



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, April 22, 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:

Scott Branch (Architect), Chair

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member)

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 Branch at 3:05 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

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

Board Members absent: None.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner, Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician, Dave Stone, Contract Planner;

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 2 of 18

*Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase (*for Item M-1 only), and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk, .

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for April 8, 2008

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Abstain: Messner) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for April 8, 2008, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Member Wignot reported that the Street Tree Subcommittee met today and discussed items in the General Plan related to the urban forest. He said that the subcommittee will discuss ordinance standards that would be required for attaining Street Tree USA status for subsequent years. Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner stated that the next Street Tree Subcommittee meeting will be on Wednesday, May 28, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) Congratulated Member Schneider and Member Messner on their reappointment to the DRB by the City Council, both for three-year terms. 2) Reported that the correct lighting fixtures which are recessed have been installed in the Hampton Inn parking lot by the applicant. 3) Stated that Member Brown will check the lighting fixtures at the Hampton Inn parking lot and report back.

B-4. CHAIR & VICE-CHAIR ELECTIONS

By consensus, the DRB Members moved Item B-4, Chair & Vice Chair Elections, to be considered at the end of the agenda.

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 H-1, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, requested a continuance to May 13, 2008; the applicant for Item L-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, requested a continuance to the next available meeting and plans have been submitted; and the applicant for Item L-2, No. 08-026-DRB, 7859 Rio Vista Drive, requested a continuance to May 13, 2008.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 3 of 18

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, to May 28, 2008, per the applicant's request; and to continue Item L-2, No. 08-026-DRB, 7859 Rio Vista Drive, to May 13, 2008, per the applicant's request.

MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to continue Item H-1, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to May 13, 1008, for review by the full board, not the Sign Subcommittee.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Chair Branch stated that Item F-1, No. 07-206-DRB, will be reviewed by the full DRB on the Consent Calendar because the applicant was not present at 2:30 p.m. today.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-206-DRB

163 Aero Camino (APN 073-070-004)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 16,450-square foot industrial/office building on a 43,560-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to install a liquid nitrogen distribution tank screened with pultruded I-bar cladding. The proposal includes a remodel of the exterior façade including new plaster screen walls, a new entry feature, and framing and plastering over existing vertical supports. The proposal includes replacing the existing onsite sidewalk in front of the building with pavers, and drought resistant planters. New parking striping and curbing are also proposed to improve circulation and access to parking. No additional floor area is proposed with this submittal. The project was filed by agent David Jones with Lenvik & Minor Architects on behalf of Marc Winnikoff, property owner. Related cases: 65-V-025, 65-V-008, 74-DP-024. (Continued from 3-11-08, 2-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

The plans were presented by agent David Jones with Lenvik & Minor Architects on behalf of Marc Winnikoff, property owner.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item F-1, No. 07-206-DRB, 163 Aero Camino, as submitted, with the condition that there will be no exterior light fixtures.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Member Schneider reported that the Sign Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-2, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-211-DRB

120 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-050-030)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The applicant proposes to install a two sided freestanding entry sign for the Patterson Place Apartments measuring a maximum of 4-feet 4-inches tall by 8-feet wide. The sign area is proposed to be approximately 18 ½ -inches by 7-feet 4-inches for an aggregate of approximately 11 square feet on each side of the structure. The non-illuminated sign shall have aluminum pin mounted flat cut out (F.C.O.) “Burnt Crimson” lettering. The portion of the sign reading “Patterson Place” will have 6-inch high letters, the portion of the sign reading “APARTMENTS” will have 4-inch high letters, and the address portion of the sign will have 4 ½ -inch high letters. The sign would be located approximately 9-feet east of the edge of public right-of-way and approximately 36-feet north of the Patterson Place Apartments entrance. No logos are allowed as part of the sign. The application was filed by agent Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, property owner. Related case: 74-CP-39, 07-211-SCC. (Last heard on 4-8-08*, 3-11-08*, 2-26-08*, 2-12-08*, 1-23-08*, 1-08-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to continue Item H-1, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to May 13, 1008, for review by the full board, not the Sign Subcommittee.

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

5730 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual* 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 4-08-08*, 3-25-08*, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on April 22, 2008:

The plans were presented by David Lemmons of Central Coast Signs, agent, on behalf of Jerry Anderson, property owner.

