



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

### CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

### STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

### ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

### REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

#### Members:

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Scott Branch (Architect)

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

---

#### A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

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

Board Members absent: Carl Schneider.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

May 28, 2008

Page 2 of 19

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Natasha Heifetz Campbell, Contract Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

### B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

#### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for May 13, 2008.

**MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Abstain: Brown, Wignot; Absent: Schneider) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for May 13, 2008, as amended.**

#### B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the Subcommittee met today, approved the minutes, and continued the meeting to June 24, 2008, at 2:00 p.m. because staff was unable to attend the meeting. The items on the continued agenda are nursery standards and Items in the General Plan related to the urban forest.

#### B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported that there have not been any Planning Commission or City Council actions that impact the DRB since the last meeting.

#### B-4. PROJECT PREAMBLE DISCUSSION

Chair Wignot stated that he requested an agenda item to discuss the appropriateness of the preamble presented by the Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase prior to the review of DRB Permit No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road, on April 22, 2008. He disclosed that he subsequently had a telephone conversation with Steve Chase who provided him with a copy of the transcript of what was said.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase stated that it became clear in his phone conversation with Chair Wignot that the situation where he addressed the DRB with regard to the project could have been handled much better. He said that the preamble could have been presented after the item was introduced, from the staff's table on the dais, and after staff had been called upon by the Chair to make comments, which is the procedure that should be followed by staff in the future. He apologized if his actions left anyone upset or feeling that this was advocacy for the project, which was not his intent. He stated that the purpose of his comments was to inform the DRB, after reading the minutes from the previous review, that staff had been discussing with the applicant the direction for the project with regard to a certain density and site plan, which are within staff's realm and also within the DRB's purview. He clarified that matters of design are clearly within the purview of the DRB.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

May 28, 2008

Page 3 of 19

Chair Wignot stated that he was personally taken aback by the Director of Planning and Environmental Services presenting a preface for an item in the way that happened. He stated that there had been some questions raised during the previous review of the project and that the DRB members were hoping for some answers. Those answers were not provided. This, Chair Wignot felt, further accentuated the awkwardness of the Planning Director's preamble statement.

Member Brown expressed appreciation that Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase appeared today to try to clarify the situation. She stated that she does not believe it is appropriate for any planner or Planning Director to advocate for a project. She expressed concern that the preamble statement set the tone that she does not believe is acceptable or appropriate. She commented that the Director of Planning and Environmental Services should have contacted the DRB Chair if there was a concern regarding the comments in the minutes and that the situation could have been handled better at that level.

Member Branch expressed appreciation to Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase for appearing and providing clarification and stated that Chair Wignot and Member Brown explained his same concerns. Vice Chair Smith stated that he had the same concerns expressed by Chair Wignot and Member Brown.

### 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 no requests for continuance have been received.

### E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Member Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-1, No. 07-222-DRB; Item F-2, No. 07-230-DRB; and Item F-3, No. 08-076-DRB RV01.

### F. CONSENT CALENDAR

#### F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-222-DRB

1 South Los Carneros Road (APN 073-330-023)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 100,000-square foot commercial property on a 10.31-acre lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a wireless communications facility on the roof of the building. The facility would consist of two roof-top mounted antenna arrays and associated equipment located within the existing rooftop equipment screenwalls. Part of the screenwall would be replaced with RF-transparent fiberglass with a finish to match the existing screenwall. No changes to building height, floor area, elevations, or parking are proposed. The project was filed by Gordon Bell of Strategic Real Estate Services, Inc., agent, on behalf of I. V. Investments, property owner. Related cases: 07-222-LUP. (Last heard on 5-13-08) (Shine Ling)

**ACTION:** Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he and Assistant Planner Shine Ling reviewed today the final plans for Item F-1, No. 07-222-DRB, 1 South Los Carneros Road, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted.

**F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-230-DRB**

7154 Tuolumne Drive (APN 077-104-019)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 1,254-square foot residence with an attached 441-square foot 2-car garage on a 7,245-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 787-square feet in additions, consisting of a 664-square foot second-floor addition, and a 123-square foot interior stairwell leading up to the second-floor addition. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,482 square feet, consisting of a 2,041-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 441-square foot 2-car garage. This proposal is within the maximum floor area guidelines for this property, which is 2,241 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence; however the existing aluminum sliding windows will be replaced with vinyl. The project was filed by agent Fernando Vega on behalf of Maria Teresa and Jose Castillo, property owners. Related cases: 03-093-DRB, -LUP; 07-230-LUP. (Last heard on 5-13-08, 4-08-08, 2-26-08) (Brian Hiefield)

**ACTION:** Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he and Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reviewed today Item F-2, No. 07-230-DRB, 7154 Tuolumne Drive, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted with the condition that staff will provide him with the cut sheets for the exterior light fixtures for review. He stated that the applicant called out the colors to match existing and that an addition was made that roof colors shall match existing.

