



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, March 24, 2009

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:00 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)

Notices:

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

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 2 of 17

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for March 10, 2009

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

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

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

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-157-DRB

600 Pine Avenue (APN 071-130-040)

This is a request for *Final* review. The applicant proposes to construct a 23,376-square foot manufacturing/office addition (18,694-square foot first-floor & 4,682-square foot second-floor mezzanine) on the east end of the existing building and an 1,650-square foot "airlock" addition on the north side of the building, expand parking from 165 to 239 (188 standard, 44 compact, & 7 ADA compliant) parking spaces, and to retain 3 loading zones and the 20 indoor bicycle parking spaces. The resulting 2-story structure would be 84,561 square feet with a maximum height of 35 feet, consisting of a 63,219-square foot first-floor & a 21,342-square foot second floor mezzanine. (Continued from 2-24-09, 9-23-08) (Scott Kolwitz/Laura Vlk)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-24-09 Meeting:

1. Chair Wignot commented: a) The storm drainage information should be provided by the time of Final review, if possible.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The lighting seems too bright, particularly along the edge of the property. b) The applicant is requested to restudy the lighting plan and eliminate light trespass.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-1, No. 08-157-DRB, 600 Pine Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) The applicant shall

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 3 of 17

restudy the lighting plan and eliminate light trespass beyond the property line; and 2) The applicant shall provide details with regard to the color of the light poles; and to continue the item to March 24, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-021-DRB

7414 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-063 & 065)

This is a request for *Preliminary/Final* review. The applicant requests approval of a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the western parcels of the Hollister Business Park. The proposed OSP provides for three (3) different types of signs: wall signs, directional, and informational signs. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign. (Continued from 2-24-09) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-24-09 Meeting:

1. The two existing lighting fixtures that illuminate the existing monument sign shall be changed to shielded fixtures, using the same light fixture that was previously approved for the Hollister Business Park East Overall Sign Plan. A note shall be added to the Sign Permit indicating that the light fixture shall be replaced as a condition of approval.
2. Overall Sign Plan, Item II. Signage Allowances, A. Monument Signs: The second to the last sentence shall be changed to read: "The sign is lit with one monument shielded uplight on each side".

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION: By consensus, the Sign Subcommittee continued Item H-1, No. 09-021-DRB, 7414 Hollister Avenue, to March 24, 2009, for Preliminary and Final review on the Consent Calendar, with comments.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-127-DRB

840 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-070-027)

This is a request for *Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes a total development of 3,884 square feet consisting of a 3,524-square foot Kingdom Hall and a 360-square foot covered entry on a 46,173-square foot lot in the 20-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a concrete block 15-square foot freestanding institutional monument sign with a redwood top piece. The two line sign will read "Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses" on the top line, and "Salon del Reino de los Testigos de Jehova" on the bottom line, both with 5.5 inch individually mounted PVC letters painted black. The site address will be located near the top of the monument sign using the same lettering. The sign will be illuminated from above with down-lights mounted under the fascia. The project was filed by agent Carlos Grano on behalf of Goleta Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, property owner. Related Cases: 08-127-LUP/SCC. (Continued from 2-10-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 4 of 17

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-10-09 Meeting:

1. Pin-mounting of the letters is recommended.
2. Suggest that the shape of the stone buttress be slightly modified.
3. The applicant needs to provide color chips and lighting details.
4. Member Brown requested some additional landscaping at the base of the monument sign.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to continue Item H-2, No. 08-127-DRB, 840 North Fairview Avenue, with comments, to March 24, 2009, for Preliminary/Final review.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-148-DRB

