Building A would contain three, 3-bedroom market rate units and one affordable 2-bedroom unit (1,059 – 1,613 gross square feet), Building B would contain four 3-bedroom market rate units (1,610 – 1,672 gross square feet), and Building C would contain two 3-bedroom market rate units (1,613 – 1,672 square feet), one affordable 2-bedroom unit (980 square feet), and one 2-bedroom market rate unit (1,123 square feet). All units would have natural gas fireplaces. Floor plans for the units are shown on Sheets A4 – A6.

The architectural style is described as California Craftsman vernacular including hip roofs with exposed rafter tails, wooden brackets and gable pediment decoration, shutter and vinyl clad wood windows, canvas awnings, stone treatments, and built-up columns with cement plaster finishes. Building elevations showing the structural design are provided on Sheets A7 – A9 and site elevations are shown on Sheet A10. An aerial view of the proposed project and photo-realistic perspectives are shown on Sheets A11 – A12.

Access and Parking

A single access to and from the condominiums would be provided from Calle Real. The minimum 24-foot wide drive aisle to the west of the garages would include a hammerhead turnaround for emergency vehicles near the lot between Buildings B and C. Parking would include 12 single car garage parking spaces and 24 uncovered spaces, most of which would be located along the western property boundary, for a total of 36 parking spaces. A common trash enclosure would be provided adjacent to these spaces across from Building B. The driveway and parking area would encompass an area of approximately 11,563 square feet (28% of the site). Parking spaces are depicted on Sheet A1.

The project would include an offer to dedicate back to the City an approximately 4,016 square foot right of way area along the Calle Real frontage for roadway purposes.

Grading and Drainage

The site would require approximately 1,720 cubic yards of cut and 50 cubic yards of fill, including 1,670 cubic yards of export. A 4' tall screen wall would be constructed along the southern property boundary, exclusive of the drive aisle entrance. A retaining wall and 5' screen wall would be constructed along the length of the western property boundary and the western portion of the northern property boundary the width of the

parking spaces and drive aisle. A 40" railing would run along side almost the entire length of the eastern property boundary between unit 2 in Building A to unit 12 in Building C. A 6' sound wall would be constructed on either side of the eastern entrance to the tot lot area. Storm water runoff would be directed to landscaped areas, bioswales, and the storm drains equipped with cleaning inserts for all catch basins. A detention basin is proposed south of Building A east of the drive aisle to retain the difference in the stormwater runoff from the pre-development condition to the post-development condition during a 25-year storm event. Swales that drain to drop inlets are proposed along the northern property boundary, between buildings, as well as along the western property which drains to the detention basin. The Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan is shown on Sheet C1.

Landscaping

A landscape plan for the site depicts a mixture of native, drought tolerant trees, shrubs and groundcovers. Project perimeter and internal landscaping is proposed to screen and soften views of the buildings. Landscaping would occur within the common open space areas as well as the private yards. Private landscaped yards would cover approximately 2,084 square feet of the site (5%). A preliminary Landscape Plan is depicted on Sheet A2.

Common open space would total approximately 17,344 square feet (42% of the site) exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated back to the City for transportation purposes, and includes a tot-lot play area. Common open space is depicted on Sheet A3.

Modifications Requested

The proposal includes requests for modifications to certain standards of the Article III, Inland Zoning Ordinance, as follows:

- A modification for zero lot line on all attached units, rather than the 10 feet required. (Section 35-222.8.2).
- A modification from the required parking design to allow vehicles to encroach into the private street when backing out. (Section 35-262.3(d)).
- A modification from the required minimum perimeter landscaping to allow 6'6" rather than the 10 feet required. (Section 35-322.13.4)

Application of State Density Bonus Law

The proposed project includes a request for application of State Density Bonus Law (Government Code §65915 *et. seq*) relative to the granting of one incentive for the provision of two affordable units. The 11 condominium units with associated garages and common open space over 0.94 acres would result in a density of approximately 11.7 dwelling units per gross acre. With the addition of one density bonus unit, the density would be 12.77 dwelling units per gross acre, which exceeds the maximum allowed density of 12.3 dwelling units per gross acre in the zone district, but which is allowed under the State Density Bonus program. The proposal includes a request for granting of

one concession related to private outdoor patio area requirements per City Code §35-292(f).4(1), Density Bonus for Affordable Housing Projects, Development Incentives¹.

E. IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES ASSOCIATED WITH THE REVISED PROJECT

1. Aesthetics

One unit has been added, increasing the total number of units from 11 to 12. The change in number of units has resulted in a different proposed number and configuration of buildings onsite. The total number of residential buildings decreases from five of the originally proposed project, to three with the redesign. All buildings would be arranged along the east side of the property and oriented towards the adjacent residential condominium development rather than in a courtyard setting around a central drive aisle. Uncovered parking spaces would abut the entirety of the western property boundary leaving this area, along with the drive aisle open. Additionally, three detached garage buildings are added, separated from the rear of each unit by private open space areas. Each of these buildings would include four single car attached garages with a maximum height of 14 feet. The revised project includes an FAR of 0.51, exceeding the recommended FAR of 0.30 and while open space would increase on the site with the redesign from approximately 33% to 42%, the project may result in aesthetic impacts related to its perceived scale relative to adjacent development. The three-story residential structures would be 33 feet 6 inches, an increase of 3 feet 6 inches over the originally proposed two-story courtyard project, but below the zoning ordinance limit of 35 feet. Additional visual simulations with views from Calle Real and with the story poles superimposed were provided by the applicant and are attached.

Within the planned residential development adjacent to the southeasterly side of the project, the two-story residential building closest to Calle Real is set back approximately 120 feet from the street, 60' farther than the proposed residential structures. The first street-facing unit consists of a single story design element. The building pads of this adjacent development are situated at a slightly lower elevation nearest the street which descends gradually toward the interior of the project toward the rear and northerly side of the project site. The surfaces of the project site were previously raised and leveled with imported fill. The site plan shows the front, southeast corner of Building A to have a finished pad elevation approximately 5.5 feet higher than that of the nearest adjacent residential structure that is situated closest to the street. Along its western boundary the surface of the lot is at grade with that of the paved parking lot of the shopping center that abuts the site. The gas pump canopy of the gas station closest to Calle Real is set back approximately 45 feet from the curb and edge of pavement of the street, 15' closer than the proposed residential structures.

¹ A reduction in site development standards or a modification of zoning requirements, including but not limited to a reduction of the minimum open space requirement to 30%, allowing zero side yard setbacks throughout the development, building height, distance between buildings, setbacks, parking, building coverage, screening, or a reduction in architectural design requirements which exceed minimum building code standards.

The Calle Real frontage of the project site is 143.44-feet wide. With the combination of sidewalk and parkway strip widths, a 28-foot right-of-way for potential future use by the City of Goleta, and an additional 23-foot setback, the side wall of Building A facing the street would be set back approximately 64 feet. Therefore, the project would function as a transition between business uses and single and multi-family residential neighborhoods. Building A would have an effectual 21-foot setback from the easterly boundary with the adjacent planned residential development. The internal driveway access to the proposed project site provides a minimum 24-foot separation between the garages and the uncovered parking. As viewed from street level along Calle Real the combination of the side yard set back, the 24-foot wide interior access driveway, and the uncovered parking with landscaped perimeter would account for approximately 33 percent of the frontage width of the lot. Thus maintaining a view corridor through the parcel to the backdrop of the foothills and Santa Ynez Mountain skyline.

Project landscaping is an integral component of any development proposal to soften building masses, reinforce pedestrian scale, provide a transition between adjacent properties and provide screening along public streets. The project's Preliminary Landscaping Plan (Sheet A2) proposes large canopy trees around the perimeter of the site such as 24" boxed coast live oaks and jacarandas estimated to reach between 30-50 feet at maturity, and medium canopy trees along the western property boundary such as 24" boxed fruitless olives estimated to reach between 25-30 feet at maturity. Tall shrubs and large shrub massings including 5 gallon pittosporum, ceanothus, flannel bush, and bush anemone are proposed throughout the site. The planting plan includes four large canopy trees and three medium canopy trees within the open setback area between Calle Real and Building A. The plan indicates that the southeast property boundary near Building A would be landscaped with a large canopy tree and three medium flowering trees estimated to reach between 10-30 feet at maturity to visually screen the front half of the building from the neighboring uses and in westbound views from Calle Real. Toward the northeasterly side of the project site, an existing 195-foot long hedgerow (of tall Myoporum shrubs) would be left undisturbed and a large canopy tree and flowering trees would be added to further screen that portion of the development.

Prior to assurances that specific elements of the project such as landscaping that is appropriately sized and located to sufficiently screen and soften the visual impact of the buildings fronting Calle Real, as well as HVAC equipment and utility connections that are properly screened from view, the effect of the proposed project on neighborhood compatibility and the visual character of the surrounding area, including impacts to views of the site as one travels westward along Calle Real, would be considered potentially significant. There would be no changes to impacts on aesthetics described in the Final MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

Impact AES 1: *The proposed project would result in short-term aesthetic impacts during construction. (Class II)*

Impact AES 2: *The proposed project design including appropriately sized and located landscaping would be compatible with the surrounding development pending Final approval by the City of Goleta, including the Design Review Board. (Class II)*

Impact AES 3: *The proposed utilities and mechanical equipment would be properly screened from view pending Final approval by the City of Goleta, including the Design Review Board. (Class II)*

Impact AES 4: *The proposed project would result in night lighting and glare from structures, and the drive aisle and walkway illumination. (Class II)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on aesthetics would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

AES 1-1, AES 2-1, AES 2-2, AES 2-3, AES 2-4, AES 3-1, AES 3-2, AES 4-1

Residual Impacts

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative aesthetic impacts would be considered less than significant.

2. Agricultural Resources

The revised project would not result in any impacts on agricultural resources. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

3. Air Quality

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) accumulate in the atmosphere, where these gases trap heat near the Earth's surface by absorbing infrared radiation. This effect causes global warming and climate change, with adverse impacts on humans and the environment.

Greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) would be associated with the construction phase of the proposed project through the use of heavy equipment and vehicle trips. Emissions of greenhouse gases during this phase would be short-term. Increased development, including the proposed project, would cause GHG emissions to be generated. Emissions associated with energy use would arise from the combustion of fossil fuels to provide energy for the operational phase of the development. The proposed project would contribute incrementally to long-term increases in GHGs as a result of traffic increases and minor secondary fuel combustion emission from project elements such as space and hot water heating. Additional incremental increases in GHG emissions would occur as a result of the generation of electricity necessary to meet project-related increases in energy demand.

Project Cumulative Impacts

While global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact and the impacts of climate change on California human and natural systems would also be substantial, there currently is no agreed-upon methodology to adequately identify, under CEQA, when project-level GHG emissions contribute considerably to this cumulative impact.

At this time, there are no adopted thresholds of significance for GHG emissions and the methodology of analysis is evolving. To that end, until a good threshold is determined, the City believes it is safe to say that any project with GHG emissions (inclusive of construction and operational emissions as estimated by APCD's latest URBEMIS software program – URBEMIS 2007, Version 9.2.4) greater than the GHG reporting requirement required under ARB Resolution 07-54 (25,000 metric tons or more of CO₂ equivalent per year) should be considered significant. Projects below these levels remain unclassifiable until more evidence becomes available. The incremental project-specific and cumulative contribution to impacts associated with GHG emissions is considered less than significant in the absence of an adopted threshold and given that climatic change is global in scale.

While no significant impacts have been identified due to the speculative nature of greenhouse gas impact assessment, Mitigation Measures AQ 1-1 through AQ 2-3 would reduce the amount of GHG emissions generated during construction and operation.

The revised project would result in the same short-term and long-term air quality impacts that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

Impact AQ 1: *Ground disturbances and equipment operation during construction activities would produce short-term PM₁₀ emissions. (Class II)*

Impact AQ 2: *Exposure risk of sensitive receptors to freeway-related emissions would be adverse. (Class III)*

Cumulative Impacts

The significance of the proposed project's contribution to cumulative global GHG emissions and thereby climate change, pursuant to CEQA, cannot be classified as the project would emit less than the City's interim significance threshold for GHG's of 25,000 metric tons per year. Therefore, cumulative impacts on air quality would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

AQ 1-1

The following mitigation measures would be recommended:

AQ 2-1, AQ 2-2

The following mitigation measure is recommended to further reduce the risks associated with freeway-related emissions:

AQ 2-3 The applicant shall provide an Air Quality Disclosure Statement to potential buyers of units, summarizing the results of technical studies that reflect a health concern resulting from exposure of children to air quality emissions generated within 500 feet of a freeway.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The applicant shall provide this disclosure statement as part of the project CCRs to the City Attorney and Planning & Environmental Services to verify the disclosure statement is fair and adequate. The disclosure shall be reviewed and approved prior to recordation of the Final Map.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify that the Air Quality Disclosure Statement has been incorporated into the CCRs prior to sale of homes. Planning & Environmental Services shall review and approve the statement for objectivity, balance, and completeness.

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and project contributions to cumulative air quality impacts would be less than significant. Project contributions to GHG emissions, would be reduced through implementation of the required and recommended mitigation measures noted above.

4. Biological Resources

The revised project would result in the same impacts to biological resources that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact BIO 1: *Disruption of birds of prey could occur off-site if they are nesting during the construction period. (Class II)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on biological resources would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would still be required:

BIO 1-1

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on biological resources would be less than significant.

5. Cultural Resources

The revised project would result in the same impacts to cultural resources that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact CR 1: *Project construction could result in disturbance of unknown sub-surface cultural resources. (Class II)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on cultural resources would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would still be required:

CR 1-1

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on cultural resources would be less than significant.

6. Geology and Soils

The revised project would result in the same impacts to geology and soils that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact GEO 1: *Project grading would result in a short-term increase in the amount of soil exposed to wind and water erosion. (Class II)*

Impact GEO 2: *Removal of fill material and expansive soils without proper shoring could result in stability impacts along the western property line. (Class II)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on geology and soils would remain as described in the MND. (Class II, Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

GEO 1-1, GEO 1-2, GEO 1-3, GEO 2-1

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on geology and soils would be less than significant.

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The revised project would result in the same impacts from hazards and hazardous materials that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact HAZ 1: *Radon could be a component of the underlying geologic unit which could result in Radon gas exposure levels exceeding EPA guidelines. (Class II)*

Impact HAZ-2: *Exposure to contaminated soils during site preparation activities would be potentially significant. (Class II)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on hazards and hazardous materials would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would still be required:

HAZ 1-1, HAZ 2-1, HAZ 2-2

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts from hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant.

8. Hydrology and Water Quality

As a result of the revised project, minor changes to drainage improvements would occur. Storm water runoff would first be directed to landscaped areas and bioswales prior to reaching the storm drains equipped with cleaning inserts for all catch basins as previously proposed. With the revised project, one detention basin is proposed, south of proposed Building A, to retain the difference in the stormwater runoff from pre-development to post-development conditions. The revised project would result in the same impacts on hydrology and water quality that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact HYDRO/WQ 1: *Surface runoff from the proposed project could result in entry of pollutants into the storm drain system during construction and post-development. (Class II)*

Impact HYDRO/WQ 2: *Onsite drainage improvements would be adequate to detain and convey surface water runoff to prevent flooding pending final approval by the City of Goleta. (Class II)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

HYDRO/WQ 1-1, HYDRO/WQ 1-2, HYDRO/WQ 1-3, HYDRO/WQ 2-1

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.