**F-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-076-DRB RV01**

Happy Harry's Produce Market; 7020 Calle Real (APN 077-155-036)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The approved project involved construction of a 2,984-square foot produce market with a 24.5 peak height, 10 standard and 1 ADA accessible parking spaces, access improvements, covered refuse/recycling enclosure, grading, removal of 1 arroyo willow and 1 coast live oak tree, and installation of an herb garden and associated landscaping on a 0.53 acre parcel in the CN zone district. Exterior building materials consist of the following; roof—Sherwood Forest color Certain Teed Grand Manor Shingles, walls—Hardi-Plank siding color California Beach, window trim—color Irish Moss, and aluminum windows—color white. The proposed project involves expanding the covered trash enclosure to accommodate both trash and recyclable dumpsters and relocating the enclosure to the NE corner of the property. The project application was filed by Hesh Ghorbanzadeh, agent, on behalf of Alireza Ebrahimi Khamseh and Mohammad Abbass Ali, property owners. Related cases: 46-SB-DRB & 46-SB-LUP (Alan Hanson)

**ACTION:** Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he and Senior Planner Alan Hanson reviewed the revised plans today for Item F-3,

**No. 08-076-DRB RV01, Happy Harry’s Produce Market, 7020 Calle Real; and that Revised Final Approval was granted as submitted.**

## **G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown reported that the Sign Calendar will be reviewed by the full Design Review Board.

## **H. SIGN CALENDAR**

### **H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-024-DRB**

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

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Hollister Business Park. The proposed OSP provides for two (2) different types of signs: wall signs and directional/informational signs. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 08-024-OSP; -CUP. (Last heard on 5-13-08, 4-08-08, 3-25-08, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Assistant Planner Shine Ling provided a copy of the Final proposed Overall Sign Plan for the Hollister Business Park, stating that the text includes the changes that were requested by the DRB at the previous review. Shine Ling stated that the Zoning Administrator approved the Overall Sign Plan after the DRB granted Preliminary Approval.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to grant Final Approval of Item 08-024-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, as submitted.**

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

5730 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-006)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property consists of a commercial property for multiple retail tenants on an approximately 8,500-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district (Retail Commercial). The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan for the building. The proposed Overall Sign Plan (OSP) provides for wall signs for individual tenants and for the shopping center. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by David Lemmons of Central Coast Signs, agent, on behalf of Jerry Anderson, property owner. Related cases: 08-028-OSP. (Last heard on 5-13-08, 4-22-08, 4-08-08\*, 3-25-08\*, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Assistant Planner Shine Ling provided a copy of the Final proposed LA PLACITA DE GOLETA Overall Sign Plan (OSP), stating that the text includes the changes that were requested by the DRB at the previous review. He stated that the Zoning

\* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

May 28, 2008

Page 6 of 19

Administrator approved the Overall Sign Plan after the DRB granted Preliminary Approval. Shine Ling said that after the review by the Zoning Administrator, staff made a change in the OSP that the maximum length of the anchor tenant sign shall be 12.5 feet for consistency with a previous recommendation by Sign Subcommittee Member Schneider that the maximum length of the sign be no more than 35 percent of the frontage (which was brought to staff's attention by the applicant). Shine Ling clarified that the signs in the OSP are the only signs allowed on the building and that one of the conditions of approval by the Zoning Administrator is that all unpermitted signs shall be removed before staff issues the Sign Permit.

Comments:

1. Concern was expressed that there are existing signs on the building that are not in conformance with the Overall Sign Plan that should be removed before the Sign Permit is issued.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to grant Final Approval of Item 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, with the following conditions: 1) the maximum length of the anchor tenant sign shall be no more than 35 percent of the frontage which is calculated to be 12.5 feet; and 2) a condition shall be added that is similar to the condition of approval by the Zoning Administrator that all existing signs shall be removed that are not in compliance with the Overall Sign Plan prior to issuance of the Sign Permit.**

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- SEE ITEM F-1

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

RECESS HELD FROM 3:45 P.M. TO 3:53 P.M.