5892 Calle Real (APN 069-110-061)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes a commercial building occupied by Bank of America. The applicant proposes to install new signage associated with Bank of America, including a new freestanding pole sign (Sign 1), two wall signs (Signs 14, & 15), and two directional signs (Signs 11, & 13). Signage proposed that will not require permits are a sign for disabled parking (Sign 3), glass door signage (Signs 9, & 10), and a Do Not Enter sign to replace the existing sign (Sign 12). The project was filed by agent Steve Stallone on behalf of Bank of America, property owner. Related cases: N/A. (Continued from 2-10-09*, 1-13-09, 12-9-08*, 11-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-13-09 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) It seems redundant to have both the wall sign facing Calle Real and the monument sign; and it also seems redundant that both signs are the same size; and b) She does not support the wall sign that faces Calle Real.
1. Member Branch commented: a) The wall sign facing Calle Real is acceptable; and b) The wall sign facing Encina Road should be eliminated.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The wall sign facing Encina Road seems redundant, noting that there is a duplication of signs when coming down Calle Real from Fairview Avenue; b) It is appropriate for a wall sign to be located on the wall that faces Calle Real, but the design would be better if the wall sign is reduced in size or the design is changed to lettering and logo, without the red background; and c) The intent with regard to the wall sign facing Calle Real is to reduce the amount of red in the background.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) He agreed with the comments by Members Branch, Brown and Schneider; and b) The plans that have been changed by the applicant in response to the DRB comments provide a clearer understanding of the proposal, which is useful to continue the Conceptual review.
4. Member Messner commented: a) The wall sign facing Encina Road does not seem to be needed; and b) The monument sign is more visible than the wall sign when driving down the street; c) He supports reducing the size of the wall sign

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 5 of 17

facing Calle Real, noting that it is too big for a one-story building, it is located too close to the street, and the size is the same as the monument sign.

5. Chair Wignot commented: a) The applicant responded to all of the comments that were made at the last meeting; and, from a personal standpoint, it is somewhat troublesome that more changes are now requested.

STRAW VOTE:

How many members support removing the proposed wall sign facing Encina Road?

Members voting in the affirmative: Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, Smith, and Wignot. (7).

Members not voting in the affirmative: None.

STRAW VOTE:

How many members support further reducing the wall sign facing Calle Real?

(Note: A vote was not conducted in lieu of discussion).

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 1 vote (No: Brown) to continue Item H-1, No. 08-148- DRB, 5892 Calle Real, to February 10, 2009, for Conceptual/Preliminary review on the Sign Calendar, after review by the Zoning Administrator, with the following Conceptual comments: 1) The proposed wall sign that faces Encino Lane shall be omitted; 2) The wall sign that faces Calle Real shall be approved but the wall sign as proposed shall either be reduced in size or changed in design to some type of individual lettering and logo without the red background.

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-002-DRB

334 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-090-028)

This is a request for *Preliminary/Final* review. The property known as the Hollipat site includes the approved temporary parking lot associated with the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital replacement project. The lot is under construction and will contain 376 parking spaces on approximately four acres in the PI and DR-20 zone districts. The applicant requests new signage for this temporary lot identifying it as the location for hospital parking. All 15 signs would be temporary post and panel with a painted finish on all sides including weather sealed edges secured to painted wood posts. The posts would be installed in the ground with concrete. Three types of temporary signage are proposed: an identification sign, directional and informational signs, and parking signs. The colors of the signs would be Dunn-Edwards "Before the Storm" Green and white reflective vinyl. No lighting is proposed. The project was filed by agent Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services Inc. on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 09-002-CUP, 08-218-LUP, 07-171-OA, 07-171-DP. (Continued from 3-10-09*, 2-10-09) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-10-09 Meeting:

1. The horizontal sign format (Sign Type C-02) is more appropriate for the corner of Hollister Avenue and Patterson Avenue than the vertical format (Sign Type C-01).

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 6 of 17

2. The height of the horizontal signs (Type C-02) should be lowered approximately 12 inches.
3. The "Exit to Patterson Ave." signs located at T02 and T03 do not seem necessary.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to continue Item H-4, No. 09-002-DRB, 334 South Patterson Avenue, to March 10, 2009, for Preliminary/Final review, with the following comments: 1) Change the format of Sign Type C-01, located at T06 (corner of Hollister Avenue and Patterson Avenue) to a horizontal format, to match Sign Type C-02 (located at T01 and T04); 2) Lower the height of the Type C-02 Signs approximately 12" to a height of 5'6", and adjust the relationship of the font size between the text "Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital" and "Parking" so the font size for "Parking" reduces in scale; 3) Omit the Sign Type C-03 located at T02 ("Exit to Patterson Ave."); and 4) Omit the Sign Type C-03 located at T03 ("Exit to Patterson Ave.").