The Sign Subcommittee reviewed the proposed Anderson Building Overall Sign Plan.

Comments:

1. The maximum length of the anchor tenant sign shall be thirty-five (35) percent of the frontage of the building.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 5 of 18

2. Staff is requested to consider adding ‘human’ portable signs along with other items that are not permitted in item IV Prohibited Signs. Member Brown expressed concern that it is distracting when humans use portable signs for advertising purposes.
3. The word “decorative” shall be removed from item IV.7 Light bulb strings and exposed tubing.
4. The language “not to exceed thirty (30) days” shall be added to item IV.7 Light bulb strings and exposed tubing with regard to temporary holiday lighting.
5. The word “seasonal” shall be added between the words “for” and “promotional” in item IV. Prohibited Signs, #8 Temporary signage and advertising devices.
6. The word “logos” (which are not allowed for tenants) shall be removed from item VI.1 Procedures for Signage Review and Approval.
7. The Anderson Building Overall Sign Plan shall be renamed to the La Placita de Goleta Overall Sign Plan.
8. The temporary banner sign shall be placed in a fixed location on the east elevation directly below the logo, with small eye bolts permanently mounted, which shall be explained on the plans as to the relationship.
9. The font needs to be bolded on the “LA PLACITA” words on the Directional/Information signs. The Directional/Informational Sign concept is appreciated.
10. The concept of grand opening signs will not be considered at this time, per the applicant’s suggestion.
11. This is a nice building and the applicant’s efforts are appreciated.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-2, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, with comments, to May 13, 2008, for Preliminary review.

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 two-

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 6 of 18

story, 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 4-20-04, 3-16-04, 2-17-04*, 1-6-04, 12-2-03) (Cindy Moore)

Site visits: Made by all members:

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by agent Troy White of Dudek and Associates on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner, and the project team members including Russ Goodman and Steve Fedde of Sares-Regis Group; Bob Cunningham and Lauri Romano, project landscape architects; Don Donaldson, project civil engineer; and the project architect.

The project team presented the project history, the project and specific buildings and road infrastructure, and proposed landscape design. Russ Goodman commented that for approximately fifty years the project site served as the headquarters for Delco. Mr. Goodman stated that the objective is to turn this site into first-class, modern business park of high flexibility to service the needs of the high-tech and office industrial community, outwardly focused, landscaped, and taking advantage of a numerous features and constraints on the site. He said that the plans include restoring, enhancing and expanding the large wetlands area, as well as providing a park area in another area and trails for the benefit of the public.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: 1) the applicant is requested to provide a streetscene showing the three buildings lined up along Hollister Avenue because he has some concerns and would prefer making the Building 1 architecture slightly different and not so repetitive of Building 2 and Building 4; b) while he appreciates the curved glass element at the entry he has some concerns having the curved glass element that goes towards the restaurant; c) Building 2 and Building 4 are fairly well done; d) the buildings work with the existing architecture across the street; e) the metal curtain wall forms that lead into the project will be somewhat successful; f) the trellis structure is unsuccessful and needs to be reworked; g) the façade that shows thickness as it turns the corner and turns into the glass element works well; however the wall seems too thin at the corner; h) the lighting plans need to show photometrics and cut sheets; i) expressed concern regarding the water feature at the corner and would prefer a solution that doesn't use water, stating that he believes it is a bad precedent to set in this area; and k) the project is headed in a reasonable direction.
2. Member Wignot commented: a) overall the project is moving in the right direction based on his review of the minutes of the previous review; b) it would be beneficial if reclaimed water service could be used for irrigation, given that the size of the

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 7 of 18

property and relative proximity to the reclaimed water mains that are in use at UCSB; c) a water feature at the corner of the intersection may not be appropriate especially if potable water would be used; however the intersection is very busy and could benefit from another type of calming effect, for example, some type of wind sculpture element; d) he appreciates the ingress and egress plans for the corner; e) the location and screening for utility boxes and transformers need to be shown on the plans; and f) the plan to locate a restaurant on the corner is appreciated.