9. Land Use

The proposed General Plan Amendment to Land Use Element Table 2-1, Allowable Uses and Standards for Residential Use Categories, regarding building intensity standards, has been deleted as a result of the City's adoption of changes in June 2008 (Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Track 2 Amendments). Table 2-1 now includes recommended building intensity standards (including FAR limitations) and allows these standards to be exceeded based on a "good cause" finding. The revised project includes an FAR of 0.51, exceeding the recommended FAR of 0.30. Visual impacts are discussed under Section 1, Aesthetics. The project includes a request for application of State Density Bonus Law relative to the granting of an incentive for the provision of two moderate income affordable units.

The revised project is consistent with existing and planned land uses in the vicinity of the project and would not result in any impacts on land use. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

10. Mineral Resources

The revised project would not result in any impacts on mineral resources. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

11. Noise

The applicant's consulting noise engineer submitted updated estimates of future noise levels for the project based on the revised 12 unit alternative plan (URS, November 10, 2008). The study used the Federal Highway Administration Traffic Noise Model (TNM 2.5, Lau et al 2004), to estimate exterior noise levels on the property at representative locations.

With the private yards now located along the western (rear) side of the residential units and the garages located to the west of the yards, the residences and garages act as barriers that help reduce exterior noise in the yards. Therefore, it is no longer deemed necessary to include the perimeter noise wall that was proposed along the eastern boundary of the previous design. Results showed that future exterior noise levels in the private yards will range from 55.2 to 63.7

dBA, all below the standard of 65 dBA. Placement of 6' walls east of the tot lot would provide some additional reduction to about 57 dBA, but the walls are not deemed necessary since the result without the walls is well below 65 dBA.

Results showed that future exterior noise levels at building sites within the project boundary will range from approximately 62.3 dBA (Unit 5 in Building B south wall, ground level), up to 74.0 dBA (Unit 1 in Building A, south wall, second story). The study states that interior noise level is a function of the sound transmission loss qualities of the construction material and surface area of each element, with doors and windows generally being the acoustical weak link in a building. Further, the study states that by limiting the number and size of these openings on the sides of the building exposed to noise, interior noise levels will be minimized. Unit 1 in Building A would be exposed to the greatest amount of noise and has windows facing south. Unit 1 would have a 6 foot high wall along the southern edge of its private yard to reduce noise levels from Calle Real and Highway 101. Because exterior CNEL values at most of the buildings, particularly along the eastern exposure will continue to be above 65 dBA, it will be necessary to incorporate structural features to ensure that interior CNEL values can be maintained at or below 45 dBA. The revised project would result in the same impacts from noise that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact NSE 1: *Residential uses would be exposed to noise levels greater than CNEL 65dB. (Class II)*

Impact NSE 2: *Construction activity would impact residential sensitive receptors within 1,600 feet of the project site. (Class II)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts from noise would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

NSE 1-1, NSE 2-1, NSE 2-2

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts from noise would be less than significant.

12. Population and Housing

The revised project would not result in any impacts on population and housing. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

13. Public Services

The revised project would not result in any impacts on public services. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

14. Recreation

The revised project would not result in any impacts on recreation. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

15. Transportation/Traffic

As a result of increasing the project by one unit, a corresponding slight increase in trip generation would occur (from 65 ADT to 70 ADT; 6 PM PHT). Proposed parking for the 12 units would exceed the zoning ordinance requirements by three spaces. The proposal no longer includes a request for granting of the modification related to a reduction in the number of required parking spaces, nor is a modification required. The revised project would result in the same impacts to transportation/traffic described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact TR 1: *Emergency access would be deficient if parking along the main drive aisle occurs. (Class II)*

Impact TR 2: *Demand for construction related vehicle parking would create a short term parking impact. (Class II)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative transportation/traffic impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

TR 1-1, TR 2-1

The following mitigation measures would still be recommended:

TR 3-1, TR 3-2

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts from transportation/traffic would be less than significant.

16. Utilities and Service Systems

As a result of addition one unit with the revised project, a slight increase in wastewater generation (from 0.002 mgd to 0.0022 mgd), water use (from 2.2 AFY to 2.4 AFY), and solid waste generation (from 27.69 tons/year to 30.21 tons/year) would occur. The revised project would result in the same impacts to utilities and service systems described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact WW 1: *A final determination as to the availability of central sewer service by the GWSD to serve the proposed project cannot be made without a Sewer Service Connection Permit. (Class II)*

Impact WS 1: *A final determination as to the availability of central water service by the GWD to serve the proposed project cannot be made without a Can & Will Serve letter. (Class II)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative utilities and service systems impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

WW 1-1, WS 1-1

The following mitigation measures would still be recommended:

SW 1-1, SW 1-2, SW 1-3

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

F. FINDINGS

It is the finding of the Planning and Environmental Services Department that the previous environmental document as herein amended may be used to fulfill the environmental review requirements of the current project. The current project meets the conditions for the application of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 and preparation of a new EIR or ND is not required. The Citrus Village Project MND (07-MND-004) is hereby amended by this 15164 addendum for the revised Citrus Village Project.

View From Calle Real



PGA

PEIKERT GROUP ARCHITECTS, LLP

10 E Figueroa, suite 1,
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Citrus Village

7388 Calle Real, Goleta, CA

March 09, 2009

View From Northbound Calle Real



PGA

PEIKERT GROUP ARCHITECTS, LLP

10 E Figueroa, suite 1,
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Citrus Village

7388 Calle Real, Goleta, CA

March 09, 2009

View From Southbound Calle Real



PG&A

PEIKERT GROUP ARCHITECTS, LLP

10 E Figueroa, suite 1,
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Citrus Village

7388 Calle Real, Goleta, CA

March 09, 2009

View with Story Poles



PGA

PEIKERT GROUP ARCHITECTS · LLP

10 E. Figueroa, suite 1,
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Citrus Village

7388 Calle Real, Goleta, CA

March 09, 2009

ATTACHMENT 5

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

CITRUS VILLAGE GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

Land Use Element

LU 1.2 Residential Character. [GP/CP]—The Land Use Plan map shall ensure that Goleta's land use pattern remains predominately residential and open, with the majority of nonresidential development concentrated along the primary transportation corridor—east and west along Hollister Avenue and US-101. The intent of the Land Use Plan is to protect and preserve residential neighborhoods by preventing intrusion of nonresidential uses that would be detrimental to the preservation of the existing character of the neighborhoods.

Policy LU 1.8 New Development and Neighborhood Compatibility [GP/CP]—Approvals of all new development shall require compatibility with the character of existing development in the immediate area, including size, bulk, scale, and height. New development shall not substantially impair or block important viewsheds and scenic vistas, as set forth in the Visual and Historical Resources Element.

Consistent. This policy is intended to ensure that new development is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The bulk, mass, and scale of the project would be greater than the surrounding commercial and residential uses, but would function as a transition between business uses and single-family residential neighborhoods. While the project would result in some viewshed interruption from Calle Real as opposed to the unobstructed view across a vacant parcel currently, the uncovered parking area and drive aisle located along the western portion of the property would remain open, maintaining a view corridor through the parcel to the backdrop of the foothills and Santa Ynez Mountain skyline. The maximum height of the structures is proposed to be 33'6", 1'6" below the maximum height of 35' allowed by the zoning ordinance. Consistency with recommended building density and intensity standards are discussed below under Policy LU 2.5, Planned Residential (R-P). Open space would increase on the site from approximately 40% to 42%, exceeding with the zoning ordinance requirement. Aesthetic impacts would be addressed through use of landscaping that is appropriately sized and located to screen and soften the visual impacts of buildings fronting Calle Real. Therefore, the proposed project is considered consistent with this policy.

LU 1.13 Adequate Infrastructure and Services. [GP/CP] — For health, safety, and general welfare reasons, approvals of new development shall be subject to a finding that adequate infrastructure and services will be available to serve the

proposed development in accordance with the Public Facilities and Transportation Elements.

Consistent. This policy is intended to ensure that new development is coordinated with the availability and/or provision of adequate public facilities and infrastructure to adequately serve it. Adequate water, sewer, and utility services are already available from the Goleta Water and Goleta West Sanitary Districts, local utility service providers, fire and police protection services, based on letters received from these agencies during project review. Project impacts on local school enrollment would be mitigated pursuant to State statute by payment of development impact fees to the various school districts so impacted. As such, the proposed project is considered consistent with this policy.

LU 2.5 Planned Residential (R-P). [GP/CP] — *The intent of the Planned Residential designation is to allow flexibility and encourage innovation and diversity in design of residential developments. This is accomplished by allowing a wide range of densities and housing types while requiring provision of a substantial amount of open space and other common amenities within new developments. Clustering of residential units is encouraged where appropriate to provide efficient use of space while preserving natural, cultural, and scenic resources of a site. Planned residential areas may also function as a transition between business uses and single-family residential neighborhoods. This designation permits single-family detached and attached dwellings, duplexes, apartments in multiunit structures, and accessory uses customarily associated with residences. This designation is intended to provide for development of residential units at densities ranging from 5.01 units per acre to 13.0 units per acre, with densities for individual parcels as shown on the map in Figure 2-1. Assuming an average household size of 2.0 to 3.0 persons, this use category will allow population densities between 10 persons per acre and 39 persons per acre.*

LAND USE ELEMENT, TABLE 2-1:

**TABLE 2-1
ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL USE CATEGORIES**

Allowed Uses and Standards	Residential Use Categories				
	R-SF	R-P	R-MD	R-HD	R-MHP
Residential Uses					
One Single-Family Detached Dwelling per Lot	X	X	-	-	-
Single-Family Attached and Detached Dwellings	X	X	X	X	-
Multiunit Apartment Dwellings	-	X	X	X	-
Mobile Home Parks	-	-	-	-	X
Second (Accessory) Residential Units	X	X	-	-	-
Assisted-Living Residential Units	-	-	X	X	-
Other Uses					

Allowed Uses and Standards	Residential Use Categories				
	R-SF	R-P	R-MD	R-HD	R-MHP
Religious Institutions	X	X	X	X	-
Small-Scale Residential Care Facility	X	X	-	-	-
Small-Scale Day Care Center	X	X	X	X	X
Public and Quasi-public Uses	X	X	X	X	-
Accessory Uses					
Home Occupations	X	X	X	X	X
Standards for Density and Building Intensity					
<i>Recommended Standards for Permitted Density</i>					
Maximum Permitted Density (units/acres)	5 or less	5.01–13	20	30	15
Minimum Permitted Density (units/acres)	N/A	N/A	15	15	N/A
<i>Recommended Standards for Building Intensity</i>					
Maximum Floor Area Ratios (FAR)	N/A	0.30	0.50	1.10	N/A
Maximum Structure Height (Inland Area)	25 feet	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet	25 feet
Maximum Structure Height (Coastal Zone)	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	N/A	0.30	0.30	0.40	N/A
Minimum Open Space Ratio	N/A	0.40	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minimum Lot Size	7,000 s.f.	4,500 s.f.	N/A	N/A	2,500 s.f.
<p>Notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use Categories: R-SF– Single-Family Residential; R-P – Planned Residential; R-MD – Medium-Density Residential; R-HD – High-Density Residential; R-MHP – Mobile Home Park. 2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; - indicates use not allowed. 3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code. 4. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause. 5. N/A = Not applicable. 					

Consistent. The General Plan designated the project site as Planned Residential with a maximum allowable density of 13 units/acre. The 11 condominium units with associated garages and common open space over 0.94 acres would result in a density of approximately 11.7 dwelling units per gross acre. With the addition of one density bonus unit, the density would be 12.77 dwelling units per gross acre and as such, is consistent with this policy.

The applicable land use table for the proposed project, Table 2-1, Allowable Uses and Standards for Residential Use Categories, shown above, states a recommended maximum residential floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.30 for the Planned Residential Land Use Designation. The applicant proposes a FAR of 0.51 with 12 residential condominiums within three 3-story structures and three detached garage buildings each containing 4 single car garages. The total structural development including garages would be 20,772 gross square feet. The total building footprint would be 9,752 square feet (24% of the site). This would exceed the recommended FAR standards outlined in Table 2-1. Per Table 2-1, the recommended standards for building intensity may be revised by a

Resolution of the decision-making body based upon a finding of good cause. Per the GP/CLUP Glossary, good cause is:

“defined as a better site or architectural design, will result in better resource protection, will provide a significant community benefit and/or does not create an adverse impact to the community character, aesthetics or public views.

This good cause finding can be made based on:

- a. The supportive comments received from the DRB for the architectural design including the two-bedroom, two-story units placed at either ends to soften the building mass adjacent to Calle Real on the south and the adjacent condominium development to the north, and the movement of units away from the west property line and adjacent commercial uses;
- b. The inclusion of two moderate income affordable units.

The scale and design of the Citrus Village project would allow it to function as a transition between business uses and single-family residential neighborhoods. These project components and conditions of approval for the development would make the project consistent with this policy.

Open Space Element

OS 8.4 Evaluation of Significance [GP/CP]—For any development proposal identified as being located in an area of archaeological sensitivity, a Phase I cultural resources inventory shall be conducted by a professional archaeologist or other qualified expert. All sites determined through a Phase 1 investigation to potentially include cultural resources must undergo subsurface investigation to determine the extent, integrity, and significance of the site. Where Native American artifacts have been found or where oral traditions indicate the site was used by Native Americans in the past, research shall be conducted to determine the extent of the archaeological significance of the site.

OS 8.7 Protection of Paleontological Resources. [GP/CP] — Should substantial paleontological resources be encountered during construction activities, all work that could further disturb the find shall be stopped and the City of Goleta shall be notified within 24 hours. The applicant shall retain a qualified consultant to prepare a report to the City that evaluates the significance of the find and, if warranted, identifies recovery measures. Upon review and approval of the report by the City, construction may continue after implementation of any identified recovery measures.

Consistent. These policies are intended to provide for protection of archaeological and cultural resources. The project site is not shown to contain significant archaeological, paleontological or historical resources.

The nearest identified resource occurs approximately 3,000 feet to the southeast along the Union Pacific Railroad. Implementation of the required conditions of approval is intended to provide for such protection in the event that cultural resources are uncovered during grading/construction activities. As such, the project is considered consistent with these policies.

Conservation Element

CE 8.4 Buffer Areas for Raptor Species [GP/CP]—Development shall be designed to provide a 100-foot buffer around active and historical nest sites for protected species of raptors when feasible. In existing developed areas, the width of the buffer may be reduced to correspond to the actual width of the buffer for adjacent development. If the biological study described in CE 8.3 determines that an active raptor nest site exists on the subject property, whenever feasible no vegetation clearing, grading, construction, or other development activity shall be allowed within a 300-foot radius of the nest site during the nesting and fledging season.

Consistent. This policy requires buffer areas for special status species. Conditions of approval require surveys of possible raptor nesting sites within 100 feet of any construction area during the nesting and fledging season. Implementation of this condition would ensure project consistency with this policy.

CE 10.3 Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management [GP/CP] — New development shall be designed to minimize impacts to water quality from increased runoff volumes and discharges of pollutants from non-point sources to the maximum extent feasible consistent with the requirements and standards of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. Post construction structural BMPs shall be designed to treat, infiltrate, or filter stormwater runoff in accordance with the City's Stormwater Management Program. Examples of BMPs include the following:

- a. Retention and detention basins;
- b. Vegetated swales;
- c. Infiltration galleries or injection wells;
- d. Use of permeable paving materials;
- e. Mechanical devices such as oil-water separators and filters;
- f. Revegetation of graded or disturbed areas.