### L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

#### L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-095-DRB

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an existing approximately 36-square foot balcony, an existing approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, and a 390-square foot 2-car carport on a 6,300-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to permit a 120-square foot garden shed, 76-square foot fire

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

May 28, 2008

Page 7 of 19

pit and 50-square foot Jacuzzi, to construct a 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis, and to expand the approximately 36-square foot balcony to an approximately 108-square foot balcony that would be partially supported by the existing carport. Access from the proposed second-story balcony extension to the top of the carport is not proposed. The resulting 2-story structure would be a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an approximately 108-square foot balcony, an approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, a 390-square foot 2-car carport, a 120-square foot garden shed, a 76-square foot fire pit, a 50-square foot Jacuzzi, and 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis. This existing permitted structure is above the recommended maximum allowable floor area for this property, which is 1,984 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage; however, as the proposed project consists of non-habitable structures, the situation will not be exacerbated. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Victor Alvarez on behalf of Juan & Lola Zaragoza, property owners. Related cases: 05-095-LUP. (Continued from 04-08-08\*, 2-26-08, 2-12-08\*, 1-23-08\*, 1-08-08, 10-16-07\*, 09-05-07\*, 08-21-07, 12-18-05\*) (Scott Kolwitz)

The plans were presented by Juan Zaragoza, property owner. He stated that the following changes were made in response to the previous DRB comments: a) the columns are now square rather than round to conform with the neighborhood; b) the drawings show the existing conditions and proposed plans; c) the front elevation is consistent with the side elevations; and d) the blue color on the existing carport will be changed to white so the trim colors will match. Juan Zaragoza also said that the project architect advised that in response to a DRB suggestion to consider matching the pitch of the carport with the house's roof pitch, a higher pitch for the carport would draw more attention to the carport. Juan Zaragoza stated that he would agree to a condition that would restrict access and use of the carport roof unless for temporary repair and maintenance, and that would prohibit storage.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz distributed an e-mail received from Julie Dyer, dated May 28, 2008, with regard to existing conditions on the site, expressing concern that the issues regarding the rear of the property be addressed. Scott Kolwitz stated that these issues are related to code enforcement and that the e-mail will be forwarded to City staff for review with regard to compliance. He clarified that items in the rear yard, which are permitted and unpermitted, will be addressed during the land use permit process.

Speakers:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, stated that the documentation provided by the applicant throughout the process has been confusing and very difficult to use for review purposes. He suggested that the drawings should be cleaned up before the project is approved. He also expressed concern that he does not believe the neighborhood would benefit from the expansion of the front balcony to a 108-square foot deck connected to another flat surface on the top of the carport.

\* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Smith and Member Herrera both stated that the applicant has addressed and responded to the DRB's comments.
2. Member Branch commented: a) the barbeque design is acceptable; b) the size of the deck in the front elevation will be somewhat deeper but it is not a significant change from the existing balcony to be of concern; c) the removal of the blue color is an improvement; d) the driveway paving materials should be consistent; and e) commented that it would behoove the applicant to keep up with the painting of the railing to prevent deterioration.
3. Chair Wignot commented: a) the initial project has been scaled back; b) essentially the front elevation will remain the same although the balcony will be slightly deeper and tie in to the carport; c) the loss of the blue color will be of benefit to the overall project; d) the plans should note that the proposed white color is the same as the existing fascia boards; and d) the driveway paving materials should be consistent with the existing paving.
4. Member Brown requested that staff research and report back regarding the preparation of a notice to property owner which would restrict access and use of the carport roof unless for temporary repair and maintenance. She commented that from the time of her initial review of the project, she has had some concerns that the project does not improve the streetscape.

**MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, as submitted with the following conditions: 1) the colors shall be called out on the plans; 2) the driveway paving materials shall be consistent; 3) staff shall research and report back regarding the preparation of a notice to property owner, that would be binding for future property owners, which would restrict access and use of the carport roof unless for temporary repair and maintenance and not allow the carport to be used as habitable area or for storage; and continue to June 10, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

## **M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR**

### **M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 03-051-DRB**

Northeast Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real (APN 077-160-035)

This is a request for further *Conceptual* review. The project site is undeveloped. The applicant proposes a new 8,184-square foot, three-story Islamic Center. The proposed center would include a 3,468-square foot first floor, 3,792-square foot second floor, and 468-square foot third floor, and a 456-square foot mechanical dome. The first floor would include a 635-square foot prayer area, 646-square foot meeting room, 574-square foot restrooms, 433-square foot entry/foyer/vestibule, 192 square feet kitchen and 988-square foot of additional storage and circulation areas. Additionally, a 1,046-square foot entry court, 414 square foot loggia and 1,107 square foot play area would be available for non-habitable exterior use. The second floor would include a 1,431-square foot dining room, 537-square foot lecture room, 303-square foot office, 270-square foot storage area, 393-square foot of circulation, and



## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

May 28, 2008

Page 9 of 19

an 858-square foot residence. The third floor would include the final 468-square foot residence with 456-square foot of additional mechanical areas above.

A total of 42 parking spaces are proposed, although a parking modification to reduce this number to 38 may be required to extend the length of the site's driveway throats.

Frontage improvements, including sidewalk, curb, and gutter would be provided along Calle Real. In addition, two new street lights are proposed: one near the northwest corner of the site and one near the southwest corner of the site.