3. Member Smith commented: a) the entry off of Hollister Avenue with the two curved wall panels is appreciated; b) he agrees with the comment from Member Schneider that the end wall may need to be slightly thicker; c) the Building 1 architecture should be a little more distinctive, for example with an international style element, than Building 2 and Building 4; d) he does not believe there is a great need for the buildings to have architectural allegiance with the buildings across the street on Hollister Avenue which seem unattractive big-boxes with holes; e) he appreciates the concept of a water fountain feature on the corner, noting that the same water could be re-circulated; and f) requested a little more use of the stone material on the buildings.
4. Member Brown commented: a) there needs to be some sort of sense of separation between the pedestrians and the roadway traffic on Los Carneros; b) requested the applicant pursue working with the owner of the property next door to provide access to the Kmart property; c) requested that the proposed metal and stone materials be incorporated consistently throughout the site; d) the applicant shall provide a lighting plan; e) suggested consideration of another way to feature the corner rather than a water feature with regard to this era of scarce resources; f) the streetscape should include the façade of the proposed restaurant and its relationship to the buildings next door; g) the opportunity for people to walk and bike throughout the project is a good feature; h) the landscaping plans for many trees is appreciated; i) the path that cars and pedestrians would take to and from the restaurant needs to be clear on the plans; j) expressed appreciation that stormwater issues are addressed and incorporated in the plans; k) requested that the plans show the building elevations integrated with the landscaping, particularly when the restaurant is reviewed; l) suggested that the project provide for recycling of green waste on the site through composting and mulching; and m) expressed appreciation for the thoughtfulness and concern for the community that has gone into the design of the project.
5. Member Messner commented: a) the performance bonds are needed with regard to the relocation of palm trees; b) the landscape plans need to show that the double rows of Ginkgo trees need to be only male species due to concerns with regard to pollen; c) the plans for street lighting should include lighting outside the parking lot and in connection with the airport; and d) the landscape plans need to conform to the City's current Recommended Street Tree Planting List and planting guidelines with regard to trees in the right-of-ways.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) the concept of a water feature in the corner is appreciated; b) the landscaping plans with many trees throughout the property is appreciated; c) the drainage plans are fine; and d) the use of reclaimed water on the site would be great.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 8 of 18

7. Chair Branch commented: a) the applicant is requested to provide a streetscene showing how the building integrate on the site; b) he appreciates that the Building 1 architecture relates to Building 2 and Building 4 but suggested some difference in Building 1, for example, in terms of materials and proportions; c) the accent wainscot seems somewhat thin on the bottom; d) the green sea glass is a great element; e) the wing that is protruding seems a little thin and may need to be returned or thickened; f) reclaimed water would be useful on the site being that it is so large; g) the water feature at the corner is attractive but he does have concerns with regard to the water conservation point of view; h) he appreciates the design wherein Building 2 and Building 4 guide into the project; and i) this project is well done and it clear a lot of time and work has been spent on it.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-1, No. 37-SB-DRB, Cabrillo Business Park, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to June 10, 2008, with comments.

RECESS HELD FROM 4:50 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

K-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-059-DRB

5575 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-090-085)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes 14 Housing Authority apartments known as Grossman Homes, as well as management and maintenance offices on a 2.43 acre lot in the Design Residential (DR-20) zone district. The applicant requests a two lot subdivision to subdivide the parcel into two parcels of 2.19 acres (Parcel 1) and .24 acres (Parcel 2), and an amendment to a previously approved Development Plan which would allow the construction of a community center for the residents of the Grossman Homes on Parcel 1, the Miller Community Center, and an additional single-family dwelling, The Braddock House, on Parcel 2. The community center would be 16'3" tall and total 1,536 square feet. The Braddock House would be 16'5" tall and total 2,755 square feet and would be used as a Special Care Facility to provide semi-independent living for up to four (4) developmentally disabled adults. Access is provided via an existing 25' wide driveway from Armitos Avenue. The Goleta Water District and Goleta Sanitary District would continue to provide water and sewer service to the site. Modifications from the requirements of the zoning ordinance are being requested for the number of parking spaces, parking areas setbacks, and landscaping. The project was filed by the County of Santa Barbara Housing Authority, property owner. Related cases: 83-DP-014. (Continued from 3-25-08, 2-26-08, 9-18-07, 08-21-07) (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by John Polanskey, Director of Housing Development, County of Santa Barbara Housing Authority; and Jason Rojas, Project Coordinator, County Housing Authority. John Polanskey responded to the DRB comments from the previous review on March 25, 2008, as follows: 1) provided a color board showing that the proposed color matches the existing color; 2) provided the floor plan and south elevation that now show that the two windows shall be fixed facing the adjacent Kellogg Ranch, along with a notation on the floor plan and elevation; 3) provided a cut sheet showing the proposed bollard light fixture with a louvered

element that shields the light downward; and 4) provided an updated photometric plan.