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

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

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes two screened storage areas and nine buildings totaling 326,490 square feet on a 92.25-acre lot in the Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Building 2 and associated improvements, improvements for the entry and private internal drive, and street and frontage improvements to Hollister Avenue as part of the phased build out of the previously approved Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 2 would be a two-story, 40,000-square foot structure. Associated improvements for the building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, and parking. New materials consist of concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out, the Cabrillo Business Park would total 948,782 square feet, including 707,100 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. The project was filed by agent Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 08-107-DP AM, 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN. (Continued from 2-10-09*, 11-12-08*, 9-23-08*, 7-22-08, 6-10-08*, 4-22-08, 4-20-04, 3-16-04, 2-17-04*, 1-6-04, 12-2-03) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-22-08 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the current proposed location for the Goleta Water District backflow preventer is the preferred location, noting that the equipment would be pushed back as far from the curb as possible, and that the current location shown is in the realm of forty feet; b) the backflow preventer

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 7 of 17

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

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

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-016-DRB

75 Coromar Drive (APN 073-150-014)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The applicant proposes to install a soil and groundwater remediation system at the southeast corner of the property in the front yard setback. The equipment would be approximately 10 feet tall, with vent piping extending an additional 5 feet. The work area would be screened within an existing 6-foot wooden fence. No habitable floor area or other exterior changes to existing development are proposed. (Continued from 2-24-09) (Shine Ling)

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 8 of 17

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-24-09 Meeting:

1. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Cut sheets will need to be provided showing that the lighting will be directed downward and will be dark sky compliant.
2. Chair Wignot commented: a) Suggested that motion detectors be installed to reduce the lighting impact. b) The fence is not very attractive and is not similar to any other fence in the area; however, it would be acceptable since it is temporary.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) A deadline should be designated for the end of the remediation and removal of the fence. b) The recommended deadline should be three years, with the opportunity for two one-year extensions
4. Member Brown commented: a) There will need to be documentation with regard to future work that will be done to restore the landscaping. b) The applicant is requested to provide a proposed landscape plan.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 09-016-DRB, 75 Coromar Drive, with comments, to March 24, 2009, for Preliminary review.

K-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-023-DRB

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

This is a request for *Preliminary* review of Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital which proposes to improve its existing facilities to comply with State Senate Bill 1953. Existing development consists of a 93,090-square foot hospital. The applicant proposes to replace the hospital with an entirely new facility and demolish the old hospital building, resulting in a total of 152,925 square feet. Parking to serve the hospital will be redeveloped onsite and a temporary construction parking area is under construction across South Patterson Avenue in the northwestern portion of the parcel known as the "Hollipat" site. Phased construction is planned through 2011 in a manner that will continue to provide all existing medical services to the community. The hospital parcel has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Office & Institutional with a Hospital Overlay. The zoning for the hospital is Professional & Institutional (PI) and the southern portion of the hospital parcel has the Approach Zone Overlay. The project was filed by agent Suzanne Elledge on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 07-171-OA, 07-171-DP, 09-002-CUP. (Continued from 7-8-08, 6-24-08, 5-28-08, 5-13-08*, 2-12-08, 01-23-08, 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-08-08 Meeting (Partial):

Comments Regarding the Landscape Plan:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) the addition of the pedestrian path through the orchard and the addition of the center island in the entry driveway are appreciated; b) it appears that a sidewalk will be needed for pedestrians coming from the temporary parking lot across Patterson Avenue to walk to the front of the hospital without having to walk across the area for vehicles;

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 9 of 17

2. Member Messner commented: a) the *Canary Island Pine* species, which is a skyline tree, fits well at the proposed location but he has some concern that the species has a lot of droppings and pine cones, however, there will probably be full-time garden maintenance; b) the addition of the center divider at the entryway is appreciated; c) the placement of the palm trees in the entryway is appropriate and appreciated since the trees are old and have been on the property for a long period of time; d) the location of the center divider needs to be set back enough to provide room for traffic to make the turn to enter the driveway, and there needs to be consideration that vehicles may be moving fast if there is an emergency; e) the addition of the pedestrian pathway in the orchard area is appreciated; f) recommended a wishbone design for the pedestrian path which would provide more walkways, and the addition of benches, or other types of seating; and g) the landscape plans are done very well.
3. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with Member Messner's recommendation to add a wishbone design for the pathway through the orchard area; and b) suggested that adding benches for seating and a water fountain feature would make the orchard area more usable.
4. Member Brown commented: a) requested adding some openings in the curbs in the parking lots with regard to stormwater issues; b) requested coordination of lighting standard concepts if there will be trees in tree wells; c) the location and screening of the trash enclosure will need to be addressed in the future; and d) requested consideration of the concept of increasing permeability in the parking lots and any other appropriate areas, such as adjacent to grassy areas.
5. Chair Wignot commented that the plan to relocate the existing palm trees in front of the existing Medical Office Building is appreciated.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote that Conceptual review of Item M-3, No. 07-171-DRB, 351 S. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue, has been completed with comments, and the item will be taken off calendar to continue with further processing.

