

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, June 10, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

Members:

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

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

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

Board Members absent: Simon Herrera.



June 10, 2008 Page 2 of 13

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

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for May 28, 2008

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

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

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

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

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

C. PUBLIC COMMENT

No speakers.

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

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

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

June 10, 2008 Page 3 of 13

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

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

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

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

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an existing approximately 36-square foot balcony, an existing approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, and a 390square foot 2-car carport on a 6,300-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to permit a 120-square foot garden shed, 76-square foot fire pit and 50-square foot Jacuzzi, to construct a 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis, and to expand the approximately 36-square foot balcony to an approximately 108-square foot balcony that would be partially supported by the existing carport. Access from the proposed second-story balcony extension to the top of the carport is not proposed. The resulting 2-story structure would be a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an approximately 108-square foot balcony, an approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, a 390-square foot 2-car carport, a 120-square foot garden shed, a 76square foot fire pit, a 50-square foot Jacuzzi, and 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis. This existing permitted structure is above the recommended maximum allowable floor area for this property, which is 1,984 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage; however, as the proposed project consists of non-habitable structures, the situation will not be exacerbated. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Victor Alvarez on behalf of Juan & Lola Zaragoza, property owners. Related cases: 05-095-LUP. (Continued from 5-28-08, 4-08-08*, 2-26-08, 2-12-08*, 1-23-08*, 1-08-08, 10-16-07*, 9-05-07*, 8-21-07, 12-18-05*) (Scott Kolwitz)

Consent Calendar Review Speaker:

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

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

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

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

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

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

- H. SIGN CALENDAR
 - NONE
- I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR
 - NONE
- J. FINAL CALENDAR
 - NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

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

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

June 10, 2008 Page 5 of 13

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

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

• NONE

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

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

6300 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-050-020)

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

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

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

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

The project was filed by agent Kenneth Marshall of Dudek & Associates on behalf of 6300 Hollister Associates, property owners and RD Olson. Related cases: 07-007-

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

June 10, 2008 Page 6 of 13

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

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

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

SPEAKER:

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

Comments:

 Member Schneider commented: a) the removal of the southeast portion of the building is a good change and it addressed some concerns at the previous review;
b) the overall mass, bulk and scale is fine, noting that when he visited the story poles today he observed that the three-story portions are set quite a ways back June 10, 2008 Page 7 of 13

from Hollister Avenue; c) expressed concern that there are some landscaping restrictions at the southeast corner, suggesting consideration of the use of vines, and also the possibility of planting bigger entry trees near Hollister Avenue, to help soften the southeast corner; d) suggested consideration of adding some type of Chumash cultural and/or educational element, noting that the lobby area may open up to the open space area; e) for an example of a cultural element, there is a strip along a building at UCSB that he recently viewed while riding his bike; f) screening plans for the dumpster will need to be provided at some point; g) suggested consideration of the use of some enhanced materials for the sidewalks; and h) overall, the project is fine.

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

June 10, 2008 Page 8 of 13

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

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

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

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

Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road (APN 079-210-049) This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is a vacant 14.46-acre property in the DR-8 zone district, located in western Goleta on a parcel extending west of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection.

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

Common open space would total approximately 302,282 square feet (48%) exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated to the City of Goleta, and includes a children's play area and trail, with benches throughout the proposed Devereux Creek restoration

June 10, 2008 Page 9 of 13

area. A conceptual landscape plan includes restoration of the Devereux Creek corridor. The 87 eucalyptus and 8 cypress trees to be removed would be replaced with a total of 282 drought tolerant Mediterranean and native tree species, both ornamental (e.g., Melaluca, London Plane Tree, etc.) and indigenous to the area (e.g., coast live oak and sycamore).

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

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

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

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

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

SPEAKER:

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

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

June 10, 2008 Page 10 of 13

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

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

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

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

Overall General Comments of Majority of DRB Members:

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

Comments of Individual DRB Members:

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

June 10, 2008 Page 11 of 13

f) pulling back the plans will read well from Hollister Avenue and provide space between the units which will allow for the change of architectural styles.

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

June 10, 2008 Page 12 of 13

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

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

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

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

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

Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange

This is a request for further *Advisory* review. The proposed project includes the removal of the existing Cathedral Oaks Road/Hollister Avenue/US Highway 101 bridge over U.S. Highway 101 and bridge over Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and the construction of new bridges to align with the existing terminus of Cathedral Oaks Road. The proposed overcrossing (US Highway 101) and overhead (UPRR) bridges would accommodate a 12-foot vehicle lane in each direction, one 12-foot center left turn pocket lane/median, 5-foot shoulders/bike lanes in each direction, and a 6-foot sidewalk located on the west side. The project was filed by Caltrans, in association with the City of Goleta. (Last heard on 5-13-08, 4-08-08*, 1-23-08*, 11-06-07*, 10-16-07*, 8-21-07, 7-17-07; 5-02-06) Related case: 05-037-DP. (Rosemarie Gaglione; Laura Bridley)

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

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

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

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

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

P. ADJOURNMENT: 5:31 P.M.

Minutes approved on July 8, 2008.