John Polanskey, Director of Housing Development, County of Santa Barbara Housing Authority, stated that he discussed the project today with Reilly Pollard, neighbor, who was in attendance at the meeting earlier because he was unclear regarding project's status in the process. John Polanskey stated for the record that the applicant will meet again with interested neighbors once the final construction plans are substantially completed prior to the next DRB review. John Polanskey also said that the applicant is committed to continue to work with the City with regard to concerns regarding the neighborhood park, particularly related to street parking. He noted that parking problems have not been mitigated due to police presence.

Comments:

1. The applicant's time and work with the DRB on this project are appreciated.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-2, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to grant Preliminary Approval, as submitted, and continue to June 24, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

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 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 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)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, to May 28, 2008, per the applicant's request.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-026-DRB

7859 Rio Vista Drive (APN 079-600-034)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,180-square foot residence and an attached 462-square foot two-car garage (with a permitted partial garage conversion of 168 square feet) on a 6,534-square foot lot in the DR-4 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 623 square feet in additions (114 square feet on the first-floor and 509 square feet on a new second-floor). The resulting two-story structure would be 2,265 square feet, consisting of a 1,803-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 462-square foot two-car garage (with a permitted partial garage conversion of 168 square feet). This proposal is consistent with the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by Tony Xiques of Ddesign Systems, agent, on behalf of Robert Andre, property owner. Related cases: 08-026-LUP. (Last heard on 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-2, No. 08-026-DRB, 7859 Rio Vista Drive, to May 13, 2008, per the applicant's request.

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-043-DRB

Cambridge Drive Community Church; 550 Cambridge Drive (APN 069-560-030)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes an existing 2,640-square foot church sanctuary, an existing 1,450-square foot classroom building, and an existing 2,200-square foot office/classroom building on a 2.4-acre lot in the DR-3.3 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 449-square foot office addition to the education/classroom building. The resulting one-story structure would be 1,899 square feet. A 345-square foot as-built storage shed near the education/classroom building is also part of the scope of the project. No changes to the other buildings are proposed. All materials used for this project are to match the existing building. The project was filed by Donald Sharpe, architect, on behalf of Cambridge Drive Community Church, property owner. Related cases: 08-043-SCD; 08-043-LUP. (Shine Ling)

Site visits: Made by all members except Herrera.

Ex-parte conversations: Member Messner stated that he has not had contact with the applicant recently but he has trimmed the applicant's trees in the past years, not recently.

The plans were presented by Donald Sharpe, architect, on behalf of Cambridge Drive Community Church, property owner.

Comments:

1. The applicant is requested to show the plans for the porch cover element that connects to the existing building.
2. The proposed lighting should be fine because it is underneath the porch but the applicant needs to submit lighting plans for review.
3. Member Schneider commented that while the bat and board material adds some character, the style is foreign to the other elements on the site.
4. Member Wignot commented that the office doorway on the southeast elevation would benefit from the larger overhang on the eastern side of the building.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-043-DRB, Cambridge Drive Community Church, 550 Cambridge Drive, as submitted, and continue to May 13, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall provide light fixture cut sheets; 2) the applicant shall provide color boards; and 3) the applicant is requested to show the plans for the porch cover element that connects to the existing building.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. 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 currently vacant. The approximately 14.46-acre property is located in western Goleta extending west of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection. The property has a land use designation of Planned Residential, 8 units per acre, and is in the DR-8 zone district.

The applicant is requesting approval of a vesting tentative tract map, general plan amendments, and final development plan as described below.

Vesting Tentative Tract Map (32,032; 07-102-VTM)

The applicant requests a one lot subdivision of the 14.46-acre parcel for airspace condominium purposes to provide for 102 residential units, associated infrastructure, and common open space.

Final Development Plan (07-102-DP)

The Final Development Plan is a request to allow the construction of a 102-unit residential condominium project totaling 126,376 square feet of building coverage.