The parking area and project site would be landscaped, although landscape plans have not yet been submitted. A 6-foot tall plaster wall is proposed along the perimeter of the property, and an 8-foot tall plaster wall is proposed around the entry court and play area. Other minor structures include a mailbox at the Los Carneros Road driveway, bicycle racks, and a trash and recycling enclosure in the parking lot.

The property is zoned C-H (Highway Commercial), and the land use designation in the City's General Plan is Office & Institutional. The project was filed by the Islamic Society of Santa Barbara as the applicant and property owner with Md Wahiduzzaman, Mukhtar Khan and Ken Mineau as owner representatives. Related cases: 03-051-CUP, 03-051-DP. (Last heard on 4-8-08\*, 2-12-08\*, 01-23-08\*, 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

The plans were presented by Ken Mineau and Md Wahiduzzaman, as owner representatives. Ken Mineau provided an update on the status of the project and the plans. He stated that the biologist's report was completed this morning and is currently being reviewed by the project's team. He said that the biology report suggested moving the building further to the south, which was originally proposed, to address the flight path of birds in the area. He stated that the applicant plans to consider other alternative locations on the site, for example the southeast corner or in the center of the site along the southern border. Ken Mineau said that the project team members met with the Goleta Valley Historical Society to discuss their mutual ideas and agreed that the site constraints need to be defined before addressing the details with regard to the building and the tower element.

Documents: 1) e-mail from Craig Geyer, dated May 27, 2008, RE: Islamic project; 2) e-mail from Treva Yang, dated April 7, 2008, with regard to steel tree wells; and 3) e-mail from Craig Geyer, dated January 8, 2008, transmitting an article from the *Santa Barbara Newsroom* entitled "Plans Close for Santa Barbara's First Islamic Mosque".

Speakers:

Craig Geyer, neighbor, stated that his two major concerns are parking and that the size of the proposed building is too large for the lot size. He believes that the project does not meet parking requirements and that the requirements need to be established per Section 35-257 based on the auditorium space. He requested that the correct designated parking requirements be applied to the project, the building size be reduced to the appropriate size for the required parking and that a revised project be

\* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

presented that is compatible with the surrounding area with regard to design and size that provides required parking. He also commented: a) the traffic study of December 2006, needs to be updated; b) ESHA studies are needed; c) if the building is moved story poles need to be installed and should show the height of the dome; and d) there is currently no reciprocal parking agreement.

**(Ronald Nye, architectural historian, and member of the Board of Directors of the Goleta Valley Historical Society, stated that he and historian Fermina Murray attended a meeting a few weeks ago with Ken Mineau and Mukhtar Khan. Mr. Nye stated that the meeting was useful and he expressed appreciation with regard to the applicants' attitude and willingness to listen. He expressed their main concerns, which remain substantially the same, as follows: a) the size of the building seems out of scale with the property; b) there is visibility of the project from the Lake Los Carneros Natural Preserve; c) there are concerns regarding the sheer bulk of the project, particularly if it is placed at the corner; d) the project interferes with what is considered a scenic corridor when exiting the freeway and looking north on Los Carneros Road; and e) expressed the preference for a project that is a little more compatible with the traditional Goleta ranch or farm style, stating that he is pleased to hear that the applicants are willing to move in that direction.) not included in approved set.**

Charles Hornick, neighbor, stated that he is interested in hearing the results of a report that has been discussed which he believes would include an in-depth study of the water concerns in the area. Mr. Harnick commented that from his experience over the past thirty years, he was unable to ride his bike up Los Carneros Road due to flooding in the street and area, and stated that he believes this kind of information should be included in the water study. He clarified that his concerns with regard to water issues include flooding, stormwater management and potable water.

Norma Geyer, neighbor, expressed her concern regarding parking, stating that it was her understanding that 42 parking spaces were only required because the project had a reciprocal agreement with the Christ Lutheran Church, and that she believes from attending a meeting at the church that the church has a concern with regard to the reciprocal agreement. She also expressed concern that moving the building forward would make it difficult for drivers to see around the corner and that the project may need a traffic light. Norma Geyer stated that the vacant lot behind the church is not zoned for parking; however construction workers are parking there, which is an enforcement issues for the City to address.

