



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, October 14, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

Members:

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair	Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)
Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair	Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Scott Branch (Architect)	Carl Schneider (Architect)
Cecilia Brown (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 Wignot at 3:00 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

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

Board Members absent: None.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 2 of 18

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for September 23, 2008

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Abstain: Brown, Schneider) to approve the Design Review Board minutes for September 23, 2008, as submitted.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the next meeting will be on October 28, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that in response to the DRB request at the last meeting, staff reviewed the completed project at Taco Bell on Fairview Avenue and determined that the landscape plans were followed as approved with the exception that the height of the base stump for the palm tree in front of the middle of the center window was slightly less than the approved height.

Member Messner stated that he had thought that the approved plans showed that the approved plans showed the palm tree in the middle of the center window would be located off center for aesthetics. Chair Wignot stated that he agreed with Member Messner's recollection with regard to the location of the palm tree; however at this time it does not seem appropriate to require the applicant to move the palm tree. Member Brown commented in support for the completion of projects as approved.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) He clarified that staff reminds applicants on a regular basis of the requirements and information requested that needs to be provided for review at the DRB meetings. 2) An appeal to the Preliminary Approval of the project at 7837 Langlo Ranch Road was received and a DRB member will need to be designated to attend the Planning Commission hearing. 3) The Planning Commission reviewed the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital project on October 13, and recommended to the City Council approval of the hospital and direction for the DRB to restudy the entrance and lobby, and their relationship to the parking lot, and the multiplicity of building materials used. 4) The final joint workshop between the Planning Commission and DRB on Building Intensity Standards will be held on October 20, 2008. 5) The City's Public Works yard has moved and will now be located onsite at the Cabrillo Business Park. 6) The City Council will review the Rincon Palms Hotel and the Marriott Residence Inn projects on October 21, 2008. 7) Staff is in the process of preparing recommendations for consideration by the City Council with regard to revisions of the DRB Bylaws, in particular with regard to signage review.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 3 of 18

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 No. J-1, No. 07-141-DRB, 6325 Lindmar Drive, requested a continuance to November 25, 2008; and the applicant for Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, requested a continuance to November 12, 2008.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item J-1, No. 07-141-DRB, 6325 Lindmar Drive, to November 25, 2008, per the applicant's request; and to continue Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, to November 12, 2008, per the applicant's request.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he met today and reviewed the plans with agent R. Brian Nelson on behalf of Jeff and Michelle Liephardt, property owners, and that Final Approval of Item F-1, No. 06-054-DRB, 7295 Butte Drive, was granted as submitted.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 06-054-DRB

7295 Butte Drive (APN 077-103-003)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 1,663-square foot residence and an attached 473-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,035-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 741-square feet in additions, consisting of a 264-square foot 1st floor addition, and a new 477-square foot second story. This proposal also includes a 186-square foot porch on the first floor. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,877 square feet, consisting of a 2,404-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 473-square foot 2-car garage. This proposal meets the maximum allowable floor area guideline for this property, which is 2,437.7 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. New materials consist of sepia brown wood fascia and beams, paint colors swiss coffee, salsa, and autumn wheat, and presidential, shadow grey, 40-year, composition shingles. The project was filed by agent R. Brian Nelson on behalf of Jeff and Michelle Liephardt, property owners. Related cases: 06-054-LUP; 07-143-APP; 07-198-APP. (Continued from 09-23-08, 09-09-08, 07-03-07, 06-05-07) (Laura Vik)

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on October 14, 2008:

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch met today and reviewed the plans with agent R. Brian Nelson on behalf of Jeff and Michelle Liephardt, property owners. The applicant provided the cut sheets for the proposed lighting fixtures, and noted the

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 4 of 18

make and model of the fixtures on the plans. Final Approval of Item F-1, No. 06-054-DRB, 7295 Butte Drive, was granted as submitted.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown reported that the subcommittee met today with Assistant Planner Shine Ling and Craig Minus of the Towbes Group, agent for Sumida Family Limited Partnership, and the project team; and reviewed the Conceptual plans for Item H-1, No. 08-131-DRB, 5505-5585 Overpass Road and 5410 Hollister Avenue.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-131-DRB

5505-5585 Overpass Road & 5410 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-330-011 & 071-330-012)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes the approved Sumida Gardens Apartments development, which will contain 9 buildings totaling 194,448 square feet on approximately 10.26 acres in the DR-20 zone district. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Sumida Gardens Apartments development. The proposed OSP provides for five (5) different types of signs: monument and identification signs; directional signs; pool signage; parking signage; and miscellaneous signage. The OSP would specify the design and maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign. A total of 20 sign types are proposed. Sign materials generally consist of wood, aluminum, and acrylic. Sign colors are generally ivory, gold, beige, brown, red, and green. Some signs are proposed to be internally illuminated. The project was filed by Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, agent for Sumida Family Limited Partnership, property owner. Related cases: 08-131-OSP; -CUP. (Continued from 9-09-08*, 8-12-08) (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on October 14, 2008:

The Sign Subcommittee reviewed today with Assistant Planner Shine Ling and Craig Minus of the Towbes Group, agent for Sumida Family Limited Partnership, and the project team including Ron Wilkinson of Vogue Sign Company; Item H-1, No. 08-131-DRB, 5505-5585 Overpass Road and 5410 Hollister Avenue.

Comments: (Conceptual review of the applicant's response to the following comments from the meeting of August 12, 2008, as follows:)

1. The photograph and proposed landscape plans were provided and reviewed.
2. Proposed illumination for the off-site monument sign: Acceptable as submitted.
3. Off-site monument sign: The applicant shall restudy: a) the letter heights; b) the line spacing; and c) improving the proportionality fit on the face of the sign to address the concern that there was a significant amount of white space.
4. On-site monument sign: The applicant shall restudy: a) the letter heights; b) the line spacing; and c) improving the proportionality fit on the face of the sign to address the concern that there was a significant amount of white space.
5. Front entry directory sign: Acceptable as submitted.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 5 of 18

6. On-site directory signs (open space at the base): Acceptable as submitted.
7. On-site directory signs: Acceptable as submitted.
8. Entrance: The height of the rental office sign shall be reduced so that the portion of the sign with the words "Rental Office" will remain and the additional height of the sign will be cut down (which will include the removal of the words "Sumida Gardens Apartments" and removal of the picture of the palm tree).
9. Model number signs: Acceptable as submitted.
10. Address plaques for buildings and address plaques for units: Acceptable as submitted.
11. Pool signage: Acceptable as submitted.
12. Parking signage: Acceptable as submitted.
13. Miscellaneous Signage: Acceptable as submitted.
14. Any other proposed signs: Will need to be presented for review.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION: There being no objections, Item H-1, No. 08-131-DRB, 5505-5585 Overpass Road and 5410 Hollister Avenue, was continued with comments to November 12, 2008, for Preliminary review.

Chair Wignot commented, in general, that the City's Sign Ordinance, as well as Overall Sign Plans, should reflect lighting guidelines.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-141-DRB

6325 Lindmar Drive (APN 073-005-021)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 27,927-square foot industrial/manufacturing building, 20,276-square feet of courtyards, loading docks and parking, an as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage/water treatment enclosure/addition, and 23,535-square feet (32%) of landscaping on a 73,616-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a mechanical courtyard in the existing courtyard between buildings A and C, construct two new mechanical roof wells (one on building B and one on building C), permit the aforementioned as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage area on the west side of building A, permit an as-built parking lot on the east side of buildings B and C (which requires the removal of 1,167-square feet of landscaping), alter the loading area on the west side of building A, abandon an existing driveway on the north side of the property, remove equipment from the front yard setback for re-location into the proposed mechanical courtyard, remove an unpermitted parking lot storage area on the southwest side of the property, and re-locate equipment from the side yard (along the south property line) setback. All materials used for this project are to match the existing buildings with the exception of new lighting, which will be Lamps Plus bronze, 9" high outdoor dark sky tube lights. The project was filed by agent Bruce Burke on behalf of James L. Bartlett, property owner. Related cases: 07-141-DP AM01; 07-141-LUP. (Continued from 08-26-08) (Laura Vlk)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item J-1, No. 07-141-DRB, 6325 Lindmar Drive, to November 25, 2008, per the applicant's request.

J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-075-DRB

7090 Marketplace Drive (APN 073-440-013)

This is a request for *Final* review. The development includes 475,487 square feet of commercial development with 2,490 parking spaces on approximately 49 acres over 7 parcels in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 7,770-square foot addition to an existing 24,017-square foot building previously occupied by CompUSA and to eliminate 31 parking spaces. The entry would be relocated from the east elevations' northern end to the center of the building, and a car stereo installation bay would be created on the southern elevation. The resulting total onsite development would include 483,257 square feet, and the 1-story structure would be 31,787 square feet. Available parking throughout the entire shopping center would be reduced from 2,490 to 2,459 parking spaces with a reduction from 177 to 146 parking spaces located on this parcel. Parking stall sizes are proposed to remain in their current modified configuration. A total of 12 Bradford Pear trees, 3 Brisbane Box trees, and 1 Tipu tree are proposed to be removed, but 17 comparable trees are proposed to be planted. Minor alterations to drive aisles and lighting are also proposed. New materials include a storefront/entry with a kynar finish/clear anodized aluminum, "Solar Gray" glazing, new metal doors to be painted to match the adjacent surfaces and new bollards with either an unspecified finish or to be painted Ben Morre #343 "Bright Yellow." All other materials (including lighting and landscaping) for this project are to match the existing commercial property. The project was filed by Kimberly A. Schizas on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 95-SP-001, 95-DP-026, 96-EIR-3, & 08-075-DP AM. (Continued from 9-23-08, 9-09-08, 8-12-08) (Natasha Heifetz Campbell & Scott Kolwitz)