General Plan Amendments (07-102-GP)

The project proposes amendments to 10 Goleta General Plan policies and tables. These amendments address issues including: facilitating construction of a new fire station; allowing for a 50-foot development setback from Devereux Creek top of bank; visual resource view corridors; timing implementation of regional traffic mitigations; residential exterior development within areas subject to noise levels of 65 dBA CNEL on Hollister Avenue; and affordable housing inclusionary standards.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 12 of 18

Unit and Building Design

Seven residential two-story building types are proposed, arranged around two loop road configurations, accessed from Hollister Avenue on the west, and Las Armas Road on the east. Single family residence (SFR detached) units would have a maximum height from finished floor to roof ridgeline of 24 feet, and Townhouse (T.H., attached) units would have a maximum height of 22 feet. The 2- and 3-bedroom T.H. floor plan to be offered at the market sales category provides for an extra optional bedroom. Building sizes would vary as follows:

Unit Type	Number	Area (square feet)
Single-Family Residence (Three-Bedroom)	47	2,466 - 2,872
Townhouse (Three-Bedroom/Option for Four)	15	2,324
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom/Option for Three)	14	1,492-1,820
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	14	1,364
Townhouse (One-Bedroom)	6	774
Studio	6	566

A total of 66 buildings would be constructed in the following configuration:

Unit Type	Number of Buildings
Single-Family Residence	47
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	4
(1) Townhouse (Three-Bedroom) and (2) Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	9
(1) Townhouse (Three-Bedroom) (1) Townhouse (Two-Bedroom) (1) Townhouse (One-Bedroom) and (1) Studio	6

Architecture and Landscaping

The proposed architecture proposed for both detached and attached units is described as a mix of Spanish, Ranch, and Monterey styles.

Perimeter units would be oriented toward Hollister Avenue; no sound wall along the roadway is proposed. Units adjacent to Devereux Creek will be oriented to take

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 13 of 18

advantage or proposed restoration of this biologically sensitive area. All units would have private outdoor areas. Private open space would equal 74,402 square feet (12%), such that total project open space would be 60% of all the project area. Common open space would total approximately 302,282 square feet (48%) exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated to the City of Goleta, and includes a children's play area, and trail, with benches throughout the proposed Devereux Creek restoration area.

A conceptual landscape plan includes restoration of the Devereux Creek corridor and a pesticide- and herbicide-free maintenance program. The 87 eucalyptus and 8 cypress trees over 6-inches in diameter measured at breast height 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 and Parking

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. Decorative paving (2-feet wide on each side) would provide a visual sense of narrowing of paving width to 24-feet, intended to provide a traffic calming effect. A portion of the eastern interior loop adjacent to the proposed open space landscape restoration area would incorporate a "grass-crete" type substructure material that would allow for natural dispersal of native grass seed. This paving material, in addition to interior road width and turning radius, was determined in consultation with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department.

A total of 258 parking spaces would be provided, exceeding the 228 spaces required. All market-rate units would include a private 2-car garage, while affordable-rate units would include a private 1-car garage. Additional uncovered parking would be provided within 200-feet of the affordable units as required by ordinance.

Site Preparation

The site would require approximately 105,610-cubic yards of cut and 75,126-cubic yards of fill. Maximum vertical height of cut and fill slopes would be 4 feet. A retaining wall on the northern project boundary would have a maximum 6-foot height.

Utilities

The Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District would provide water and Sewer service to the site. (Last heard on 3-25-08) (Cindy Moore & David Stone)

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase stated that he read the minutes from the previous review and it was his understanding that the DRB members were very concerned regarding the density of the project, which he referred to as compaction. He said that he would be speaking in broad parameters and that he wanted to provide some information with regard to the dialogue between staff and the applicant. He stated that maximizing open space was encouraged by staff with regard to the overall approach, in particular on Hollister Avenue, the coastal setting and view corridor. He said that staff thought the groves were lovely and this was

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 14 of 18

seen as a sort of gateway piece. He said that he has seen this type of development product in other locations in gateway pieces throughout the State. He stated that he likes the layout and that the reason he likes it for this particularly property is that there are no walls per se and it tries to maximum the open space side. He stated that this type of architecture was encouraged from the perspective of open space and trying to maximum open space. He also stated that it was seen as good overall balance. He noted that it is the role of the DRB to review the project with the applicant to determine if the design is a good fit.