- g. Other measures that are promoted by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and those described in the BMP report of the Bay Area Association of Stormwater Management Agencies.*

CE 10.6 Stormwater Management Requirements. [GP/CP] — *The following requirements shall apply to specific types of development:*

- a. Commercial and multiple-family development shall use BMPs to control polluted runoff from structures, parking, and loading areas.*

Consistent. Project design includes numerous storm water BMPs into the site design including but not limited to bioswales and a retention basin. Through the use of these measures, the City's water quality standards will be met during construction and ensure that storm water impacts are minimized to the maximum extent feasible in accordance with the City's Storm Water Management Plan. Therefore, the project can be considered consistent with these policies.

CE 10.8 Maintenance of Stormwater Management Facilities [GP/CP]—*New development shall be required to provide ongoing maintenance of BMP measures where maintenance is necessary for their effective operation. The permittee and/or owner, including successors in interest, shall be responsible for all structural treatment controls and devices as follows:*

- a. All structural BMPs shall be inspected, cleaned, and repaired when necessary prior to September 30th of each year.*
- b. Additional inspections, repairs, and maintenance should be performed after storms as needed throughout the rainy season, with any major repairs completed prior to the beginning of the next rainy season.*
- c. Public streets and parking lots shall be swept as needed and financially feasible to remove debris and contaminated residue.*
- d. The homeowners association, or other private owner, shall be responsible for sweeping of private streets and parking lots.*

Consistent. This policy requires new development to provide long-term maintenance of all stormwater runoff control facilities and water quality protection best management practices (BMPs). The City will require through the conditions of approval that the homeowners association CC&Rs include provisions for such long-term maintenance in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications with enforcement authority granted to the City.

CE 12.1 Land Use Compatibility [GP]—*The designation of land uses on the Land Use Plan Map (Figure 2-1) and the review of new development shall ensure that siting of any new sensitive receptors provides for adequate buffers from existing sources of emissions of air pollutants or odors. Sensitive receptors are a facility or land use that includes members of the population sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Sensitive receptors may include children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. If a development that is a sensitive receptor is proposed within 500*

feet of U.S. Highway 101 (US-101), an analysis of mobile source emissions and associated health risks shall be required. Such developments shall be required to provide an adequate setback from the highway and, if necessary, identify design mitigation measures to reduce health risks to acceptable levels.

Consistent. This policy is intended to ensure that adequate buffers are provided for sensitive receptors for air pollutants. The MND found that the risk of exposure of project residents to air pollutants generated by mobile sources along Highway 101 and the railroad tracks would not be significant due to the relatively low volumes of traffic on these transportation facilities. Conditions of approval require provision of ventilation systems to remove particulate matter to further reduce risks associated with freeway related vehicular emissions. Also, the project is conditioned to provide an Air Quality Disclosure Statement to potential buyers of units, summarizing the results of technical studies that reflect a health concern resulting from exposure of children to air quality emissions generated within 500 feet of a freeway. Therefore, this project is considered consistent with this policy.

CE 15.3 Water Conservation for New Development. [GP] — *In order to minimize water use, all new development shall use low water use plumbing fixtures, water-conserving landscaping, low flow irrigation, and reclaimed water for exterior landscaping, where appropriate.*

Consistent. Conditions of approval require the use of drought-tolerant native or Mediterranean landscaping and drip irrigation. Therefore, this project is considered consistent with this policy.

Safety Element

SE 1.3 Site-Specific Hazards Studies [GP/CP]—*Applications for new development shall consider exposure of the new development to coastal and other hazards. Where appropriate, an application for new development shall include a geologic/soils/geotechnical study and any other studies that identify geologic hazards affecting the proposed project site and any necessary mitigation measures. The study report shall contain a statement certifying that the project site is suitable for the proposed development and that the development will be safe from geologic hazards. The report shall be prepared and signed by a licensed certified engineering geologist or geotechnical engineer and shall be subject to review and acceptance by the City.*

SE 1.9 Reduction of Radon Hazards. [GP] — *The City shall require the consideration of radon hazards for all new construction and require testing of radon levels for construction of homes and buildings located in areas subject to moderate or high potential for radon gas levels exceeding 4.0 picocuries as shown on maps produced by the California Division of Mines and Geology. The City shall require*

new homes to use radon-resistant construction where needed based on U.S. Environmental Protection Agency guidelines.

SE 4.11 Geotechnical Report Required. [GP/CP] — *The City shall require geotechnical and/or geologic reports as part of the application for construction of habitable structures and essential services buildings (as defined by the building code) sited in areas having a medium-to-high potential for liquefaction and seismic settlement. The geotechnical study shall evaluate the potential for liquefaction and/or seismic-related settlement to impact the development, and identify appropriate structural-design parameters to mitigate potential hazards.*

SE 5.2 Evaluation of Soil-Related Hazards [GP/CP]—*The City shall require structural evaluation reports with appropriate mitigation measures to be provided for all new subdivisions, and for discretionary projects proposing new nonresidential buildings or substantial additions. Depending on the conclusions of the structural evaluation report, soil and geological reports may also be required. Such studies shall evaluate the potential for soil expansion, compression, and collapse to impact the development; they shall also identify mitigation to reduce these potential impacts, if needed.*

Consistent. These policies are intended to protect new development against geologic hazards such as earthquake faults, liquefaction, slope instability and seismic related settlement. Conditions of approval require preparation of a radon report including recommendations to mitigate any radon gas exposure at levels exceeding EPA guidelines prior to approval of a land use permit. Potentially significant impacts were identified related to erosion and the removal of fill material and expansive soils without proper shoring. Conditions of approval require implementation of requirements identified in a final Geotechnical and Engineering Geology report related to excavation, recompaction, removal and replacement of fill materials and expansive soils thus ensuring project consistency with these policies.

SE 7.2 Review of New Development. [GP/CP] — *Applications for new or expanded development shall be reviewed by appropriate Santa Barbara County Fire Department personnel to ensure they are designed in a manner that reduces the risk of loss due to fire. Such review shall include consideration of the adequacy of “defensible space” around structures at risk; access for fire suppression equipment, water supplies, construction standards; and vegetation clearance. Secondary access may be required and shall be considered on a case-by-case basis. The City shall encourage built-in fire suppression systems such as sprinklers, particularly in high-risk or high-value areas.*

Consistent. This policy is intended to ensure adequate fire protection infrastructure is incorporated into the design of new development. Access to the residential development would be provided from Calle Real and the driveway design has been approved by the Fire Department. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.

SE 10.6 Responsibility for Cleanup by Responsible Party. [GP] — No new development or substantial redevelopment shall be permitted on land determined to contain actionable contamination until the party responsible for such contamination has been identified and has accepted financial responsibility for any required remediation. The posting of a bond or other appropriate surety in an amount and form acceptable to the City shall be required as a condition of development approval. In appropriate circumstances, the City may assist in attempting to obtain outside grants or other resources to address contamination issues and help fund remediation.

SE 10.7 Identification, Transport, and Disposition of Potentially Contaminated Soil. [GP] — The City shall require a Soil Management Plan and a project-specific Health and Safety Plan for all new development and redevelopment within areas containing potentially contaminated soil. The Soil Management Plan and Health and Safety Plan should establish standards and guidelines for the following:

- Identification of contaminated soil.
- Identification of appropriate personal protective equipment to minimize potential worker exposure to contaminated soil.
- Characterization of contaminated soil.
- Soil excavation.
- Interim and final soil storage.
- Verification sampling.
- Soil transportation and disposal.

The Soil Management Plan and Health and Safety Plan should also address naturally occurring hazardous materials that may be present in the soil, such as methane and Radon-222, and include contingencies (e.g., characterization, management, and disposal) if they are present.

Consistent: The state Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) conducted soil sampling in September 2007 in response to a citizen complaint regarding the presence of hazardous materials in fill material. DTSC identified the presence of polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). The Santa Barbara County Fire Prevention Division (FPD), LUFT/SMU Program staff reviewed the DTSC sampling results and require preparation of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Workplan designed to investigate and delineate all areas of potential concern at the site prior to map recordation. Implementation of required conditions and remediation actions as required by the Santa Barbara County Fire Prevention Division (FPD) allow findings of consistency with these policies.

Visual and Historic Resources Element

VH 1.1 Scenic Resources [GP/CP]—An essential aspect of Goleta's character is derived from the various scenic resources within and around the city. Views of these resources from public and private areas contribute to the overall attractiveness of the city and the quality of life enjoyed by its residents, visitors, and workforce. The City shall support the protection and preservation of the following scenic resources:

- a. The open waters of the Pacific Ocean/Santa Barbara Channel, with the Channel Islands visible in the distance.
- b. Goleta's Pacific shoreline, including beaches, dunes, lagoons, coastal bluffs, and open coastal mesas.
- c. Goleta and Devereux Sloughs.
- d. Creeks and the vegetation associated with their riparian corridors.
- e. Agricultural areas, including orchards, lands in vegetable or other crop production, and fallow agricultural lands.
- f. Lake Los Cameros and the surrounding woodlands.
- g. Prominent natural landforms, such as the foothills and the Santa Ynez Mountains.

VH 1.4 Protection of Mountain and Foothill Views [GP/CP]—Views of mountains and foothills from public areas shall be preserved. View preservation associated with development that may affect views of mountains or foothills should be accomplished first through site selection and then by use of design alternatives that enhance, rather than obstruct or degrade, such views. To minimize structural intrusion into the skyline, the following development practices shall be used where appropriate:

- a. Limitations on the height and size of structures.
- b. Limitations on the height of exterior walls (including retaining walls) and fences.
- c. Stepping of buildings so that the heights of building elements are lower near the street and increase with distance from the public viewing area. Increased setbacks along major roadways to preserve views and create an attractive visual corridor.
- d. Downcast, fully shielded, full cut off lighting of the minimum intensity needed for the purpose.
- e. Limitations on removal of native vegetation.
- f. Use of landscaping for screening purposes and/or minimizing view blockage as applicable.
- g. Revegetation of disturbed areas.
- h. Limitations on the use of reflective materials and colors for roofs, walls (including retaining walls), and fences.
- i. Selection of colors and materials that harmonize with the surrounding landscape.
- j. Clustering of building sites and structures.

VH 2.3 Development Projects Along Scenic Corridors [GP]—Development adjacent to scenic corridors should not degrade or obstruct views of scenic areas. To ensure visual compatibility with the scenic qualities, the following practices shall be used, where appropriate:

- a. Incorporate natural features in design.
- b. Use landscaping for screening purposes and/or for minimizing view blockage as applicable.
- c. Minimize vegetation removal.
- d. Limit the height and size of structures.
- e. Cluster building sites and structures.
- f. Limit grading for development including structures, access roads, and driveways. Minimize the length of access roads and driveways and follow the natural contour of the land.
- g. Preserve historical structures or sites.
- h. Plant and preserve trees.
- i. Minimize use of signage.
- j. Provide site-specific visual assessments, including use of story poles.
- k. Provide a similar level of architectural detail on all elevations visible from scenic corridors.
- l. Place existing overhead utilities and all new utilities underground.
- m. Establish setbacks along major roadways to help preserve views and create an attractive scenic corridor. On flat sites, step the heights of buildings so that the height of building elements is lower close to the street and increases with distance from the street.

Consistent. These policies are intended to protect the City's scenic resources as defined in Policy VH 1.1 of the General Plan, public views of the mountains and foothills, public views of open space, and natural landforms, as well as ensure that new development adjacent to designated scenic corridors does not obstruct or degrade public views of scenic resources as seen from these view corridors. The maximum height of the structures is proposed to be 33'6", 1'6" feet below the maximum height of 35' allowed by the zoning ordinance. Although the project site is directly visible from Calle Real, a scenic corridor in the General Plan, it would not block a continuous view from Calle Real as this area is already developed with structures beyond which mountain views remain. With the structures arranged along the eastern portion of the property, a view corridor to portions of the foothills and the Santa Ynez Mountain skyline would be maintained along the uncovered parking area and drive aisle located along the western portion of the property. Therefore, with implementation of conditions of approval relating to submittal of final improvement plans for DRB review identifying colors and materials, shielded lighting fixtures, and landscaping that is appropriately sized and located to screen and soften the visual impacts of buildings fronting Calle Real as well as screen the HVAC equipment, the proposed project is considered consistent with these policies.

VH 3.2 Neighborhood Identity [GP]—*The unique qualities and character of each neighborhood shall be preserved and strengthened. Neighborhood context and scale shall be maintained. New development shall be compatible with existing architectural styles of adjacent development, except where poor quality design exists.*

VH 3.3 Site Design [GP]—*The City's visual character shall be enhanced through appropriate site design. Site plans shall provide for buildings, structures, and uses that are subordinate to the natural topography, existing vegetation, and drainage courses; adequate landscaping; adequate vehicular circulation and parking; adequate pedestrian circulation; and provision and/or maintenance of solar access.*

VH 3.4 Building Design [GP]—*The City's visual character shall be enhanced through development of structures that are appropriate in scale and orientation and that use high quality, durable materials. Structures shall incorporate architectural styles, landscaping, and amenities that are compatible with and complement surrounding development.*

Consistent. These policies are intended to ensure that the architectural design of new development is compatible with the City's visual character. The architectural style is described as California Craftsman vernacular including details such as hip roofs with exposed rafter tails, wooden brackets and gable pediment decoration, shutter and other decorative window treatments and built-up columns with cement plaster finishes. The maximum height of the structures is proposed to be 33'6", 1'6" feet below the maximum height of 35' allowed by the zoning ordinance. A landscape plan for the site depicts a mixture of native, drought tolerant plants and trees throughout the site including oak, olive, and Jacaranda. Project perimeter and internal landscaping is proposed to screen and soften views of the buildings. With the revised 12 unit project, open space would increase on the site from approximately 40% to 42% and include a tot-lot play area. Access to the residential development would be provided from Calle Real and the private drive design has been approved by the Fire Department. The project exceeds the parking space requirement per the zoning ordinance by three spaces. The MND and Addendum dated March 18, 2009 found that the scale, site design, mass, and height of the project along with its architecture would be compatible with that visual character and as such, the project is considered consistent with these policies.

VH 3.5 Pedestrian-Oriented Design [GP]—*The city's visual character shall be enhanced through provision of aesthetically pleasing pedestrian connections within and between neighborhoods, recreational facilities, shopping, workplaces, and other modes of transportation, including bicycles and transit.*

Consistent. The project is located in an area within walking distance to public transit for access to jobs opportunities, retail outlets, and recreational facilities. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

VH 4.4 Multifamily Residential Areas [GP]—In addition to the items listed in VH 4.3, the following standards shall be applicable to multifamily residential development (see LU 1.9 and LU 2.3):

- a. Roof lines should be varied to create visual interest.
- b. Large building masses should be avoided, and where feasible, several smaller buildings are encouraged rather than one large structure. Multiple structures should be clustered to maximize open space.
- c. Multifamily residential developments shall include common open space that is appropriately located, is functional, and provides amenities for different age groups.
- d. Where multifamily developments are located next to less dense existing residential development, open space should provide a buffer along the perimeter.
- e. Individual units shall be distinguishable from each other. Long continuous wall planes and parking corridors shall be avoided. Three-dimensional façades are encouraged.
- f. Extensive landscaping is encouraged to soften building edges and provide a transition between adjacent properties.
- g. Storage areas for recycling and trash shall be covered and conveniently located for all residents and screened with landscaping or walls.
- h. Safe and aesthetically pleasing pedestrian access that is physically separated from vehicular access shall be provided in all new residential developments whenever feasible. Transitional spaces, including landscape or hardscape elements, should be provided from the pedestrian access to the main entrance. Main entrances should not open directly onto driveways or streets. Safe bicycle access should be considered in all residential developments.