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

5484 Overpass Road (APN 071-220-033)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 5,780-square foot shop building, a 1,362-square foot office building, a 18,835-square feet of unenclosed materials storage (a portion of which – in the southwest corner of the property – is as-built), an as-built 640-square foot storage unit, and two unused fuel pumps and associated underground fuel tanks on a 84,070-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 2,961-square foot, two story office addition, and a new trash enclosure. This application also includes a proposal to permit the aforementioned as-built outdoor material storage area and storage unit, and to re-configure the site's parking areas. All materials used for this addition are to match the existing office building with the exception of the proposed lighting, which would be the Capri Mini by The Plaza Family. The project was filed by agent Joseph H. Moticha on behalf of Randy Douglas, Tierra Contracting, Inc., property owner. Related cases: 07-045-DP AM01, 07-045-LUP. (Continued from 1-13-09*, 11-12-08*, 10-14-08*, 9-23-08*, 9-09-08) (Laura Vlk)

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 10 of 17

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

9-09-08 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) suggested the applicant consider replacing, at some location on the site, the two avocado trees that will be removed.
2. Member Branch commented: a) the transition of the board and bat materials to a stucco façade at the corner of the building seems odd; b) the stucco appears as a wainscot; and c) as an example for consideration, on some buildings on other sites, stucco is used up to the floor height, with board and bat materials used above the stucco.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) the overall design of the building is good; b) there needs to be a better resolution of materials, for example, using a little more board and bat materials on the new addition (he noted that the existing building style seems to be board and bat); c) requested that the applicant document the existing trees located along the eastern property line; and d) requested the applicant consider the possibility of adding one or two trees that would help fill in the area along the eastern property line where the avocado trees will be removed, planting a tree species that grows upright such as the Sycamore species.
4. Member Messner commented: a) recommended that the tree species that would be added to the landscape plan should be evergreen rather than a Sycamore species which is deciduous for continual privacy.
5. Chair Wignot commented: a) the applicant's use of double pane windows and additional insulation along the eastern property line will be helpful to address the noise from the adjacent animal control use; and b) suggested that the applicant consider using solar panels for hot water and/or electricity, if feasible.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith) to continue Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, to September 23, 2008, with the following comments: a) the applicant is requested to restudy the resolution of materials on the building; b) the applicant is requested to provide a landscape plan showing all approved landscaping and what is being removed; and c) the applicant is requested to study the potential addition of a couple of trees along the eastern property line.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-017-DRB

286 Magnolia Avenue (APN 071-114-013)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,526-square foot self-serve car wash with related landscaping and a pole sign on a 7,200-square foot parcel in the C-3 zone district. The applicant proposes to remodel the façade of the existing car wash bays and to construct an 84-square foot addition to a storage room. All materials are proposed to match the existing structures. The project was filed by Dawn Sherry, architect, on behalf of John Price, property owner. Related cases: 09-017-LUP. (Shine Ling)

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-026-DRB

5940 Calle Real (APN 069-110-045)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 3,100-square foot commercial restaurant building on an approximately 22,000-

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 11 of 17

square foot parcel in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to use a 710-square foot outdoor area in front of the restaurant for dining and to construct a windscreen and firepit for the area. Materials for the windscreen would consist of glass and concrete painted off-white to match the restaurant building. Materials for the firepit would consist of CMU blocks with stone veneer and a metal fireplace screen. The project was filed by Dawn Sherry, architect, on behalf of Fresco North, tenant, and Bob Bartlett, property owner. Related cases: 09-026-LUP. (Shine Ling)