Member Brown commented that the DRB expressed its appreciation regarding the project's open space. She stated for purposes of clarification that there were suggestions made by the DRB with regard to making the project look less dense internally, for example, combining some of the units or repositioning products where there was more space. She believes that the DRB liked the architecture but there were some suggestions made that would help the overall site planning.

The plans were presented by Chuck Lande, and other project team members including Mark Scheurer, project architect; Katie O'Reilly Rogers, project landscape architect; and Mary Meaney Reichel, project planner, on behalf of Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership. The plans included shadow studies.

Charles Lande, project team member, explained their philosophy regarding how they approached the project with consideration of the land, the community and efforts to create a balance with the neighborhood integration and open space. He said that these innovative home types which provide a balance between lot coverage and living area have been built in numerous locations and are appreciated by the residents. He stated that the project team considered some of suggestions made by the DRB in terms of site planning but one of the concerns in combining the buildings was that there would be too much mass along Hollister Avenue. He clarified that there is no solid wall separating the project on the western property line, and apologized that he made a mistake at the last meeting when he stated that there was a solid sound wall.

Mark Scheurer, project architect, discussed the proposed floor plans, private open spaces and yards.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, stated that she believes this project is a little change from the 2001 project that was rejected. She expressed concern that the project has too many units, too narrow streets, substandard driveways, too few parking spaces, and insufficient environmental setbacks. She also made the following comments: a) the streetscape does not show the interior street which will have an alley-like appearance with parking spaces and garages; b) she believes that most of the studies for the Residences at Sandpiper were done in 2001 and are no longer valid given the length of time that has passed; c) she believes that the environmental review of the site needs to be sufficient and specific, not general; d) from her experience, there are parking problems associated with narrow streets in a residential development which can also be hazardous at busy times; and f) from her observation of the elevations, the units look like two-story boxes with a little ornamentation.

Overall General Comments of DRB Members:

1. The proposed project is being considered with regard to solving the concerns of the DRB that there are some areas in the site plan that seem too tight.
2. The applicant is requested to address the DRB's comments with regard to the site planning and may provide conceptual responses rather than full floor plans, per the applicant's request.
3. The entry area for the units seems too tight with regard to the units facing the western property line and the multi-family units in upper northeastern area.
4. The addition of a raised boardwalk through the meadow that would provide a pedestrian path is very important and would facilitate the opportunity for the residents to have some interaction with the open space area.
5. The applicant shall provide the detailed plan showing the existing trees and how many will remain, be removed, and be replaced.

Comments of Individual DRB Members:

1. Member Brown stated that the applicant has not shown a response to suggestions made by the DRB at the previous meeting to address the concerns that the project seems too tight and dense. She said that these suggestions were made to provide some more room on the lots and more variation. She further said that the suggestions included integrating some of the units, repositioning some of the products, and placing a multi-family unit on the southwest corner where there is a little more space; not necessarily changing the number of units.
2. Member Brown commented: a) some variation in the architecture would be appreciated; b) expressed concern that if a wall is built on the western property line, the front entrances of the units would be next to the wall; c) the design concept of being greeted by garages in the front and walking around to the back is not favorable and should be addressed; and d) expressed concern regarding the short driveways since pedestrians would end up walking in the street because they can't walk on the sidewalk.
3. Member Smith commented: a) expressed concern that there is not enough space between the front door and the edge of the property line with regard to the units facing the railroad on the eastern side; b) expressed concern that a couple of units appear to be "short-changed" with respect to private open space on the site plan; c) suggested considering the concept of joining together two of the single-family two-story units, thereby sharing one wall, so the adjacent yards would still be the same size but the apparent distance from the neighbor would be farther away, and the back-to-back yards would provide the possibility for ambient sunlight; d) expressed concern that the parabolic elements shown on the elevations for Plan 1B and Plan 2B do not work well architecturally with the roof element which resembles California Craftsman style, and suggested possibly changing the craftsman eave elements to a style that would fit better or removing the arched elements on the exterior of the house and adding something with more of a craftsman style; and e) the design of the triplexes looking like duplexes is very creative;
4. Chair Branch commented: a) his concerns regarding density are relative to the execution on the site plan and not in actual number; b) the design concept and

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 16 of 18

variation in style of the multi-family units is appreciated; c) expressed concern that the single-family units are all two-story buildings and seem too crowded together, particularly with regard to shading and lack of sun in some yards for a fair amount of time throughout the year; d) suggested consideration of possibly decreasing the size of some of the second stories of the single-family houses by half of the footprint, or replacing some of the single-family houses with a multi-family unit to address the concern that the single-family homes appear cluttered; e) the setbacks from the street and the concept of bringing the parking in from the back side are appreciated; and f) idea is to join the grassland.