VH 4.9 Landscape Design [GP]—Landscaping shall be considered and designed as an integral part of development, not relegated to remaining portions of a site following placement of buildings, parking, or vehicular access. Landscaping shall conform to the following standards:

- a. Landscaping that conforms to the natural topography and protects existing specimen trees is encouraged.
- b. Any specimen trees removed shall be replaced with a similar size tree or with a tree deemed appropriate by the City.
- c. Landscaping shall emphasize the use of native and drought-tolerant vegetation and should include a range and density of plantings including trees, shrubs, groundcover, and vines of various heights and species.
- d. The use of invasive plants shall be prohibited.

- e. *Landscaping shall be incorporated into the design to soften building masses, reinforce pedestrian scale, and provide screening along public streets and off-street parking areas.*

Consistent. These policies establish architectural guidelines for project design and landscaping. The 12 units are located within three buildings, arranged along the east side of a drive aisle, leaving the western portion of the property open. Open space would cover 42% of the parcel and include a tot-lot play area. The proposed condominiums include varied rooflines, building articulation and architectural details that help avoid monolithic structures as well as a drought tolerant plant palette in the landscape plan that integrates with the proposed structures to break up their mass and scale. Canopy and flowering trees proposed along the northern property boundary and retention of the existing Myoporum along the eastern property boundary would provide a buffer to the adjacent, slightly less dense residential development. As such, the project is considered consistent with these policies as conditioned.

VH 4.12 Lighting. [GP] — Outdoor lighting fixtures shall be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent over-lighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow. The following standards shall apply:

- a. *Outdoor lighting shall be the minimum number of fixtures and intensity needed for the intended purpose. Fixtures shall be fully shielded and have full cut off lights to minimize visibility from public viewing areas and prevent light pollution into residential areas or other sensitive uses such as wildlife habitats or migration routes.*
- b. *Direct upward light emission shall be avoided to protect views of the night sky.*
- c. *Light fixtures used in new development shall be appropriate to the architectural style and scale and compatible with the surrounding area.*

Consistent: The Citrus Village project would be reviewed by DRB for preliminary and final approval prior to approval of land use permit. This review would include provision of appropriate lighting standards, fixtures, and styles to minimize night sky lighting and maintain consistency with the surrounding area. Therefore, with conditions of approval, the project would be considered consistent with this policy.

VH 4.14 Utilities [GP]—New development projects shall be required to place new utility lines underground. Existing overhead utility lines should be placed underground when feasible. Undergrounding of utility hardware is encouraged. Any aboveground utility hardware, such as water meters, electrical transformers, or backflow devices, shall not inhibit line of sight or encroach into public walkways

and, where feasible, should be screened from public view by methods including, but not limited to, appropriate paint color, landscaping, and/or walls.

Consistent. This policy requires all utilities serving new development to be placed underground. Conditions of approval for the project require all new utility service connections to be undergrounded. Therefore, the proposed project is considered consistent with these policies as conditioned.

VH 4.15 Site-Specific Visual Assessments. [GP] — *The use of story poles, physical or software-based models, photo-realistic visual simulations, perspectives, photographs, or other tools shall be required, when appropriate, to evaluate the visual effects of proposed development and demonstrate visual compatibility and impacts on scenic views.*

Consistent. The MND includes views of the existing project site from Calle Real, U.S. Highway 101, and from the Union Pacific Railroad. A visual simulation of how the 11 unit project would look from U.S. Highway 101 looking directly north was prepared. Additionally, a simulation showing the proposed 11 unit project outline was superimposed over existing conditions (Figure A-4 in the MND). These simulations showed that although the project site is directly visible from Calle Real, it would not block a continuous view from Calle Real as this area is already developed with structures beyond which mountain views remain.

The revised 12 unit project resulted in a different configuration and number of buildings onsite. The total number of buildings decreases from five to three, but three detached single car garage buildings are added, all arranged along the east side of the property and oriented towards the adjacent residential condominium development. Story poles were installed onsite for three days in January 2009. Additional visual simulations with views from Calle Real and with the story poles superimposed were provided by the applicant. The story poles illustrated that the uncovered parking area and drive aisle located along the western portion of the property would remain open, maintaining a view corridor through the parcel to the backdrop of the foothills and Santa Ynez Mountain skyline. Additionally, the simulations showed the visibility of the revised project and the ability of landscaping to soften views of the proposed project from Calle Real and the scale relative to adjacent development.

Transportation Element

TE 3.9 Right-of-Way Dedications and Improvements. [GP/CP] — *Existing and future rights-of-way may vary along different segments of individual streets within a single functional classification, based upon the existing patterns of development along the various segments. The appropriate street cross section, frontage improvements, and right-of-way dedications shall be established by the City Engineer when imposing conditions of approval for development applications*

on abutting parcels. Dedications of right-of-way may be greater in locations where it is appropriate to secure space for utilities, street appurtenances, transit facilities, and landscaped areas.

Consistent. The proposed project includes an offer to dedicate back to the City of Goleta an approximately 4,016 square foot area along Calle Real for roadway purposes envisioned in the Transportation Element of the General Plan. This area had been vacated by the County of Santa Barbara as part of the previously approved El Encanto Apartment project. The proposed project would be consistent with this policy.

TE 9.2 Adequacy of Parking Supply in Proposed Development. [GP/CP] — *The City shall require all proposed new development and changes/intensifications in use of existing nonresidential structures to provide a sufficient number of off-street parking spaces to accommodate the parking demand generated by the proposed use(s), and to avoid spillover of parking onto neighboring properties and streets.*

TE 9.3 Parking in Residential Neighborhoods. [GP/CP] — *Any proposed new or expanded use in residential areas shall provide adequate onsite parking to support the use. Adequate parking shall be provided to minimize the need for parking in public rights-of-way and to avoid spillover of parking onto adjacent uses and into other areas. The existing supply of on-street parking spaces shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Off-street parking for proposed new single-family dwellings in all residential use categories shall be provided in enclosed garages. Driveway aprons in single-family residential neighborhoods shall have sufficient widths and depths to allow parking of two standard-sized vehicles in front of the garage.*

Consistent. Proposed parking would exceed zoning ordinance requirements by three spaces and no modification is being requested. To preclude construction related parking or staging from occurring on Calle Real or Ellwood Station Road, conditions of approval require preparation of a construction vehicle parking plan including equipment/materials staging for both on and offsite locations prior to approval of a land use permit. As such, the project is considered consistent with these policies.

TE 11.4 Facilities in New Development [GP]—*Bicycle facilities such as lockers, secure enclosed parking, and lighting shall be incorporated into the design of all new development to encourage bicycle travel and facilitate and encourage bicycle commuting. Showers and changing rooms should be incorporated into the design of all new development where feasible. Transportation improvements necessitated by new development should provide onsite connections to existing and proposed bikeways.*

Consistent. This policy requires new development to incorporate bicycle facilities into project design to encourage alternative modes of transportation. Conditions of approval require provision of onsite bike parking and striping of Calle Real for bike lanes to encourage use of alternative transportation and reduce trip generation. As such, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

Public Facilities Element

PF 3.1 Fire Protection Standards. [GP] — *The Santa Barbara County Fire Department employs the following three standards with respect to provision of fire protection services:*

- a. A firefighter-to-population ratio of one firefighter on duty 24 hours a day for every 2,000 in population is considered "ideal," although a countywide ratio (including rural areas) of one firefighter per 4,000 population is the absolute minimum standard. Considering the daytime population in Goleta due to employees and customers, all fire stations within Goleta fell short of this service standard as of 2005.*
- b. A ratio of one engine company per 16,000 population, assuming four firefighters per station, represents the maximum population that the Santa Barbara County Fire Department has determined can be adequately served by a four-person crew. Fire stations 11 and 12 (see Table 8-1) did not satisfy this standard as of 2005. Currently, all three fire engines that serve Goleta are staffed with only three-person crews. The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) guidelines state that engine companies shall be staffed with a minimum of four on-duty personnel.*
- c. The third fire protection standard is a 5-minute response time in urban areas.*

PF 9.7 Essential Services for New Development [GP/CP]—*Development shall be allowed only when and where all essential utility services are adequate in accord with the service standards of their providers and only when and where such development can be adequately served by essential utilities without reducing levels of service below the level of service guidelines elsewhere:*

- a. Domestic water service, sanitary sewer service, stormwater management facilities, streets, fire services, schools, and parks shall be considered essential for supporting new development.*
- b. A development shall not be approved if it causes the level of service of an essential utility service to decline below the standards referenced above unless improvements to mitigate the impacts are made concurrent with the development for the purposes of this policy. "Concurrent with the development" shall mean that improvements are in place at the time of the development or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements.*

- c. *If adequate essential utility services are currently unavailable and public funds are not committed to provide such facilities, developers must provide such facilities at their own expense in order to develop.*

Consistent. These policies are intended to ensure that new development is coordinated with the availability and/or provision of adequate public facilities and infrastructure to adequately serve it. Adequate water, sewer, and utility services are already available from the Goleta Water and Goleta West Sanitary Districts, local utility service providers, fire and police protection services, based on letters received from these agencies during project review. Project impacts on local school enrollment would be mitigated pursuant to State statute by payment of development impact fees to the various school districts so impacted. As such, the proposed project is considered consistent with these policies.

Noise Element

NE 1.1 Land Use Compatibility Standards [GP]—*The City shall use the standards and criteria of Table 9-2 to establish compatibility of land use and noise exposure. The City shall require appropriate mitigation, if feasible, or prohibit development that would subject proposed or existing land uses to noise levels that exceed acceptable levels as indicated in this table. Proposals for new development that would cause standards to be exceeded shall only be approved if the project would provide a substantial benefit to the City (including but not limited to provision of affordable housing units or as part of a redevelopment project), and if adequate mitigation measures are employed to reduce interior noise levels to acceptable levels.*

NE 1.2 Location of New Residential Development [GP]—*Where sites, or portions of sites, designated by the Land Use Element for residential use exceed 60 dBA CNEL, the City shall require measures to be incorporated into the design of projects that will mitigate interior noise levels and noise levels for exterior living and play areas to an acceptable level. In the event that a proposed residential or mixed-use project exceeds these standards, the project may be approved only if it would provide a substantial benefit to the City, including, but not limited to, provision of affordable residential units. Mitigation measures shall reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA CNEL or less, while noise levels at exterior living areas and play areas should in general not exceed 60 dBA CNEL and 65 dBA CNEL, respectively.*

NE 6.4 Restrictions on Construction Hours [GP]—*The City shall require, as a condition of approval for any land use permit or other planning permit, restrictions on construction hours. Noise-generating construction activities for projects near or adjacent to residential buildings and neighborhoods or other sensitive receptors shall be limited to Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Construction in non-residential areas away from sensitive receivers shall be limited to Monday*

through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Construction shall generally not be allowed on weekends and State holidays. Exceptions to these restrictions may be made in extenuating circumstances (in the event of an emergency, for example) on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Environmental Services. All construction sites subject to such restrictions shall post the allowed hours of operation near the entrance to the site, so that workers on site are aware of this limitation. City staff shall closely monitor compliance with restrictions on construction hours, and shall promptly investigate and respond to all noncompliance complaints.

NE 6.5 Other Measures to Reduce Construction Noise [GP]—The following measures shall be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications to reduce the impact of construction noise:

- a. All construction equipment shall have properly maintained sound-control devices, and no equipment shall have an unmuffled exhaust system.
- b. Contractors shall implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures including but not limited to changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, and installing acoustic barriers around significant sources of stationary construction noise.
- c. To the extent practicable, adequate buffers shall be maintained between noise-generating machinery or equipment and any sensitive receivers. The buffer should ensure that noise at the receiver site does not exceed 65 dBA CNEL. For equipment that produces a noise level of 95 dBA at 50 feet, a buffer of 1600 feet is required for attenuation of sound levels to 65 dBA.

NE 7.5 Implementation of Recommendations from Acoustical Analyses. [GP] — For projects where an acoustical analysis is required because of potential noise impacts, the City, through its development review and building permit processes, shall ensure that all appropriate noise reduction measures are incorporated.

NE 7.6 Noise-Insulation Standards for Multi-Family Dwellings. [GP] — In compliance with state law, the City shall require all multi-family residential developments that are proposed within the 60-dBA-CNEL noise contour to include appropriate noise-insulation measures.

NE 7.7 Acoustic Design Manual Requirements. [GP] — For residential projects where mitigation is required to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA CNEL, the City Building Official shall require incorporation of measures listed in the current version of the Acoustic Design Manual for the appropriate amount of noise reduction.

Consistent. These policies are intended to ensure that new development is not exposed to unacceptable noise levels for the type and nature of the use involved and to protect sensitive noise receptors such as residential units from excessive levels of construction noise. A portion of the project site is

located within a noise contour of 65 dB or greater. Conditions of approval require that implementation of the construction techniques recommended in the noise study be incorporated into the design. Construction activities may pose a potentially significant short-term impact in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, construction hours would be limited according to conditions of approval for the project. Therefore, as conditioned, the project is considered consistent with these policies.

Housing Element

HE 10.1 Density Bonuses and Other Incentives for Affordable Housing Developments. [GP] — *The City will use density bonuses and other incentives consistent with state law to help achieve housing goals while ensuring that potential impacts are considered and mitigated. The City will consider the following possible incentives for residential developments where the applicant requests a density bonus over the maximum otherwise allowable residential density under the applicable zoning regulations and proposes to include the appropriate percentages of very low, low-, and/or moderate-income units on site or donate an appropriate amount of land for affordable residential development:*

- a. *State Density Bonus Law. Continue to offer density bonuses and incentives or concessions consistent with the State Density Bonus law (California Government Code Section 65915).*
- b. *Streamlined Development Review. Affordable housing developments shall receive the highest priority, and efforts will be made by staff and decision makers to (1) provide technical assistance to potential affordable housing developers in processing requirements, including community involvement; (2) consider project funding and timing needs in the processing and review of the application; and (3) provide the fastest turnaround time possible in determining application completeness.*

HE 10.2 Long-Term Housing Affordability Controls. [GP] — *The City will apply resale controls and rent and income restrictions for the longest term allowed by applicable law to ensure that affordable housing provided through incentives and as a condition of development approval remains affordable to the income group for which it is intended.*

Consistent. The proposed project includes a request for application of State Density Bonus Law (Government Code §65915 et. seq) and the granting of one incentive for the provision of two affordable units. The 11 condominium units with associated garages and common open space over 0.94 acres would result in a density of approximately 11.7 dwelling units per gross acre. With the addition of one density bonus unit, the density would be 12.77 dwelling units per gross acre, which exceeds the maximum allowed density of 12.3 dwelling units per gross acre in the zone district, but which is allowed under the State Density Bonus program. The proposal includes a request for granting of one

concession related to private outdoor patio area requirements per City Code §35-292(f).4(1), Density Bonus for Affordable Housing Projects, Development Incentives. The private outdoor patio area would range from 10 – 15% of the gross floor area (rather than 20%). The affordable units would be subject to a 55-year resale restriction.