The plans were presented by Kimberly A. Schizas on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. She presented the elevation sheet that has been updated with lighting cut-sheet information. She stated that the applicant found a different lighting fixture that is much nicer and comes closer to matching. She clarified that the project landscape architect will attempt to save and reuse as many of the existing trees as possible, noting that if it is not possible to plant the trees elsewhere, she would like to plant the trees at Girsh Park.

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) He expressed appreciation that the applicant researched and found a better lighting fixture in response to the DRB's comment.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The applicant's response is appreciated; and b) This is an example that there are full cut-off fixtures available with fine aesthetic characteristics.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item J-2, No. 08-075-DRB, 7090 Marketplace Drive, as submitted.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

5484 Overpass Road (APN 071-220-033)

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

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, to November 12, 2008, per the applicant's request.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-087-DRB

266 Spruce Drive (APN 079-530-027)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,061-square foot residence and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,968-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 1,734 square feet in additions, consisting of a 159-square foot first floor addition, a 325-square foot new second story, and a 1,250-square foot basement. The resulting 2-story structure with basement would be 4,245 square feet, consisting of a 3,795-square foot single-family dwelling with basement and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage. As the proposed project exceeds 3,000 square feet of habitable square footage, a third enclosed parking space would be required per Ordinance No. 03-05. When the basement is included, the proposed habitable square footage would be 3,795 square feet which exceeds the maximum allowable floor area (FAR) guidelines for this property, which is 2,642 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. When the basement square footage is removed, the proposed habitable square footage would be 2,545square feet, which is within the maximum allowable FAR guidelines for this property. A total of 629 cubic yards of cut for grading is proposed for construction of the basement. All materials used for this project are to

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 8 of 18

match the existing residence aside from new doors, windows, and exterior lighting as shown on plans. The project was filed by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. Related cases: 08-087-LUP. (Continued from 09-23-08*, 9-09-08*, 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

The plans were presented by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. He stated that the applicant has decided not to construct a second story addition. He proposed that thirty percent of the basement square footage be counted towards the FAR, stating that the resulting FAR would meet the maximum allowable floor area guidelines for the proposed project.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that it would be appropriate for the DRB to consider the following issues with regard to the project review: 1) whether it is acceptable for the proposed project to exceed the maximum allowable floor area (FAR) guidelines; 2) whether the project is acceptable as proposed with a two-car garage; and 3) whether there is support for the proposed setback modification in the front yard with regard to the basement. He stated that the DRB Conceptual comments will be forwarded to the Zoning Administrator review.

Documents: Letter from Michael Ray, dated September 2, 2008, providing further comments for the record.

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) He does not believe that the basement space should be counted as habitable space or included in the floor area; b) He would support the project with a two-car garage; c) He would support the setback modification; and d) Suggested consideration of the Notice To Property Owner (NTPO) process.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) He would support the concept that only a certain percentage of the basement square footage would apply to the FAR; b) Although the basement does not add to the visible mass, bulk and scale of the project; it adds usable square footage which needs to be considered with regard to the requirement for a third enclosed parking space, particularly because the threshold is exceeded significantly; c) He would support the setback modification; and d) He would encourage this type of development with a basement concept.
3. Member Branch commented: a) He would support the setback modification, stating that he believes the setback stops at the ground level; b) Suggested counting the amount of space in the basement that would be legally habitable, from a Building Code standpoint with regard to light and ventilation, to determine what would be considered as habitable. c) A letter was received from a neighbor, dated September 2, 2008, expressing concern that parking is a problem in the area; d) From the standpoint that the project square footage would exceed the 3,000 square foot requirement significantly with the addition of habitable space in the basement, there should be a third parking space to comply; and e) The project design is a creative solution.
4. Member Brown commented; a) She would support the setback modification; b) The issue with regard to FARs does not seem to apply because FARs relate to the