5. Member Schneider commented: a) the rear alley-loaded design concept works well along Hollister Avenue, along Los Armas Road, and facing the open spaces; but the design appears too tight when jammed up against the western property line and in the upper northeastern area with the multi-family units which is a tight space; b) he would not want to rely on potential landscaping to address the concerns regarding the entry area on the units facing the western property; c) he does not have as much concern regarding the two-story single-family units and the shadow study showing that some yards would have limited direct sunlight, noting that there could be some light reflection from units that are next door; d) he supports the addition of a raised boardwalk through the meadow which appears to be contingent upon discussion between the applicant and the Environmental Defense Center; e) parking is lacking on the eastern side and needs to be addressed with a better solution; and f) the western side has significant visitor parking.
6. Member Wignot commented: a) expressed concerned with regard to the potential for people to park along Los Armas Road on both sides because the eastern side doesn't have enough parking spaces, and when the property to the east is more fully developed that parking will be compromised; b) it does not appear that there is the ability to park a full-length sedan or truck in the short driveways; and c) he does not have enough information to know if the proposed project is essentially the same as the previous project or if it is a substantial improvement.
7. Member Messner commented: a) the DRB comments from the last meeting on March 25, 2008, also need to be addressed; and b) he stands by his comments at the last meeting.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road, with comments, to June 10, 2008.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA (CONTINUED TO END OF THE AGENDA)

B-4. CHAIR & VICE-CHAIR ELECTIONS

Member Schneider nominated Vice Chair Wignot for the position of DRB Chair.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to elect Vice Chair Wignot to the position of DRB Chair.

Member Brown nominated Member Smith for the position of DRB Vice Chair.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to elect Member Smith to the position of DRB Vice Chair.

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Vice Chair Wignot requested a future agenda item to discuss the appropriateness of the Director of Planning and Environmental Services speaking to the DRB on behalf of an applicant today prior to the beginning of Item M-1.

After discussion regarding the request by Vice Chair Wignot, an agenda item was scheduled for May 28, 2008, for a discussion amongst the DRB members. Member Brown and Member Schneider stated that after the discussion it may be appropriate for the Chair to speak with the Director of Planning and Environmental Services on behalf of the DRB.

Member Brown requested a future agenda item to discuss the DRB subcommittees.

After discussion, an agenda item to discuss DRB subcommittees was scheduled for May 28, 2008, rather than May 13, 2008, because two members indicated they will be absent from the May 13th meeting.

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Chair Branch announced that he will volunteer to stay on the Consent Calendar Subcommittee.

Vice Chair Wignot suggested that it would be appropriate to have the expertise of an architect on the Consent Calendar.

Member Wignot announced that he will not be present at the DRB meeting on May 13, 2008.

Member Brown announced that she will not be present at the DRB meeting on May 13, 2008.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz expressed appreciation on behalf of staff to Member Messner and Member Schneider for their service on the DRB and reapplying for continued service. He congratulated Member Wignot on his election to the position of Chair and Member Smith on his election to the position of Vice Chair, and thanked Member Branch for his service as Chair and Member Wignot for his service as Vice Chair for the past year.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 22, 2008

Page 18 of 18

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz announced that the City of Santa Monica is conducting an Expo on alternative building materials at the Santa Monica Civic Center on April 25 and 26, 2008.

Member Herrera announced that he is involved in a project to send two soccer teams of children under sixteen years old to an international soccer tournament in Mexico in June and that the children have been participating in activities to raise funds in the community, for example, by mowing the grove by the train station, and also volunteering for community service such as beach clean-up.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 6:47 P.M.

Minutes approved on May 13, 2008.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 19 of 19