ATTACHMENT 6

ZONING ORDINANCE CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

**CITRUS VILLAGE, 04-226-DP
ZONING ORDINANCE CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS**

The following table identifies applicable requirements of the DR – Design Residential zone district and the project’s compliance with each of these requirements:

	Required	Proposed	Consistent Y/N
Lot Size/Density; DR-12.3	Maximum 12.3 dwelling units per gross acre; 3,541 square feet per dwelling unit	Approximately 11.7 dwelling units per gross acre; 3,722 square feet per dwelling unit; plus 1 Density Bonus unit resulting in approximately 12.77 dwelling units per gross acre; 3,412 square feet per dwelling unit	Yes; increase in zone district maximum allowed by State Density Bonus Law
Front Yard Setback	20 Feet from ROW line of any street	<u>Calle Real</u> : 51 feet from existing ROW; 23 feet from ROW after dedication	Yes
Side Yard Setback	10 feet	None to 21 feet or greater Pergola within setback on east side	Yes, with approval of modification
Rear Yard Setback	10 feet	18 feet minimum	Yes
Distance Between Buildings on Same Building Site	5 feet	16 feet minimum	Yes
Building Coverage	≤ 30% net lot area	24%; 9,752 square feet	Yes
Building Height	≤ 35 feet	33 feet 6 inches	Yes

Citrus Village Zoning Ordinance Consistency Analysis

	Required	Proposed	Consistent Y/N
Parking spaces	Residences - 2.5 spaces per dwelling unit: 30 spaces Visitors – 1 space per 5 dwelling units: <u>3 spaces</u> TOTAL: 33 spaces	36 (12 single car garage spaces and 24 uncovered spaces)	Yes
Parking Area Setbacks	Uncovered areas ≥ 15 feet to ROW; ≥ 5 feet to any property line	6 feet 6 inches to western property line	Yes
Parking Design	Uncovered areas screened from street & adjacent residences to height of 4' by plantings, fences or walls No encroachment into street or sidewalk when backing out of space	5-foot screen wall on west; 4-foot screen wall on south Encroachment into private drive	Yes Yes, with approval of modification
Common Open Space	$\geq 40\%$	42%	Yes
Driveways /uncovered parking separated from property lines by landscaped strip	≥ 5 feet	6 feet 6 inches on western property boundary	Yes
Minimum perimeter landscaped strip	10 feet	Minimum 6 feet 6 inches on western property boundary	Yes, with approval of modification

Citrus Village Zoning Ordinance Consistency Analysis

	Required	Proposed	Consistent Y/N
Other:			
Onsite storage space in addition to space within the units	180 cubic feet	180 cubic feet minimum within the garage	Yes
	Individual metering	Yes	Yes
	Provision for separate laundry facilities in each unit not encroaching upon parking	Yes	Yes
Private outdoor patio area	≥ 20% of gross floor area of the unit	Ranges from 10% (Unit 9) to 15%	Yes; concession under State Density Bonus Law

ATTACHMENT 7

PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING MINUTES



**PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, AUGUST 25, 2008**

6:00 P.M.
City Hall
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California

Members of the Planning Commission

*Kenneth Knight, Chair
Brent Daniels, Vice Chair
Edward Easton
Doris Kavanagh
Julie Kessler Solomon*

*Patricia Miller, Secretary
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk
Scott Porter, Legal Counsel*

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m. by Chair Knight followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Present: Planning Commissioners Daniels, Easton, Kavanagh, Knight, and Solomon.
Absent: None.

Staff present: Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase, Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller, Legal Counsel Scott Porter, and Recording Clerk Linda Gregory.

PUBLIC FORUM

No speakers.

AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A.1 Planning Commission Minutes for August 11, 2008.

Recommendation:

Approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes for August 11, 2008.

MOTION: Vice Chair Daniels moved/Commissioner Easton seconded, to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes for August 11, 2008, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

B.1 04-226-TM, -DP, -RN: Citrus Village Project located at 7388 Calle Real; APN 077-490-043.

Recommendation:

1. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 08-__ (Attachment 1), entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta Approving the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (07-MND-004) and Accepting the Addendum Dated August 15, 2008 to the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Adopting CEQA Findings and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Citrus Village Project; 7388 Calle Real, APN 077-490-043".
2. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 08-__ (Attachment 2), entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta Approving a Vesting Tentative Track Map (TM 32,027) for Condominium Purposes, a Final Development Plan, and a Road Naming Application for the Citrus Village Project, Case No. 04-226-TM, -DP, -RN; 7388 Calle Real, APM 077-490-043".

Staff Speakers:

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller

Legal Counsel Scott Porter

Site visits: Made by Commissioners Daniels, Easton, Kavanagh, Knight and Solomon.

Ex-parte conversations: Vice Chair Daniels reported that Detlev Peikert, applicant, called him last week to see if he had any questions. Commissioner Kavanagh reported she met with Detlev Peikert and Lisa Plowman. Commissioner Easton stated that he received an e-mail from Karen Lovelace which he believes was sent to all Commissioners. Chair Knight reported that he met with Lisa Plowman over the weekend.

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller presented the staff report and PowerPoint entitled "City of Goleta Planning Commission, August 25, 2008, Citrus Village Project, 7388 Calle Real". She presented a document entitled "Citrus Village – Revised Conditions" with regard to Conditions of Approval #3 and #48.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 6:37 P.M.

Documents: 1) E-mail from Bill Pertsulakes, Manager, Padre Shopping Center, dated August 25, 2008. 2) "Brookside Condo Stats – 37 Units Total" submitted by Karen

Lovelace. 3) E-mail from Karen Lovelace dated August 25, 2008, subject: Citrus Village Comments, with attachments including photographs. 4) Five photographs submitted by Karen Lovelace on August 25, 2008. 4) Comments submitted by Ingeborg Cox, MD, August 25, 2008. 5) Comments for the August 25, 2008, Planning Commission Meeting from Barbara Massey.

Lisa Plowman, Planning Manager with Peikert Group Architects, applicant, presented the plans and PowerPoint. With regard to parking, she stated that there will be a requirement in the CC&Rs requiring that the residents must use their garages for their cars. Detlev Peikert, applicant, responded to questions from the Commissioners.

RECESS HELD FROM 7:25 P.M. to 7:32 P.M.

Speakers

Dr. Ingeborg Cox, MD, Goleta, read her written comments, which were submitted for the record, expressing concerns with regard to the proposed project. She expressed concern that the health of the future residents should be top consideration and demanded accurate up-to-date data before going forward on the project. She questioned why story poles were not installed for this project.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, El Encanto area, spoke in opposition to the proposed project, stating that it is an inappropriate, visually attractive, market rate project on a site with a prior proposed low-income housing project that was inappropriate and unattractive. He expressed concern with regard to potential parking problems, stating that the size of the project is too much for the site. He suggested that it would be more appropriate to zone the site for Neighborhood Commercial use.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, read her written comments, which were submitted for the record, expressing concerns with regard to the proposed project. She stated that the proposed project has a number of shortcomings, but limited her comments to two concerns: a) the FARs which she believes are too high for the small site and exceed the standards; and b) the modifications which she believes are excessive. She also expressed concern with regard to the lack of setbacks on the western property boundaries. She requested that the problems with the project be addressed before the project is approved.

Earl Lovelace, representing El Encanto neighborhood, expressed concern that the proposed project would be enormously oversized. He read an e-mail from Bill Pertsulakes, Manager, Padre Shopping Center, dated August 25, 2008, which was submitted for the record. The e-mail indicated that the Padre Shopping Center owner hopes that any improvements of the vacant land would not block any visual exposure of existing tenants by passing traffic that would hinder their business.

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, stated that she has been following the proposals for this site for approximately eight years and provided a brief history. She expressed concern that the project is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood, stating that the project is too tall and too massive, with units twice the size of adjacent condominium units at Brookside. She also expressed concern that it would be difficult to park two

cars in the garages because of the turning angles. She commented that the proposed project is the first project to be approved by the City that would be placed inside a neighborhood.

Bill Shelor, Goleta, stated that he believes the proposed project has a few challenges evidenced by the number of modifications requested. He commented: 1) The City needs more work force housing located close to arterials. 2) Questioned whether the proposed in lieu fee is equivalent to providing a unit of workforce housing, stating that the Planning Commission has discretion for determination of the in lieu fee amount. 3) The wide angle computer simulations distort the actual visual impacts on the viewshed. 4) This proposed project is another example of the need for the DRB and Planning Commission collaboration on conceptual review.

Commissioner Solomon commented that the project is beautiful and comparable to the projects shown by the applicant in terms of its quality and elegance. Her concerns are that the proposed housing development sets up conflict in the community and conflicts between the potential residents. She commented: 1) With regard to impacts, she does not believe that because houses were built adjacent to Highway 101 in the past necessarily justifies placing more residents adjacent to the highway. 2) Although parking requirements are met, the parking in these types of neighborhoods is usually inadequate, which will cause disputes. 3) There is no room for any overflow parking, noting that no parking is allowed on Calle Real. 4) It is not appropriate for children to be playing in a tot lot next to a bar; and a six-foot wall is not adequate separation. There may be conflicts between the parents and the owners of the adjacent property and bar, who are business owners whose interests need to be considered also. 5) From her experience driving past the site in the mornings, there is quite a lot of traffic, especially people going to and from the high school. This area of the roadway is of special concern, particularly with the students and the glare from the sun. 6) The courtyard driveways will probably be used more heavily, with residents who work, which may set up a traffic situation where there would be conflict. 7) Closing windows and using air ventilation systems to provide a wholesome interior while there are energy constraints does not seem to be a "green" solution. 8) Expressed concern regarding whether the City's in lieu fees are adequate to help fund affordable housing.

Commissioner Easton expressed concern that there are a couple of problems that he believes have not been addressed satisfactorily which include: a) the adjacency of the tot lot to the bar located on the commercial property; b) noise; c) the impact of light from the adjacent commercial property on the westward facing bedrooms, noting that the 7-Eleven store is open all night and the bar is open until 2:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights; and d) parking and interior traffic concerns which need to be resolved, for example, guest parking and the courtyard design. He believes that studying how to resolve the problems might produce a better design. He noted that the suggestion in a letter from Karen Lovelace to redesign the site plan to accommodate parking on the west side of the property with a parking structure would buffer the adjacent commercial property and would seem to resolve many of the problems. He also commented: 1) A large amount of new data is now becoming known with regard to the long-term toxicity of hydrocarbons, which was not known several years ago when houses and schools were sited. 2) This project is an urban design set in a fairly rural

environment next to a small strip shopping center, stating that both the project and the site are unique. 3) The specificity shown in the staff report is appreciated.

Commissioner Kavanagh stated that while she appreciates the design and uniqueness of the proposed project, she believes there are some items that need restudy particularly with regard to the parking and overflow. She does not believe parking is sufficient even though it meets the requirements. She agreed with Commissioner Solomon's concern with regard to the potential for conflict in the neighborhood. She expressed concern that Calle Real needs to have proper striping to facilitate turning into the project safely.

Vice Chair Daniels commented that he noticed that all of the proposed units have three bedrooms, and that while the unit size is perhaps an appropriate unit size, there is no mix of unit size in the project.

Chair Knight stated that he has similar concerns with regard to the site that were expressed by the Commissioners and he believes that the project could be better. He commented: 1) Parking is an issue that needs to be addressed. 2) This project would have benefited from earlier conceptual review. 3) He believes that there will be more courtyard style development projects for this area in the future.

MOTION: Commissioner Easton moved to continue 04-226-TM, -DP, -RN: Citrus Village Project located at 7388 Calle Real; APN 077-490-043, and request that the applicant submit a redesign which resolves the problems that have been identified.

Lisa Plowman, agent for the applicant, requested a five minute recess for the applicant to consider options with regard to the project.

RECESS HELD FROM 8:40 P.M. TO 8:45 P.M.

Lisa Plowman, agent, requested a two-week continuation for the applicant to study issues raised at the hearing and return for a work session with conceptual drawings. She stated that during the work session, if the redesign will not resolve the concerns, or if the project is not viable or feasible, the applicant would probably request denial by the Planning Commission.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase recommended that forty-five minutes be allocated for the work session. He stated that if the redesign is acceptable, the project would move forward with the review process; or, if the project will not work, the findings for denial would need to be approved at a subsequent meeting.

AMENDED

MOTION Commissioner Easton moved/seconded by Commissioner Kavanagh to continue 04-226-TM, -DP, -RN: Citrus Village Project located at 7388 Calle Real; APN 077-490-043, to September 8, 2008, keeping the public hearing open.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.



**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2008**

6:00 P.M.
City Hall
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California

Members of the Planning Commission

*Kenneth Knight, Chair
Brent Daniels, Vice Chair
Edward Easton
Doris Kavanagh
Julie Kessler Solomon*

*Patricia Miller, Secretary
Tim W. Giles, City Attorney
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk*

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Knight followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Present: Planning Commissioners Daniels, Easton, Kavanagh, Knight, and Solomon.
Absent: None.

Staff present: Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase, Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller, City Attorney Tim W. Giles, Senior Planner Alan Hanson, Assistant Planner Shine Ling, and Recording Clerk Linda Gregory.

PUBLIC FORUM

Barbara Massey, Goleta, commented that the DRB has completed Conceptual review of the proposed Haskell's Landing project. She said she believes it would be advantageous if the Planning Commission could conduct Conceptual review of the Haskell's Landing project before the applicant spends a lot of money and then requests the project to be moved forward.

AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A.1 Planning Commission Minutes for August 25, 2008

Recommendation:

1. Approve the Planning Commission minutes for the Special Meeting of August 25, 2008.

Speaker:

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, requested amendments to the minutes with regard to documents that she submitted for the record. She also suggested adding the language "in the past" to Comment 1 made by Commissioner Solomon, on Page 4, for clarity, with regard to houses that were built adjacent to the highway.

MOTION: Commissioner Solomon moved/seconded by Commissioner Easton to approve Planning Commission Special Meeting minutes of August 25, 2008, as amended.

VOTE: Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

B-1. 04-226-TM, -DP, -RN: Citrus Village Project located at 7388 Calle Real; APN 077-490-043.

Continued from August 25, 2008

Recommendation:

1. Conduct continued public hearing and provide direction to staff.

Staff Speakers:

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase stated that the purpose of the process tonight is to consider whether there is a preferred design that would be acceptable for this parcel; or whether the project will not work on this parcel.

Ex-parte conversations: Vice Chair Daniels reported that he met with Detlev Peikert, applicant, and Lisa Plowman, agent, this morning at their offices and viewed the plans.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, presented and discussed a PowerPoint entitled "PGA Peikert Group Architects, LLP, Architecture and Development, Creating Livable Communities, Citrus Village, Ownership Housing Project". He also presented a document entitled "Citrus Village Planning Commission Hearing, September 08, 2008, Consideration of Alternatives", which shows Schemes A through D. The proposed alternatives to the original proposed 9 Unit Plan included: a) Revised 9 Unit Project;

b) 10 Unit Alternative plan; c) 12 Unit Alternative plan with 2 affordable and 10 market with State density bonus; and d) 16 Unit Alternative, 100% affordable with State density bonus.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, stated that he believes that the Revised 9 Unit Project plan is the superior alternative although the other alternatives could be acceptable. He requested clear direction at this time with regard to whether one of the alternatives is suitable, perhaps with suggestions to modify the plans. If it does not seem that any of the alternatives would be suitable with possible modifications, he requested that the original application be denied which would provide an opportunity for the applicant to submit an appeal to the City Council.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, said that, in general, a project with any amount of rental units would not be economically viable. He stated that the only reason the 16 Unit Rental Project Alternative would be viable is that it would require a substantial amount of financial subsidies that are available for low-income housing; however, a financing plan is not currently in place.