Jeff Hanson, stated that he provided the data for the biological study regarding the kite flight path and that he believes the building should be placed as far away from the north end of the parcel as possible. He also said that he does not recommend installing the proposed street lights, particularly the one on the northwest corner, because birds fly through the site at night. He stated that he is an avid user of the Lake Los Carneros Preserve and addressed the impacts of the project on the natural area. He expressed concern that the proposed fence would look like a fortress and would limit visibility for motorists. He suggested using a chain link fence material with plantings, possibly trumpet vines, for screening. He presented the following

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

May 28, 2008

Page 11 of 19

questions: a) whether the public access to the trail into the Lake Los Carneros Preserve will be eliminated with the addition of the proposed building and wall; b) whether there will be a gate across the driveway with regard to the perimeter wall; and c) whether the height of the building and dome will need to be addressed if there is a need to build the ground up two or three feet with regard to possible floodplain issues.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz made the following clarifications: a) the biological study has not yet been submitted to the City; and b) any reciprocal agreement for parking would be supplemental to the 42 parking spaces that are required.

### General Comments:

1. The applicant's flexibility is appreciated. The site constraints have been changing which is challenging for site planning and prolongs the review process.
2. Member Brown commented: a) expressed concern that over half of the site will be used for parking; b) the use of permeable materials to help soften the proposed hardscape is appreciated; c) she hopes that the reciprocal parking arrangements will work out; d) more information with regard to the buffer setbacks will be useful; e) expressed concern that the perimeter fence will extend the built environment around the building when it is moved towards Calle Real; f) the fence materials should be more permeable so there is not a visual barrier as the building is viewed from Calle Real and Los Carneros; g) requested some reduction in the square footage of the building since it will be moved closer to Calle Real and the square footage has increased; h) stormwater and flooding information are land use issues but it would be helpful to have some information available for site planning; i) if street lights are required, suggest lighting that incorporates dark sky standards; and j) recommended no lights on the northern part of the building.
3. Member Branch commented: a) the use of permeable paving materials is appreciated from a runoff standpoint especially along the back against the preserve; b) the bulk and scale of the building feels large as it is moved up to the corner; c) the massing of the building in itself has some nice proportions and nice elements but would probably fit better if it were reduced to about eighty-five percent of the size; d) expressed concern regarding the eight-foot wall which seems out of scale with regard to how the project integrates with the neighborhood; e) it would be better not to have exterior lighting unless required; and f) suggested that perhaps bollards at the driveway entry would have less impact in the area as a whole than street lights.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) suggested that shifting the building more to the east as far as possible from the standpoint of visibility for traffic; b) moving the building to the center would be awkward with parking on both sides; c) the building would fit with existing buildings on either side of Calle Real by being pulled back farther; d) permeable pavement materials are appreciated; e) he would prefer not having street lights; and f) story poles and more project details are needed .
5. Member Messner commented: a) he is still concerned regarding parking and would like information regarding flood zones; b) larger trees are needed in front, not palm trees, but substantial size trees; c) larger trees in larger boxes are available which can be inspected to make sure the trees are not root-bound; d) the

- trees planted in right-of-ways will need to conform to the City's Recommended Street Tree List and planting guidelines; e) permeable paving is good; f) suggested steel grate tree wells in the parking lot; g) he is not in favor of the perimeter wall; and h) expressed reservations regarding the height of the project.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) although there are permeable pavers, a bioswale would be beneficial to filter and retain water before it drains into the wetlands towards the east; and b) suggested reducing the height of the project if the size is reduced with consideration for the wildlife flight path.
  7. Chair Wlgnot commented: a) he agreed with the above DRB comments; b) expressed concern that moving the building to the southwest corner brings up the issue of size, bulk and scale because there will be too much mass at the corner; c) the adjacent properties are located back from Calle Real with parking in front of the buildings; spaces in pulled there should be consideration regarding whether traffic mitigation would be required with to what is happening in the area; d) he believes there will be a need for a traffic signal; e) expressed concern that it would be difficult to exit and turn left on Calle Real; and f) the project would benefit by the willingness of the applicant to plant trees on the northern and eastern property line so over time the trees will mature and screen the building from people walking along the public preserve and Lake Los Carneros.

**MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to continue Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, with comments, to June 24, 2008.**

**RECESS HELD FROM 5:40 P.M. TO 5:45 P.M.**

**M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-171-DRB**

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

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

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

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

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

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

May 28, 2008

Page 13 of 19

The hospital, MOB, and a portion of the Hollipat parcels have a General Plan Land Use Designation of Office & Institutional. The hospital parcel has a Hospital Overlay. The remaining portion of the Hollipat parcel has split land use designations of medium and high density residential. The zoning for the hospital, MOB, and a portion of the Hollipat parcel is Professional & Institutional (PI). The remaining portion of the Hollipat parcel has split zoning of Design Residential, 20 and 25 units per acre. The MOB parcel and a portion of the Hollipat parcel have a Design Control Overlay and the southern portion of the hospital parcel has the Approach Zone Overlay. The project was filed by agent Suzanne Elledge on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 07-171-OA, 07-171-DP. (Continued from 5-13-08\*, 2-12-08, 01-23-08, 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by agent Suzanne Elledge, and members of the project team including Bruce Bartlett, DesignARC, project architect; Stephen Wen, SWA Architects, project architect; and Martha Degasis, Arcadia Studio, project landscape architect; on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Suzanne Elledge provided an overview of the review process to date. She discussed a schedule and timelines that need to be considered with regard to moving the project forward. Bruce Bartlett presented the changes that were made in response to comments at the previous hearing in on February 12, 2008. He stated that the goal was to simplify the design to be more harmonious with the architecture of the hospital and to minimize the visual height of the building. Stephen Wen, MOB project architect, explained the architectural details of the design of the building. He stated that the entrances were better identified on the southwest and northeast corners.