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

- NONE

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. APPROVED VS BUILT SLIDESHOW

O-2. ZONING ADMINISTRATOR/SIGNAGE PROGRAMS PROCESS PATH DISCUSSION

O-3. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-4. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 12 of 17

Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines

Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)

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

Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)

The Goleta City Council established the DRB and DRB Bylaws in March of 2002 (Ordinance No. 02-14 as amended by Ordinance No. 02-26). DRB Bylaws have subsequently been amended through Resolutions 02-69, 04-03, 05-27, 07-22 & 09-04. The DRB currently operates under Bylaws from Resolution 09-04

Design Review Board Procedures

Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 13 of 17

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

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

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

Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)

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

- 1) The development will be compatible with the neighborhood, and its size, bulk and scale will be appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.
- 2) Site layout, orientation, and location of structures, buildings, and signs are in an appropriate and well-designated relationship to one another, and to the environmental qualities, open spaces and topography of the property.
- 3) The project demonstrates a harmonious relationship with existing and proposed adjoining developments, avoiding excessive variety and monotonous repetition, but allowing similarity of style, if warranted.
- 4) There is harmony of material, color, and composition of all sides of a structure or buildings.
- 5) A limited number of materials will be on the exterior face of the building or structure.
- 6) There is consistency and unity of composition and treatment of exterior elevation.
- 7) Mechanical and electrical equipment is well integrated in the total design concept and screened from public view to the maximum extent practicable.
- 8) All visible onsite utility services are appropriate in size and location.
- 9) The grading will be appropriate to the site.
- 10) Adequate landscaping is provided in proportion to the project and the site with due regard to the preservation of specimen and landmark trees, and existing native vegetation.
- 11) The selection of plant materials is appropriate to the project and its environment, and adequate provision will be made for the long-term maintenance of such plant materials.
- 12) The project will preserve and protect, to the maximum extent practicable, any mature, specimen or skyline tree, or appropriately mitigate the loss.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 14 of 17

- 13) The development will not adversely affect significant public scenic views.
- 14) Signs, including their lighting, are well designed and are appropriate in size and location.
- 15) All exterior site, structure and building lighting is well-designed and appropriate in size and location.
- 16) The proposed development is consistent with any additional design standards as expressly adopted by the City Council.
- 17) The development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.
- 18) The public health, safety and welfare will be protected.
- 19) The project architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access.
- 20) The project will provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way.

Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

Conceptual Review

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

Information required for conceptual review includes:

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

Preliminary Review

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

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 15 of 17

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

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

- a. Complete site plan showing all existing structures, proposed improvements, proposed grading, including cut and fill calculations, lot coverage statistics (i.e., building, paving, usable open space and landscape areas), vicinity map, and topography.
- b. Floor plans and roof plans (1/8" scale minimum).
- c. All elevations (1/8" scale minimum) with heights, materials and colors specified.
- d. Preliminary landscape plan, when required, showing existing and proposed trees and shrubs, including any existing vegetation to be removed. This landscape plan shall also include all retaining and freestanding walls, fences, gates and gateposts and proposed paving and should specify proposed materials and colors of all these items.
- e. Site section for projects on slopes of 20 percent or greater, and when required by the DRB.

Final Review

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

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

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 16 of 17

Revised Final

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

Multiple Levels of Approval at a Single Meeting

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

Presentation of Projects (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.3)

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

Public Testimony (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.4)

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

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

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

Appeals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.8)

Sign Appeal Periods

The **Final** or **Revised Final** approval or **denial** of a sign project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person withstanding may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. An appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within the ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed or closed early (such as on Fridays which close at 1:00 p.m.), the appeal period is extended until 5:30 p.m. on the following

Design Review Board Agenda

March 24, 2009

Page 17 of 17

business day. Planning and Environmental Services will notify the DRB as to the scheduled date of the appeal hearing. The DRB will designate a member to attend an appeal hearing.

All Other Appeal Periods

The **Preliminary** or **Revised Final** approval or **denial** of a non-sign project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person withstanding may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. An appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within the ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed or closed early (such as on Fridays which close at 1:00 p.m.), the appeal period is extended until 5:30 p.m. on the following business day. Planning and Environmental Services will notify the DRB as to the scheduled date of the appeal hearing. The DRB will designate a member to attend an appeal hearing.