Commissioner Easton commented that the proposed 10 Unit Alternative plan solves some of the principal problems which include the positioning of the project with regard to the commercial use, noise, and visual prominence from the second-story. He believes that the 10 Unit Alternative plan corresponds to the direction and concerns expressed at the last meeting. He appreciates that the plan adds an additional unit as well as more abundant guest parking. He commented that there is enough room to add a high wall and landscaping to buffer the adjacent commercial development. He questioned whether the applicant is considering adding a carport structure along the western border which would provide additional buffering. With regard to the 12 Unit Alternative plan, he commented that it does not appear that having more units on the site would be of benefit with regard to the concerns related to the adjacent commercial use and guest parking. He expressed concern with regard to the height of the third floor and requested that the applicant provide a section drawing that would show the view from the third floor windows. He expressed some concern regarding the aspect of vertical circulation with regard to the third floor. Another concern was with regard to the light transmission from the commercial site until the trees grow tall enough to provide a barrier. He also suggested some possible changes in the floor plan that would allow the living room to open into a private space; for example, he suggested consideration with regard to placing the main entrance through the kitchen, which would allow the easterly yard to be a private space rather than an entrance.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, clarified that the applicant still intends to construct a six-foot concrete block wall along the western property line.

Commissioner Solomon commented that she was impressed by aspects of the 12 Unit Alternative plan; for example, she appreciates the courtyard area, and noted that the 12 unit plan provides additional housing units which she believes is an important consideration. She agreed with Commissioner Easton that the 10 Unit Alternative would provide more abundant guest parking spaces. She suggested that the applicant consider installing solar panels on the roofs.

Chair Knight commented that he appreciates the 12 Unit Alternative plan, stating that he believes it is important to support affordable housing and it is appropriate to incorporate affordable units into project designs. From the standpoint of the layout, he appreciates that the plan addresses concerns with regard to providing a buffer between the commercial uses along the western property line. He is impressed with the privacy that is provided by the plan. He believes that, at some point, landscape buffers may be needed on both sides, stating that the landscape buffer on the west side with the *Myoporum* species will probably disintegrate soon. He noted that the unit sizes in the 12 Unit Alternative plan are reduced to a size that is basically the size of other homes in the area. In his opinion, Chair Knight said that the height of the 12 Unit Alternative plan may not be a significant issue on this parcel, which is designated for 12 units per acre, and is adjacent to a commercial parcel. He commented that the height may help block some of the noise from Highway 101 in other places in the neighborhood, which makes it seem appropriate that a project of this type would be located on the perimeter of the neighborhood, adjacent to the freeway area.

Vice Chair Daniels suggested the applicant consider providing more storage space in the garages in the 10 Unit Alternative plan; for example, in an attic space above the garage, in the front. Detlev Peikert, applicant, stated that the amount of space that could be provided for storage in the attic in the garage for the 10 Unit Alternative plan would be negligible.

Commissioner Kavanagh spoke in support of the 12 Unit Alternative plan, stating that she believes it is important to send a message that some affordable housing units are being built. With regard to her parking concerns, she appreciates the revision that separated and moved the guest parking next to the commercial property.

Speakers:

Barbara Massey, Goleta, requested that a decision regarding the project be continued to a future meeting, stating that she does not believe the Planning Commission or the public has had sufficient time to study the proposed plans. She said that if she needed to make a choice at this time, the 10 unit alternative would be preferable.

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, agreed with comments made by speaker Barbara Massey, stating that there needs to be more time to review the plans. She believes that when the number of units is being considered, the focus should be on the square footage which affects the size, bulk and scale of the project. She suggested that the reduction in the number of bedrooms in some of the units would be useful to reduce the size of the project. She commented that the 10 Unit and 12 Unit Alternatives address the concern regarding the need for separation between the residential and commercial uses. She suggested consideration be given to the row house concept, typical in Britain and Ireland, which has no separation between the houses, and provides each unit with a backyard. She believes that story poles will be needed with regard to the proposed height in the neighborhood.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase provided an overview of the application process, stating that the applicant and staff are prepared to move forward with direction from the Commission. He said that the applicant has made a

good faith effort to respond to concerns with regard to the project. He stated that the revisions shown in the alternative plans that were supported by members of the Commission at this hearing included: a) recognition that more guest parking will be provided; b) the addition of a buffer on the western side through the provision of additional space; c) more units, possibly more affordable units; d) more opportunity for privacy with the 12 Unit Alternative plan layout; e) the importance of common open space, which is actually increased in some of the alternatives; f) energy efficiency plans; and g) the reduction of the nuisance potential with regard to moving the residential use away from the adjacent commercial property. He clarified that the subject property was granted a density designation of 12.3 units per acre in the General Plan adopted in 2006, and that the parcel is zoned Design Residential, maximum 12.3 dwelling units per acre.

Commissioner Easton suggested that the applicant be directed to move forward with the site layout proposed for the 10 and 12 Unit Alternatives with regard to the location of the housing structures and parking; to work with staff to resolve whether 10 or 12 units would be appropriate; and to submit an alternative proposal with specificity that the applicant supports to the DRB for review.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, clarified that all of the proposed plans require technical modifications but do not require additional concessions such as modifications to open space and setbacks. He invited Planning Commissioners and members of the public who have taken strong interest in this project to visit his office to view the plans and learn more about the basic product.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, stated that he would be happy to move forward with the 12 Unit Alternative plan if directed by the Planning Commission, which he believes meets many of the concerns raised at the last meeting, although it is not the applicant's first choice.

MOTION: Commissioner Kavanagh moved/Commissioner Solomon seconded, to direct that 04-226-TM, -DP, -RN: Citrus Village Project located at 7388 Calle Real, APN 077-490-043, shall move forward with consideration of the 12 Unit Alternative plan, to include review by the DRB; and to continue the public hearing to November 10, 2008, which shall be re-noticed.

AMENDED

MOTION: Commissioner Kavanagh moved/Commissioner Solomon seconded, to direct that 04-226-TM, -DP, -RN: Citrus Village Project located at 7388 Calle Real, APN 077-490-043, shall move forward with consideration of the 12 Unit Alternative plan, to include review by the DRB, with the ability for the applicant and DRB to consider the 10 Unit Alternative plan if the 12 Unit Alternative Plan is found to be problematic within the review process; and to continue the public hearing to November 10, 2008, which shall be re-noticed.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.



**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2008**

6:00 P.M.
City Hall
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California

Members of the Planning Commission

*Brent Daniels, Vice Chair
Edward Easton
Doris Kavanagh
Julie Kessler Solomon*

*Patricia Miller, Secretary
Tim W. Giles, City Attorney
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk*

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Vice Chair Daniels followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Present: Planning Commissioners Daniels, Easton, Kavanagh, and Solomon.

Absent: None.

Staff present: Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase, Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller, City Attorney Tim W. Giles, Senior Planner Cindy Moore, Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz, Principal Civil Engineer Marti Schultz, and Recording Clerk Linda Gregory.

PUBLIC FORUM

Ken Knight reported that he has resigned from his position as Planning Commissioner. He stated that he is the Executive Director of Goleta Valley Beautiful and believes it is important not to create the appearance of a potential conflict of interest with his role as Planning Commissioner. He expressed his appreciation for the privilege of working with the Planning Commissioners and staff. He read an e-mail from Bob Cunningham, Principal, Arcadia Studios, dated October 30, 2008, Subject: "Nice work", in which Bob Cunningham, who attended a recent presentation for the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital project as a member of the applicant's project team, commended the Planning Commission, and Ken Knight, who served as Chair, and staff for a job well done.

Vice Chair Daniels expressed appreciation to Ken Knight for his service on the City's first Planning Commission. He thanked Bob Cunningham for the commendation in his October 30, 2008, e-mail.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, requested that the public hearing on the Haskell's Landing project scheduled for November 17, 2008, be postponed. She believes that it is important for the project to be reviewed by the entire Planning Commission with the new members when they are appointed by the newly-elected Councilmembers. She also requested that no final decisions be made until then with regard to the Citrus Village and Camino Real Hotel projects.

AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A.1 Planning Commission Minutes for October 13, 2008.

Recommendation:

1. Approve the Planning Commission minutes for the Regular Meeting of October 13, 2008.

Commissioner Easton requested that comments, which were provided in bold type in a handout, be added to the minutes regarding how pathogens are disposed with regard to the review of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital project.

Vice Chair Daniels stated that he reviewed the rerun of the Planning Commission meeting and believes it is appropriate to include the comments in the minutes.

MOTION: Commissioner Easton moved/seconded by Commissioner Kavanagh, to approve the Planning Commission minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 13, 2008, as amended.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote. Ayes: Vice Chair Daniels, Commissioners Easton, Kavanagh and Solomon. Noes: None.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

B-1. 04-266-TM, -DP, -RN: Citrus Village Project located at 7388 Calle Real; APN 077-490-043.

Continued from September 8, 2008.

Recommendation:

1. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 08-__ (Attachment 1), entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Recommending to the Goleta City Council Approval of Various Actions Related to the Camino Real Hotel Project Case No. 07-208-SPA, -DP; Conduct continued

public hearing, receive progress report, and provide direction to staff and the applicant.

Recused: Commissioner Easton recused himself, stating that he would not want an appearance of a conflict of interest if the project were reviewed by the City Council.

Ex-parte conversations: Vice Chair Daniels reported that he had a telephone call this afternoon with Detlev Peikert, applicant.

Staff Speakers:

Senior Planner Cindy Moore

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase

Senior Planner Cindy Moore stated that on September 8, 2008, the Planning Commission directed that the project move forward with consideration of the 12 Unit Alternative plan, to include review by the Design Review Board (DRB). She reported that the plans were reviewed by the DRB on October 14, 2008, and that the minutes from the DRB meeting are included in the agenda packet in Attachment 1; and that the proposed project plans are included in Attachment 2. She said that staff recommends that the Planning Commission conduct an in-progress review at the continued public hearing and provide direction to staff and the applicant regarding the proposed 12 unit alternative.

Lisa Plowman, Planning Manager with Peikert Group Architects, presented the proposed plans and a PowerPoint presentation. She stated that the applicant believes the project will benefit the community, in summary, by providing multi-family housing on an infill site; by providing a variety of housing types for local workers which will fulfill Housing Element Policies 3.1 and 4.2; and by enhancing the general vicinity with the architecture and newness of the project.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED: 6:34 P.M.

Speakers:

Barbara Massey, Goleta, requested careful consideration of what is being approved to move forward because she believes the project will have a long impact on the area. She expressed the following concerns: a) The project has been scaled down a little but much more needs to be done; b) She believes that DRB members expressed opinions that the project is too dense and had concerns regarding the height; c) DRB members requested that story poles be installed which was also requested by members of the community; d) The three-story buildings in the project impact the Brookside condominiums and the view; e) She believes the project is not appropriate and out of scale for the surroundings, and should be revised to fit the site and not encroach into the setbacks, noting that it exceeds the recommended FARs; f) She requested reduction in the number of units and the size of the units, and also lowering the height to two stories; and g) Requested that story poles be installed.

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, spoke in opposition to the project and read her letter she presented at the hearing that includes her concerns. She stated that she went to the Willow Creek project in Old Town to view the product and does not believe that the design is conducive to family life, or appropriate for very young or elderly persons, with its steep stairways and small, narrow living and dining areas. When driving through the Willow Creek site recently at 9:00 p.m., she observed that all but two parking spaces were taken even though nineteen units are for sale. She believes that story poles should be installed because the area is a designated view corridor site.

Bill Shelor, Goleta, stated that he recognizes that this infill site has some constraints that make it difficult; however he believes that three-stories are unprecedented in the El Encanto Heights area. He requested that story polls be placed on the site.

PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION OF THE HEARING CLOSED AT 6:41 P.M.

Senior Planner Cindy Moore read General Plan Policy VH 4.15 - Site Specific Visual Assessment with regard to the use of story poles in the review process. She stated that visual simulations were provided by the applicant which staff believes satisfies the policy.

Commissioner Solomon commented that while there is community concern regarding the scale of the project, and the project has three stories with the potential for a portion to tower over the Brookside condominiums, she believes it would be fair to provide the opportunity to view story poles.

Lisa Plowman, Planning Manager, Peikert Group Architects, stated that the applicant would prefer working with staff to provide visual simulations that would be appropriate, rather than story poles which is very expensive. She clarified the visual simulations were submitted with the project application that show views while traveling east towards the west on Calle Real. She stated that story poles would be installed, however, if required by the Planning Commission. She noted that this project's mean height is 26 feet as measured under the City's code, but the peak height is at 34 feet. She stated that it would be feasible for the applicant to remove one affordable unit if directed by the Planning Commission.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, stated that the project is meant to be entry-level housing and that their plans are to bring in several local employers and possibly public agencies to provide housing for their employees when the project is approved. He said that spending money on story poles would make these plans more difficult.

Commissioner Kavanagh stated that she believes story poles would be useful because of the slope of the property and how it is lower at the street than at the back of the property.

Vice Chair Daniels recommended that staff develop a program for installing the story poles that consists only of areas of concern that would include corners and ridgelines. He noted that it would be useful to provide markings that indicate elements such as heights, different levels and finished floors.

Commissioner Kavanagh commented that she went to Willow Creek in Old Town to visualize the housing product type, and spoke with two critical workforce people there, who commute to work from out of the area and felt that the product type does meet their needs. She encouraged others to visit the Willow Creek site. She spoke in support of moving the project forward with the 12 Unit Alternative, stating that she would not be in favor of losing an affordable unit. She appreciates that extra parking spaces were added to the plans.

Commissioner Solomon commented, in general, that the General Plan allows for development in infill while maintaining a certain degree of open space, and that in order to maintain the character of the community, projects may need to be considered that are somewhat denser than what was built in the past.

Vice Chair Daniels spoke in support of moving the project forward with the 12 Unit Alternative. He requested that staff provide, prior to the next hearing, an evaluation of the 12 Unit Alternative plan after review that would include story poles, with the ability for staff to address issues that may result from the story pole process.

Commissioner Solomon requested that staff consider providing extra noticing with regard to the installation of story poles in addition to the regular noticing process

In response to the consensus of the Planning Commission, Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller stated that 12 Unit Alternative plan will move forward and that the public hearing on the Citrus Village Project located at 7388 Calle Real; APN 077-490-043, will be continued to a special meeting of the Planning Commission on January 26, 2009; and also that staff will work with the applicant with regard to the story pole process and will consider mailing a notice to the neighbors and interested persons on the record.

RECESS HELD FROM 7:20 P.M. TO 7:26 P.M.

B-2. 07-208-SPA, -DP: Camino Real Hotel Project, Located at 401 Storke Road; APN 073-440-019.

Recommendation:

1. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 08-__ (Attachment 1), entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Recommending to the Goleta City Council Approval of Various Actions Related to the Camino Real Hotel Project Case No. 07-208-SPA, -DP; 401 Storke Road; APN 073-440-019.

Recused: Commissioner Easton recused himself.

Site visits: Made by Vice Chair Daniels, Commissioner Kavanagh and Commissioner Solomon.