### Comments:

#### General Summary of the DRB Comments:

1. There is a consensus of the DRB that the current proposed architecture design of the MOB needs to have some of the playful articulation that was the result of the last ad hoc subcommittee meeting, which seems to be missing in the current plans. Some kind of round, curved, element at the corner of Hollister/Patterson is preferred. The south elevation, and the portion of the east elevation wrapping around to the south elevation, both appear too linear and institutional.
2. The plans for the MOB and the hospital should be shown together in order to facilitate the next review of the project. The previous DRB comments show that the hospital design is appreciated for the most part.
3. An ad-hoc subcommittee meeting shall be held, to include Member Schneider who is absent from today's meeting, prior to the next DRB review on June 24, 2008.
4. A placeholder will be held for the DRB meeting on July 8, 2008, to review together the landscaping, the temporary parking lot and preliminary signage.
5. The willingness of the applicant to work with the DRB is appreciated. This is an important building and the visual qualities of the corner of the building at the Hollister/Patterson intersection are important.

#### Additional Individual DRB Comments:

\* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

May 28, 2008

Page 14 of 19

1. Member Branch commented: a) overall, there are many elements of the new design that are appreciated; b) the forms are starting to come together fairly well and it is appreciated that progress has been made; c) the inset courtyard is appreciated; and d) the corner of the building at the Hollister/Patterson intersection still needs some attention to design, noting that there was a softness with the original round element that played off the chapel in the hospital, although the large original round design is not recommended.
2. Member Brown commented: a) expressed concern that the linear design of the building is plain and needs to be more interesting; b) the architecture at the corner of Hollister/Patterson needs to have more interest and a round element will be helpful; and c) the elevations with more 'playfulness' may be due to the use of color.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) expressed concern that the new design is more toned down and appears very linear, and not like a place of healing, on the west and east elevations and particularly on the south elevation; and b) he really appreciates the hospital's architecture and would prefer that the building speaks closer to the hospital's design.
4. Member Messner commented: a) he believes it would be good for the design of the MOB to render some closeness to the hospital but would prefer it be kept separate and apart; b) recommended that stone work be added on the north elevation which would blend with the landscape and also draw attention to the entrance, as well as blend with the hospital without seeming connected like the drawing above; c) the stone work on the south elevation is appreciated, and suggested rotating the columns half a turn diamond shaped; and d) there needs to be adequate signage with directions to facilitate navigation throughout the site.
5. Member Herrera commented that he appreciated the original design with the glass in the corner and suggested that a similar design would be attractive.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) expressed appreciation that the building was reduced from three stories to two stories; b) the new design appears more institutional in the sense of being bland, in particular the south elevation and the east elevation as it wraps into the south elevation; c) the previous design had more character and interest; and d) the north elevation along Hollister Avenue with the inset courtyard is interesting.

**MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to continue Item M-2, No. 07-171-DRB, 351 So. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue, with comments, to June 24, 2008.**

**RECESS HELD FROM 6:45 P.M. TO 6:50 P.M.**

### **M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-208-DRB**

401 Storke Road (APN 073-440-019)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is a vacant 3.02 acres (131,551 square feet) commercial property in the Retail Commercial (C-2) zone district with an Airport Approach Zone F(APR) overlay. The applicant proposes to construct a 73,828-square foot two-story 99-room service hotel. The hotel is proposed to have a Spanish architectural design to compliment the Camino Real Marketplace.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

May 28, 2008

Page 15 of 19

The first-floor is proposed as 42,480 habitable square feet with 7,043 square feet of decks, and the second-floor is proposed as 31,348 habitable square feet with 2,705 square feet of balconies. The proposed building coverage is 32.3%, and the proposed Floor-Area-Ratio is 56.1%. The proposed mean height of the structure is 32 feet, proposed second-story peak roof heights range from 25 to 35 feet, and proposed tower peaks are 38 and 48 feet.