Ex-parte conversations: Commissioner Kavanagh reported that she met with Kim Schizas, agent, regarding the project. Commissioner Solomon reported that she met



**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2009**

6:00 P.M.
City Hall
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California

Members of the Planning Commission

*Brent Daniels, Chair
Julie Kessler Solomon, Vice Chair
Doris Kavanagh
Bill Shelor
Jonny Wallis*

*Patricia Miller, Secretary
Tim W. Giles, City Attorney
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk*

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 6:07 p.m. by Chair Daniels followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Present: Planning Commissioners Daniels, Shelor, Solomon, and Wallis.
Absent: Planning Commissioner Kavanagh.

Staff present: Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase, Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller, City Attorney Tim W. Giles, Principal Civil Engineer Marti Schultz, and Recording Clerk Linda Gregory.

PUBLIC FORUM

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, requested proposed changes to the minutes from the Planning Commission meeting of January 12, 2009, with regard to Item C-2, Vandeman appeal of the Design Review Board Preliminary Approval of 08-090-DRB. He submitted a written copy of the request.

AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A.1 Planning Commission Minutes for the Planning Commission meeting of January 12, 2009.

Recommendation:

- A. Approve the Planning Commission minutes for the Planning Commission meeting of January 12, 2009.

MOTION: Commissioner Wallis moved/seconded by Vice Chair Solomon, to approve the Planning Commission minutes for the Planning Commission meeting of January 12, 2009, as amended, including the changes requested by speaker Gary Vandeman.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Daniels; Vice Chair Solomon; Commissioners Shelor and Wallis. Absent: Commissioner Kavanagh. Noes: None.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

B-1. 04-226-TM, -DP, RN: Citrus Village located at 7388 Calle Real; APN 077-490-043 (continued from November 10, 2008).

Recommendation:

- A. Take off calendar (to be rescheduled at a later date).

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller stated that staff recommends that 04-226-TM, -DP, RN: Citrus Village, located at 7388 Calle Real, be taken off calendar, to be rescheduled at a later date. She stated that one of the items that needed to be accomplished during the continuance period was the installation of story poles which took longer than expected. She confirmed that the story poles were installed on the site on January 27, 2009, and will remain on the site through January 29, 2009.

MOTION: Commissioner Wallis moved/seconded by Vice Chair Solomon, to take off calendar, to be rescheduled at a later date, 04-226-TM, -DP, RN: Citrus Village located at 7388 Calle Real; APN 077-490-043.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Daniels; Vice Chair Solomon; Commissioners Shelor and Wallis. Absent: Commissioner Kavanagh. Noes: None.

ATTACHMENT 8

AESTHETICS:

DRB MINUTES and STORY POLE PHOTOGRAPHS



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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

MINUTES – APPROVED

CONSENT CALENDAR – TUESDAY, March 21, 2006, 2:30 P.M.

Members: Ed Easton, Jaime Herman Pierce, Gary Vandeman

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – TUESDAY, March 21, 2006, 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – TUESDAY, March 21, 2006, 3:15 P.M.

GOLETA VALLEY COMMUNITY CENTER 5679 HOLLISTER AVENUE, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA

Members:

Carl Schneider (Architect), Chair
Gretchen Zee (Architect), Vice-Chair
Cecilia Brown
Ed Easton
Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Jaime Herman Pierce (Landscape Architect)
Barbara Massey
Fermina Murray
Gary Vandeman

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 Schneider at 3:00 p.m. in the Goleta Valley Community Center, 5679 Hollister Avenue, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Carl Schneider, Chair; Gretchen Zee, Vice-Chair; Cecilia Brown; *Ed Easton; Barbara Massey; Chris Messner; Jaime Herman Pierce; and Gary Vandeman.

Board Members absent: Fermina Murray. *Member Easton exited the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

Staff present: Patricia Miller, Planning Manager; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner, Alan Hanson, Senior Planner; Scott Kolwitz; Associate Planner; Laura Vlk, Assistant Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 21, 2006

Page 16 of 20

STRAW VOTE:

How many members are willing to accept a tower with the height somewhere in the 40' range?

Members voting in the affirmative: Brown, Messner, Pierce, Schneider, Vandeman, Zee. (6)

Members not voting in the affirmative: Massey. (1)

Members absent: Easton, Murray. (2)

Chair Schneider said that the direction of the DRB is to lower the tower and to restudy and adjust the architecture details. He also said the comments include: consider simpler forms, whether the spire is necessary, and possibly redesigning the cupola.

Member Massey said that she would not support a height of 40' or taller for the tower. She said she thinks that a height limit of 35' feet is preferred for Old Town by the City Council.

Bruce Bartlett, Design ARC, said that an issue was brought up during environmental review that the building may need to be raised up to nineteen feet for finished floor and that the building was to be compressed with no height increase allowed.

ACTION: Item J-1, No. 02-089-DRB, received conceptual review with comments.

RECESS HELD 7:21 P.M. TO 7:29 P.M.

J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 04-226-DRB

7388 Calle Real (APN 077-490-043)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review of a vesting tentative tract map and final development plan for 11 airspace condominium units totaling 22,424 square feet, associated infrastructure, and common open space. Three residential unit types are proposed within five two-story structures arranged along a central drive aisle. The buildings would have a maximum height of 28 feet. Buildings A-D would each contain two three-bedroom attached units (1,793 and 1,805 square feet, with a 428 square foot two-car garage each). Building E would contain one three-bedroom unit (1,571 square feet with a 240 square foot one-car garage) and two two-bedroom units (1,106 and 1,110 square feet, with a 240 square foot one-car garage each). The two two-bedroom units are proposed to be sold at a price that is affordable to moderate income households. Access to the site would be via Calle Real. Parking would include 19 garage parking spaces and 9 visitor spaces for a total of 28 spaces. The proposed project site includes approximately .94 acres in the Design Residential zone district. The application is filed by Detlev Peikert, Peikert Group Architects, on behalf of the Santa Barbara Community Housing Corporation, property owner. Related cases: 04-226-TM, -DP (Cindy Moore)

Site visits: Made by all members.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Documents: 1) Letter from El Encanto Heights Neighborhood Committee, dated February 26, 2004, to Detlev Peikert, regarding El Encanto Heights Condominium-

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 21, 2006

Page 17 of 20

Assessor's Parcel No. 077-490-043, presented by Detlev Peikert. 2) Letter from Karen Lovelace, dated March 20, 2006, regarding Permit No. 04-226-DRB.

The plans were presented by Detlev Peikert, Peikert Group Architects, and Lisa Plowman, Peikert Group Architects. Mr. Peikert provided the background information regarding the project. He said that approximately five years ago the County of Santa Barbara approved a low-income project on this site, the EL Encanto Apartments project, and that the applicant, Santa Barbara Community Housing Corporation, later determined that it would not be feasible for them to develop the project and eventually decided to sell the property. Mr. Peikert said that he was approached regarding whether he would be interested in developing the property. He said that he met with various neighbors in four meetings to show the project through its evolutionary process and eventually received a letter of support from the neighbors, El Encanto Heights Neighborhood Committee, dated February 26, 2004, which he presented. Mr. Peikert said that his concern was that the proposal would be acceptable to the neighbors and would solve many of the neighbors' issues regarding the El Encanto Apartments project.

Lisa Plowman provided photographs of similar projects that have been approved in the County of Santa Barbara and the City of Santa Barbara that follow the concept of the courtyard living style.

SPEAKERS:

Earl Lovelace, resident of El Encanto Heights for thirty-four years, expressed his concerns regarding the project: that include: 1) The project has too much use for this small site. 2) The space between the houses is very small. 3) Insufficient parking to support eleven homes. 4) There is potential for overflow parking which would impact nearby streets. 5) People tend to use garages for storage and then park cars on the street. For example, he suggested observing parking situation on Tuolumne Drive and Alpine Drive. 6) Traffic will be increased. 6) Calle Real is a very busy street. 7) He was not in support of the El Encanto apartment project.

Harry Rouse, representing El Encanto Heights Neighborhood Committee, read from a letter he said would be sent tomorrow to the City to clarify the position of the El Encanto Heights Neighborhood Committee regarding the plans. Mr. Rouse said that these plans were submitted many months after their last meeting with Mr. Peikert and are vastly different. He said that their steering committee has not had sufficient time to review these plans and they are not in a position to express any kind of support for the current proposal. He expressed concern that the plans include nine very large condominiums at market price and two smaller affordable units with greatly reduced side yard setbacks. Mr. Rouse also said that to his knowledge a letter was never sent by their committee that was not signed by at least one member of the steering committee and that a copy of the letter is not in their file dated February 26, 2004, from the El Encanto Heights Neighborhood Committee, to Detlev Peikert, supporting the single—family housing project described to them, El Encanto Heights Condominium-Assessor's Parcel No. 077-490-043.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 21, 2006

Page 18 of 20

Karen Lovelace, representing El Encanto Heights Neighborhood Committee, said that she attended one of the four meetings with the applicant regarding the conceptual drawings; however she had questions that were left unanswered and she did not give her support for the plans. She read from her letter dated March 20, 2006, regarding Permit No. 04-226-DRB, that provides background information. Karen Lovelace said that her main concerns include legality issues described in her letter; the zoning of the adjacent Padre Shopping center; the size, bulk and scale of the project, and parking. She also expressed concern regarding neighborhood compatibility and said she does not support the requested modifications.

Dr. Timothy Bullock, 7249 Tuolumne Drive, representing himself and Aubrey and Jason White, 7386 Calle Real, Brookside Homeowners Association, said their association just learned of the project last week and they do not think the condominium residents were included in the neighborhood meetings with the applicant. Dr. Bullock presented the following questions and concerns: 1) Concern regarding parking issues especially related to overflow parking. 2) There is limited pedestrian access and no sidewalks along adjacent condominium complex. 3) Suggest some pedestrian access to link with shopping center and surrounding neighborhood. 4) Will there be access to nearby parks or is there an open space nearby? 5) Are there plans for the dirt access road? 6) The site is next to a bar which can get somewhat active at night. 7) Requested an estimate of the cost of the units and for the affordable housing.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, clarified that he is not representing Santa Barbara Community Housing Corporation, property owners, and that he is representing himself as the buyer of the property which is currently in escrow. He said that the Santa Barbara Community Housing Corporation decided to sell the property and to return the redevelopment funding. Mr. Peikert said that the site is appropriately zoned and adequate parking has been provided. Also, the CC&Rs would address parking and require parking in garages.

Lisa Plowman, Peikert Group Architects, said that the goal of the project has been to make it look more like single family homes to provide for a better transition into the neighborhood.

Comments:

1. There are some concerns regarding architecture: Move away from the Spanish and Mediterranean style and consider other styles such as craftsman, cottage, bungalow, ranch, etc. This may help break up some of the two-story massing.
2. Soften some of the two-story forms, particularly to Calle Real and possibly the east side.
3. Concern regarding the size, bulk and scale in terms of the project's relationship to the surrounding neighborhood. One member said the units are somewhat too big.
4. Consider creative ways to transition this multi-family home project into the neighborhood.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

March 21, 2006

Page 19 of 20

5. The grading difference on the eastern side in relation to the Brookside Condominiums, which are lower, is significant. Concern there may be a compatibility issue regarding this transition.
6. Planting heavily with trees may help soften the transition on the eastern side at least until the adjacent property is developed.
7. Applicant shall provide drawings documenting the grading issue on the eastern side.
8. Site sections are needed to understand relationship to adjacent properties. Also need to see 8' wall on the northern property line in relation to the condominiums.
9. There will need to be increased landscaping to help soften the relationship between the shopping center and the project in terms of the reduced side yard and backyard setbacks.
10. Concern that there is no on-street parking and there is the potential for overflow parking on Ellwood Station and in the neighborhood.
11. Study whether more parking spaces can be added on the site. Possibly relocate the parking spaces. Refine the hammerhead. Look at possible rearrangement of tot lot.
12. Applicant shall provide more details regarding drainage including sizes of pipes. Concern regarding the surface drainage.
13. Recommend permeable paving or dry well to capture water back into the basin. There is a lot of paving.
14. Applicant shall provide lighting plan.
15. Add a sidewalk to the right-of-way so pedestrians are moved away from the traffic lane.
16. Adding pedestrian access from this project to sidewalks would be helpful.
17. Recommend the following changes to the landscape plan: Delete the Melaleuca because of its high water usage; add orange trees; use Marathon II dwarf for the lawn; the ten-gallon size plants are not a trade standard.
18. A suggestion was made to consider solar options.
19. Applicant shall provide information regarding square footage for garages and habital space.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Zee and carried by a 7 to 0 vote (Absent: Easton, Murray) to continue Item J-2, No. 04-226-DRB, to May 2, 2006, with comments.

K. ADVISORY CALENDAR

K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-096-LUP

5610 Cielo Avenue (APN 069-080-007)

This is a request for *Advisory* review. The property includes a 2,422-square foot residence and a 180-square foot covered patio on a 21,212-gross square foot lot and 14,409-net square foot lot in the 20-R-1 zone district. The current residence does not have a garage as the 422-square foot garage was converted to living space in 1995. The applicant proposes to construct a 600-square foot detached Residential Second Unit, an attached 280-square foot 1-car garage and a 234-square foot deck above the garage. The applicant also proposes to construct a 220-square foot 1-car carport and install a 4-foot tall retaining wall. Total onsite development would be 3,602 square



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

MINUTES - APPROVED

CONSENT CALENDAR – TUESDAY, May 2, 2006, 2:30 P.M.

Members: Ed Easton, Jaime Herman Pierce, Gary Vandeman

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – TUESDAY, May 2, 2006, 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – TUESDAY, May 2, 2006, 3:15 P.M.

**GOLETA CITY HALL
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

Members:

Carl Schneider (Architect), Chair

Scott Branch (Architect)

Cecilia Brown, Vice Chair

Ed Easton

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Jaime Herman Pierce (Landscape Architect)

Barbara Massey

Gary Vandeman

Bob Wignot

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 Schneider at 3:00 p.m. at Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Carl Schneider, Chair; Cecilia Brown, Vice Chair; Scott Branch; Ed Easton; Barbara Massey; Chris Messner; Jaime Herman Pierce; Gary Vandeman; Bob Wignot.

Staff present: Patricia Miller, Planning Manager; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Scott Kolwitz, Associate Planner; Laura Vlk, Assistant Planner; Steve Wagner, Director of Community Services; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

Chair Schneider welcomed new DRB members Scott Branch and Bob Wignot.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

May 2, 2006

Page 9 of 12

Members voting in the affirmative: Branch, Pierce. (2)

Recused: Massey. (1)

A majority of members prefer a smooth concrete slope protection on the freeway overcrossing.

STRAW VOTE:

How many members prefer the galvanized chain link fence rather than black?

Members responding in the affirmative: Easton. (1)

Recused: Massey. (1)

A majority of members prefer the black color for the chain link fence.

MOTION: Easton moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 8 to 0 vote (Recused: Massey) that comments have been received and to take Item I-1, No. 05-037-DRB, off calendar.

Paul Martinez, Caltrans, said that the next review of the project will include slope paving once negotiations have been completed with the railroad representatives. He said the landscaping and lighting will be presented at a future meeting. He said that there is the possibility that the item regarding the preference for the arched format or rectangular format may be reviewed.

I-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 04-226-DRB

7388 Calle Real (APN 077-490-043)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review of a vesting tentative tract map and final development plan for 11 airspace condominium units totaling 22,424 square feet, associated infrastructure, and common open space. Three residential unit types are proposed within five two-story structures arranged along a central drive aisle. The buildings would have a maximum height of 28 feet. Buildings A-D would each contain two three-bedroom attached units (1,793 and 1,805 square feet, with a 428 square foot two-car garage each). Building E would contain one three-bedroom unit (1,571 square feet with a 240 square foot one-car garage) and two two-bedroom units (1,106 and 1,110 square feet, with a 240 square foot one-car garage each). The two two-bedroom units are proposed to be sold at a price that is affordable to moderate income households. Access to the site would be via Calle Real. Parking would include 19 garage parking spaces and 9 visitor spaces for a total of 28 spaces. The proposed project site includes approximately .94 acres in the Design Residential zone district. The application is filed by Detlev Peikert, Peikert Group Architects, on behalf of the Santa Barbara Community Housing Corporation, property owner. Related cases: 04-226-TM, -DP (Continued from 03-21-06) (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by Detlev Peikert, Peikert Group Architects, applicant, and Lisa Plowman, Peikert Group Architects. Lisa Plowman reviewed the modifications that were made in response to DRB comments that are outlined in the Memo from Peikert Group Architects, dated April 19, 2006, regarding Citrus Village.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

May 2, 2006

Page 10 of 12

Detlev Peikert, applicant, provided an aerial photograph of the immediate neighborhood with the site plan superimposed. He said that he believes the project fits in with the neighborhood, would not be imposing, provides private open space for each residential unit and landscaping.

SPEAKERS

Karen Lovelace, resident of El Encanto Heights, expressed concerns regarding the project and submitted a letter dated May 2, 2006, and photographs she took of the site with 28' story poles that she installed. She discussed a brief history of the El Encanto Apartments project application on this site and said that she was among the many neighbors in El Encanto Heights that opposed the project because it had many of the same problems as the current project application. She said there was a General Plan Amendment and zone change with the previous project. She also said that the previous project did not go forward because there were issues regarding the soils on that site. She thinks the current project has some disadvantages that the previous project did not have. She expressed concerns regarding the current project:

- 1) There is no space for additional parking when there is not going to be enough parking. Adequate parking needs to be provided onsite, at least one car per bedroom.
- 2) The project squeezes as much as possible to fit on this site. Many of the trees will fail because they are located too close to parking spaces and will interfere with the cars and will, therefore, need to be taken out.
- 3) The 28' tall buildings will not have adequate screening.
- 4) Buffers between the residential and adjacent Padre Shopping Center need to be provided as dictated by ordinance. The 20' buffer between commercial and residential is not provided.
- 5) The doors to the houses are very close to the driveway.
- 6) The cars will need to be maneuvered to get in and out of the garages because of the angle. There is no extra room to maneuver.
- 7) There are issues regarding compatibility with the neighborhood in terms of square footage. The FAR for the previous project application was 37.68 percent and the FAR for the current proposal is 54.85 percent. Compared to the Brookside Condominiums the project is over three times the square footage of Brookside.
- 8) Applicant should be required to provide story poles.
- 9) No exceptions should be made for this project.

Comments:

1. Although parking requirements will be met, concern that there may be a need for additional parking for different occasions.
2. Concern that cars backing out of the garages are immediately into the driveway and walkway, and whether the design concept for the driveway and garages is workable.
3. One member said that the visual impacts of garages is not minimized.
4. Concern regarding size, bulk and scale. The units on the south elevation need to be smaller in scale and not appear so massive to the street, particularly coming from either the east or west along Calle Real.
5. Suggest adding one-story elements or stepped two-story elements on the south elevation.
6. The architecture should not be over-detailed because these are small houses.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

May 2, 2006

Page 11 of 12

7. Prefer the previous drawings with architecture that was simpler. The buildings next door are somewhat plain.
8. The character of the architecture is nice. Appreciate the concept of duplexes.
9. Concern that the buildings are close to the commercial site on the west elevation and that the second-story floor overlooks to the parking lot. One member said there is a lack of buffer between housing and non-residential.
10. There needs to be a more compatible/friendly relationship between the residential and commercial buildings and bar at the back of the property, particularly regarding the affordable housing end unit.
11. One member said that the affordable unit site would be an awkward place to live. Suggest that moving the northwest corner of the building eastward would provide more room.
12. A suggestion was made to eliminate a unit which would allow for a more communal open space or could become added guest parking.
13. One member suggested removing the tot lot or moving it to the other side.
14. Possibly adding some tall trees along the western property line would help buffer.
15. Appreciate the trees that are located on the east side of the project.
16. It would be useful to install a gate in the wall to allow for access to the commercial area without having to walk out to Calle Real.
17. The color of the driveway ribbon should match the adjacent color.
18. One member has reservations regarding the drainage. What is called out for in the drawing is inadequate. Also, the soil is a clay soil and retains a lot of water. The member believes there will be potential problems with the wall on the west side of the property. There is another development below this wall and the other property owners below could be negatively impacted.
19. Recommend using a paving material for parking that is durable. Turf block type material may not be appropriate for heavy use.
20. Request staff research whether there is a plan to add a combination of right and left turn lanes from Calle Real into the project site and/or Ellwood Station Road and the commercial site.

Member Massey said that she thinks it would be appropriate that issues such as size of units and setbacks be reviewed by the Planning Agency for direction prior to architectural review by the DRB.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, said that the following changes will be made to respond to some of today's comments: 1) The building on the northwest side of the property will be moved to the east to create a little more space between the existing building. 2) Some changes will be made to the treatment of the front elevations such as wrapping the entrance porch around and creating some low roofs to create a more friendly view to the street. Mr. Peikert said that from his experience in designing projects of this density type he has a clear understanding regarding how the driveway turning movement would work. He suggested that DRB members discuss concerns regarding soils and drainage directly with their project engineer at Penfield & Smith. He said he would appreciate the opportunity to move forward with the application process.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

May 2, 2006

Page 12 of 12

MOTION: Pierce moved, seconded by Vandeman and carried by a 9 to 0 vote that Conceptual review has been completed with comments on Item I-2, No. 04-226-DRB.

Planning Manager Patricia Miller clarified that the project will now be taken off calendar for the processing procedure.

J. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

J-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Member Massey requested a future agenda item to discuss potential procedures and policies to improve the flow of the DRB meetings.

Member Vandeman requested a future agenda item regarding neighborhood compatibility.

Chair Schneider requested a future agenda item to discuss preservation of private views.

Chair Schneider requested a future agenda item to discuss the Street Tree Subcommittee.

Member Easton requested a future agenda item to discuss the process of identifying specific Findings during the DRB review.

Chair Schneider requested a future agenda item to provide a presentation for new and ongoing members regarding the Brown Act.

Chair Schneider requested that staff report back regarding the possibility of conducting a special DRB meeting to discuss the future agenda items.

Vice Chair Brown said that it would be helpful to have information and materials provided by staff that are relevant to the discussions. She said she does not think it is necessary for members to reach a consensus regarding all matters discussed.

Member Pierce said that the DRB previously discussed taking pictures of architectural projects in Old Town that would work with regard to lot size and zoning.

Planning Manager Patricia Miller said that densities in Old Town are being addressed in the Draft General Plan during the current review process and that the members could comment on the draft plan as individual citizens.

J-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

No announcements.

K. RECESS HELD 4:15 P.M. TO 4:21 P.M.

L. ADJOURNMENT: 6:57 P.M.

Minutes approved May 16, 2006.



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, July 8, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

Members:

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair
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: Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 8, 2008

Page 6 of 13

more appropriate if the intent is to provide lighting for the walkway; and d) the proposed placement of the lighting does not appear to effectively illuminate the pathway and would light the shrubbery because it is not very directional and is diffused.

2. Chair Wignot commented: a) the proposed lighting plan needs clarification with regard to the placement of the wall sconces, for example, there are existing shrubs along the walkway; and b) the plans need to be show that the colors, finishes and roof materials shall match existing.
3. Member Branch commented: a) the plans need to show how the roof resolves and ties into the existing building; and b) requested that the applicant provide details with regard to the kind of tile that will be applied to the concrete piers.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented that overall the project is an improvement for the front of the building and will provide an entry that announces itself.
5. Member Schneider commented: a) agreed with Member Brown's comments requesting that the applicant restudy the lighting; b) agreed with Member Branch's request that the applicant provide tile details; and c) the project will be a nice addition to the building.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 08-082-DRB, 7526 Calle Real, with the following conditions: 1) the plans shall show that the exterior colors, finishes, and the roofing materials shall match existing; 2) the applicant shall restudy the lighting issues; 3) the plans shall show the details for the kind of tiles to be applied to the concrete piers; and 4) the plans shall show the resolution of the main roof; and to continue to August 12, 2008, for Final review by the full DRB on the Final Calendar.

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 revised project has been reduced by two units and includes a final development plan for nine condominium units totaling 19,949 square feet, associated infrastructure, and common open space. Two residential unit types are proposed within four two-story structures arranged along a central drive aisle. The buildings would have a maximum height of 30 feet. Buildings A, C, and D would each contain two three-bedroom attached units (2,205 and 2,223 square feet, with an approximately 400 square foot two-car garage each). Building B would contain three three-bedroom units (two @ 2,223 square feet and one @ 2,205 square feet with an approximately 400 square foot two-car garage each). Access to the site would be via Calle Real. Parking would include 18 garage parking spaces and seven visitor spaces, for a total of 25 spaces. The proposed project site includes approximately .94 acres in the Design Residential zone district. The project was filed by Detlev Peikert, representing 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner. Related cases 04-226-TM, - DP (Continued from 5-2-06, 3-21-06) (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by Lisa Plowman, Peikert Group Architects; and Detlev Peikert, project architect, representing 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner. Lisa

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 8, 2008

Page 7 of 13

Plowman presented background information regarding the project. She stated that it became apparent in the last few months that the project as designed may have issues with respect to some General Plan policies, and possible new Affordable Housing policies, although some flexibility has been built into the project. She said that the applicant has decided to remove the two moderately-priced units from the project, bringing the number of units down from eleven units to nine market rate units, and that in-lieu fees will be paid by the applicant.

Detlev Peikert, project architect, discussed the changes in the site plan, stating that with nine units the project density is significantly below the allowed density. He presented the proposed landscape plan and clarified that the project has no plans for a retaining wall. He stated that the applicant will revert the right-of-way on Calle Real back to the City of Goleta.

Senior Planner Cindy Moore clarified that the parking is consistent with ordinance requirements and the building height is below the City's height requirements. She stated that there are a few setback modifications that will be required with regard to the DR-12.3 zone district that would need to be approved by the decision-maker.

SPEAKER:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, expressed the following concerns regarding the project: a) the next set of plans need to show the location of all of the utility meters so that that utilities will not show up in unexpected places on the plans (when driving by the site today, he saw a massive electric panel on the west side that he does not recall being shown on the drawings); b) requested that plans for the drainage system be addressed by the DRB with regard to rain gutters to prevent flooding in the driveway; c) suggested that space for some parking may be created by turning the sidewalk along the right-of-way on Calle Real into a type of bus pull-out area, noting that there is a need for parking; d) each garage is on a different level, approximately six inches higher, so stepping up on the porch will be somewhat awkward; e) recommended that the width of the garage doors be 18-feet, which is extra wide, to help facilitate turning in the tight driveway situation; f) the water meters are shown in the right-of-way which he believes need to be shown inboard on the property; and g) it appears that the backyards for these units are totally enclosed by block walls although there is discussion regarding a bioswale, which does not seem to match.

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the location and screening of the utility meters need to be shown on the plans and reviewed; b) requested that the applicant provide lighting plans and cut sheets; c) suggested the applicant discuss with the owner of the adjacent property the possibility of landscaping the western elevation facing the commercial property, at the appropriate time; d) noted that the western elevation faces a commercial site which has an ample amount of night lighting, and suggested that the applicant may want to address this consideration with window design and/or screening; e) suggested consideration of any opportunity for additional parking on the site; and f) recommended that staff direct the applicant to work with Community Services staff regarding the stormwater runoff issues.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 8, 2008

Page 8 of 13

2. Member Branch commented: a) the elimination of the two units in the rear helps the project; b) the project is quite handsome; c) it seems like there needs to be additional guest parking; d) suggested restudying the chimney (on Sheet 8) that does not come down to the ground which seems like there is a lot of mass floating; e) suggested consideration that the dormer vents could be larger, or eliminated ; and f) the applicant's decision not to install a gate between the project and the adjacent commercial property is understandable since there is a sidewalk.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) the elimination of the two units is an improvement; b) the project is nice; c) there are some unfortunate constraints on the site, for example, the right-of-way in the front, and the two different slopes at the rear property line; d) agreed with Member Branch that the floating chimney seems odd and also the chimney with a section cut out seems odd (on Sheet 8); e) his preference would be for the dormer vents to be eliminated or minimized; f) overall, the architecture is fine and the project is reasonable; g) the comment from speaker Gary Vandeman will need to be resolved at some time with regard to the western bioswale; h) the suggestion from speaker Gary Vandeman to provide for parking in the right-of-way on Calle Real sounds interesting but would need the City's approval; and i) in his opinion, he would support the concept of reducing the open space requirement for a smaller project based upon private space being provided that is not given credit for open space, to allow for additional parking.
4. Member Messner commented: a) he still has the same concerns from the previous review regarding drainage, noting that there will be a lot of underground water especially in the raised area in the back; b) the concept of the drain located down the center is appreciated; c) there needs to be gutters that will connect into the drains because he is concerned with heavy overflows from the rain; d) the concept of pavers is appreciated to allow some water into the soil; e) the bioswale plans are appreciated; f) the project is nicely landscaped, especially towards the parking lot; g) the plans need to define who is responsible for the landscaping; and h) the landscape plans call out for small and medium trees, however, he believes there needs to be much larger trees, such as the *Brisbane Box* species, to provide more privacy for the second story from the parking lot.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with the above DRB comments that the design is fine; and b) recommended using as much permeable pavers as possible, especially towards the entrance of the project before the water enters the street.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) agreed with the above comments regarding the building architecture; b) the building design is fine (and the internal floor plans are good); c) there seems to be a constraint with the size of this parcel and the layout seems very tight; d) expressed concern that the drive aisle could become congested or blocked when there are service vehicles or movers; e) the parking requirement does not seem adequate particularly in this area where available parking is limited; f) suggested consideration that if the handicapped parking space were located near the tot lot, there could be possibly four or five regular parking spaces where there are presently three spaces; g) suggested that if there is a request for an amendment to the General Plan, consideration be given to requesting a small reduction in the open space requirement for the project to provide for more guest parking; h) the footprint of the project is shown on the aerial photograph as somewhat larger than the actual scale, making the project appear more spacious, and suggested that the photograph be adjusted to show

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

July 8, 2008

Page 9 of 13

how the project would fit in; and i) recommended that a solid six-foot cinder block wall on the western property line would be of benefit to provide further privacy for the residents in the project from the adjacent commercial center.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote that Conceptual review of Item M-1, No. 04-226-DRB, 7388 Calle Real, has been completed with comments to be forwarded to the Planning Commission including, as a recommendation, support for an applicant request to the Planning Commission with regard to the concept of giving credit for common open space on smaller projects based upon private space being provided by ordinance that is not given credit as common open space, so as to be able to fit more parking on the site; and to take Item M-1, No. 04-226-DRB, off calendar for review by the Planning Commission.

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.



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 13 of 18

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).





ATTACHMENT 9

PROJECT PLANS