A total of 99 rooms would be constructed, of which 47 rooms would be located on the first-floor and 52 rooms would be located on the second-floor. The majority of rooms would be 464 square feet in size with some larger rooms of 639 square feet, and a large 1,445-square foot two-bedroom suite would be provided. A porte cochere is proposed at the front lobby. No restaurant is proposed within the service hotel, but a service area to prepare continental breakfasts and afternoon snacks would be available for guests. Additionally, a meeting room, small board room, fitness room, business center, lounge, pool, spa, fire pits, fountains and patios are proposed as guest amenities. Noise attenuation measures, which include insulation in the exterior walls and roof and insulated glass, are proposed. The applicant anticipates the hotel to be LEED certified. New materials consist of the following:

A plaster (smooth trowel) finish with the following colors: Wall: White (Frazee #001), Trim, Surround & Cornice: Staghorn (Frazee #8731W), Wainscot: Walnut Wash (Frazee #8733M), Windows, Doors & Railing: Peppercorn (Frazee #8615D); Roof Tile: Clay Mission Tiles (Two-piece blended clay barrel tiles); Wood Trellis: Taupe – Olympic Stain; Stone: Cantera Stone.

Vehicular ingress and egress is proposed from Storke Road and Phelps Road. A 40-foot wide driveway apron would front on Storke Road, and a 30-foot wide driveway apron would front on Phelps Road. A landscaped buffer along Storke Road and Phelps Road would be expanded and replace landscaping currently installed. A bus stop would be improved as required by MTD. No additional frontage improvements are proposed to Storke Road or Phelps Road as frontage improvements, which included street lights, utilities, and meandering sidewalks, were installed during construction of the Camino Real Project in the late 1990s.

Onsite vehicular circulation would be provided by a 24-foot wide drive aisle with a minimum of a 14-foot height clearance. A total of 112 parking spaces, of which 5 parking spaces would be ADA compliant, are proposed. An additional storage area has been proposed for a total of 14 bicycles. Pedestrian circulation would be provided through 4-foot wide sidewalk segments, and would connect the hotel entrances and exits to Storke Road, Phelps Road, and the adjacent park.

An architecturally screened trash/recycling and an electrical transformer area is proposed near the northwest corner of the parcel.

Additional proposed grading would consist of 2,500-cubic yards of cut and 2,500-cubic yards of fill. The applicant proposes stormwater catch basins/drains and pollution prevention interceptors onsite and bioswales both onsite and within the right-of-way to avoid cross lot drainage.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

May 28, 2008

Page 16 of 19

A Mediterranean landscape palette is proposed and was in part designed to compliment landscaping at the Camino Real Marketplace. The proposed landscape coverage is 24.5%, which is not inclusive of the 16,000 square feet of landscaping located within the right-of-way.

The applicant is requesting a modification under Article III, Section 35-317.8.1 to allow 28 parking spaces to encroach into the southern front yard setback and to allow 30 parking spaces to encroach into the rear yard setback.

The project was filed by Kimberly A. Schizas on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 95-SP-001, 96-EIR-3, 07-208-GP, 07-208-SP, 07-208-DP, 07-208-LUP. (Last heard on 4-8-08) (Scott Kolwitz)

The plans were presented by Mark Linehan and the project team including Kim Schizas; Mark Engels; Ron Sakahara, project architect; and Jay Crawford, from project landscape architect Sydney Baumgartner's office; on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. Mark Linehan discussed the following changes that have been incorporated into the project site plan since the last DRB review which include: a) a solid six-foot wall along the north elevation that will separate the fire station from the project property; b) a three-foot wall with a three-foot wrought iron fence along the west elevation that will provide a view corridor into the park; c) the addition of landscape fingers and diamonds to increase landscaping in the parking lot; d) approximately three or four parking spaces have been lost; e) bicycle parking has been increased; and f) the fountain in the front corner has been eliminated. He pointed out the architectural changes that included: a) the tower has been eliminated; b) the color palette has been changed from white to a palette similar to the Camino Real Marketplace colors; c) some rock materials have been added; d) a square element has been changed to more of an arch; e) some windows have been added; f) wooden headers have been added to each side of the entrance; g) the inside of the porte-cochere will be made of wood; and h) a skylight has been added to the porte-cochere to provide for natural light. Ron Sakahara, project architect, stated that the architectural style now has a Tuscan-Mediterranean theme with earth tones that more reflects the Camino Real Marketplace. He stated that the lighting fixtures would closely match the style that is used in the Marketplace which shines downward, along with matching bollards along the walkways. He said that the applicant's objective is to meet the minimum LEEDS standards which would include addressing energy efficiency and recycling materials.

Speaker:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, stated that this is a great project and that should be the model for Goleta. He appreciates the attention to detail, the moving of the transformers and the addition of the bike racks. He commented that the previous design looked too busy.

Comments:



## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

May 28, 2008

Page 17 of 19

1. Member Brown commented: a) the elimination of the fountain is appreciated; b) the building design has a nice, warm ambience; c) suggested that skylights be incorporated into other public areas as well as the porte-cochere, which are a good addition for bringing daylight into the building; and d) the applicant is requested to provide a detailed lighting plan incorporating dark sky standards that includes cut sheets and the placement of the lighting fixtures and bollards.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented that he likes the plans with the changes.
3. Member Messner commented: a) the plans are fine; b) the rock and sandstone detail is appreciated; c) some copper detail is suggested; d) consider using metal balcony rails that have a curved line, rather than a 90-degree angle, which has a soothing effect; and e) the placement of mechanical equipment and valves need to be included on the landscape plans; e) the only objection he has to the proposed planting list is to recommend replacement of the Queen Palm species with the King Palm which has a more majestic appearance; and f) the City's current Recommended Street Tree list should be reviewed with regard to planting trees in the right-of-ways.
4. Member Branch commented: a) the project looks great; b) with regard to the asymmetrical form on the south elevation, his opinion is that the windows should be studied; c) expressed concern that the three-radius arch seems out of place because it is the only one on the elevation; d) the colors and materials are excellent other than one concern that the color of the wood windows should be slightly darker; e) on the north elevation, the springpoint of the arches seems a little low; and f) the stone materials should come all the way down instead of to a painted base.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) the new design is appreciated; b) recommended using as much permeable materials as possible; and c) expressed concern that from his experience, flooding occurs downstream from the property.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) the applicant has addressed his major comments from the previous meeting; b) the color palette with the earth tones, and the Tuscan Mediterranean style rather than Spanish style is appreciated; c) consider reducing the number of palm trees and choosing other species, possible similar to species in the Marketplace; d) the applicant is requested to advise where a similar lighting fixture with cut-off lighting is located that can be viewed at night; e) suggested that hedges or plantings may be appropriate for screening around backflow preventers; and f) the applicant should meet the Water District's requirements with regard to screening equipment.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) that Conceptual review has been conducted with comments; that Item M-3, No. 07-208-DRB, 401 Storke Road, shall be taken off calendar for processing and then return to the DRB for Preliminary and Final review; and that the applicant shall provide at Preliminary review the lighting plan with cut sheets for lighting fixtures and bollards.**

## N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

## **O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **O-1. SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSION & APPOINTMENTS**

Chair Wignot spoke in support of designating Member Branch, who is an architect, to serve on the Consent Calendar Subcommittee with either Member Smith or Member Schneider, who are both architects, as substitutes in Member Branch's absence. Chair Wignot stated that he will attend the Consent Calendar reviews for his edification. Member Branch volunteered to stay on the Consent Calendar Subcommittee.

Member Brown stated that she believes the DRB members should be able to participate on different subcommittees to provide design-related ideas; however because of the way it the subcommittees are structured, the members seem to be locked into specific subcommittees with regard to their skills. She stated that a larger issue may be that there are not enough members on the DRB to allow for flexibility and rotation.

Chair Wignot stated that he believes it is of benefit to have the DRB members with the landscape professional positions serve on the Street Tree Subcommittee. He noted that he would prefer to continue participating on the Street Tree Subcommittee; however he would volunteer to replace Member Brown on the Sign Subcommittee if she would like someone to take her place.

Member Brown suggested that the broader issue may need to be considered regarding whether the size of the DRB is sufficient.

Member Branch stated that the DRB functions well with seven members. Chair Wignot commented that it seems that other architectural review boards have five or seven members. Vice Chair Smith agreed with Member Branch that seven members are appropriate, stating that he is fairly new on the DRB and has been serving on the Sign Subcommittee. Member Herrera agreed that seven members are sufficient.

Member Brown commented that she believes that the Sign Committee should be separate from the Design Review Board. Member Branch agreed that there should be a separate board that reviews signs. After discussion, Member Brown suggested that this item be continued in order to gather additional information regarding whether a separate sign review board would be appropriate and what process would be needed if there was a consensus by the DRB to move forward with a recommendation to the City Council. She stated that it would be useful for staff to provide the number of individual sign permits and overall sign plans that have been reviewed by the DRB as well as some technical information with regard to procedures. She commented that it would seem that a separate sign review committee could focus on overall sign issues, stating that other jurisdictions, including the City of Santa Barbara, have a separate sign review board.

## **Design Review Board Minutes – Approved**

May 28, 2008

Page 19 of 19

There being no objections, Chair Wignot stated that the current subcommittee members would remain in their positions at this time and that this item would be continued to allow time for members and staff to research and report back. .

### **O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

No requests.

### **O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

Vice Chair Smith announced that he will be absent from the DRB meeting on July 8, 2008.

### **P. ADJOURNMENT: 8:00 P.M.**