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 9 of 18

- visual aspects of development; c) The design is a creative solution but parking is the main problem when considering the building intensity on the site; and d) The ordinance requirement for a third enclosed parking space needs to be considered.
5. Member Messner commented: a) Declined to state whether he would support the setback modification; and b) The total square footage in the basement should be counted as habitable space.
 6. Member Herrera commented: a) He would support the setback modification; and b) He expressed concern with regard to the potential for an increase in habitable space in the basement that would impact parking in the neighborhood.
 7. Chair Wignot commented: a) He would support the setback modification; b) He could not make the finding that the proposed project would provide for sufficient parking; c) He agreed with Member Branch's suggestion to count the amount of space in the basement that is legally habitable, from a building standpoint, to determine the floor area; and d) In general, suggested consideration of the Notice To Property Owner (NTPO) procedure for project reviews.

General Summary of Comments:

1. With regard to FARs, a) three members would support the concept that a percentage of the basement square footage would count towards the FAR; b) two members do not believe that the square footage of the basement is applicable towards the FAR; c) one member would support counting the total square footage of the basement; and d) one member did not comment.
2. The majority of members would not support a modification to the ordinance requirement for a third enclosed parking space.
3. The majority expressed support for the setback modification.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to take Item L-2, No. 08-087-DRB, 266 Spruce Drive, be taken off calendar, with comments.

RECESS HELD FROM 4:30 P.M. TO 4:40 P.M.

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-159-DRB

7390 Calle Real (APN 077-490-041)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property comprises a Community Shopping Center and includes two retail commercial and office buildings (approximately 6,250 square feet and 8,300 square feet) and a gasoline fueling station facility with an approximately 625-square foot canopy on a 1.05-acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to install a new above-ground Healy clean air separator tank for the gasoline fueling station facility. The tank would be placed within a new 42-square foot metal enclosure painted to match the beige color of the building. The enclosure would be 10 feet tall. Air breather piping would extend from the top of the tank to a *minimum* height of 18" above the roof of the building. The air breather piping would match the height of the existing vent risers. No habitable floor area is proposed. The project was filed by Luke Snyder of Quality Project Management, agent, on behalf of Eleni Pertsulakes, property owner. Related cases: 08-159-LUP. (Shine Ling)

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 10 of 18

Site visits: Made by all members except Brown and Schneider.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Luke Snyder of Quality Project Management, agent, on behalf of Eleni Pertsulakes, property owner. He stated that the proposed enclosure would be fully enclosed with a door for accessibility. He noted that the proposed system is an extension of the existing vent system and is designed to help capture and collect vapors from the underground storage tank that otherwise enter the atmosphere. He stated that the enclosure design is fairly standard with regard to other sites throughout the State.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling stated that the applicant will need to revise the site plan to reflect the gas station, the 7-Eleven store, and the strip mall to the back. He noted that the landscape requirement for the zone district is for not less than 5 percent of the net lot area to be landscaped.

Speaker:

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, commented that the end unit in the northeast corner of the strip mall located in the back of the site plan has historically been a bar and is currently a bar and grill business. She expressed concern that some of the patrons of the bar and grill may be drinking and smoking, and may not pay attention or ignore the "No Smoking, Flammable Vapors" signage. She requested information regarding the enforcement and consequences.

Luke Snyder, applicant, stated that the tank, which can be considered flammable, meets State requirements that it must be fully enclosed within a fire-rated enclosure if it is not located at least ten feet away from all building and property lines. He stated that the project is reviewed by other local agencies that include the County Fire Department, Fire Department Haz Mat Division, County Air Pollution Control District, and the Building Department. He clarified that the proposed equipment is required by a State-mandated program and must be installed by April 2009.

Comments:

1. Chair Wignot commented: a) He suggested that the applicant consider that the location and/or orientation of the plug on the tank may need to be changed to better facilitate drainage, servicing and maintenance with regard to the location of the tank within the enclosure; b) He provided the applicant with information he found on the internet regarding the Healy clean air separator tank that discusses normal operation and draining procedures, for reference; c) The proposal, which would add another vent riser in addition to the two existing risers would be a step forward in minimizing the amount of hydrocarbons that are released into the atmosphere; and d) It appears unlikely that there would be vapors at the ground level if the system is functioning as designed.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) He spoke in support of the applicant's plans to paint the two bollards, located in front, a bright yellow color, which is in contrast with the color of the building and will draw the motorists' attention.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-159-DRB, 7390 Calle Real, as submitted, and continue to October 28, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

L-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-169-DRB & 08-170-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual/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 M-RP and M-S-GOL zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Buildings 12A and 12B and associated improvements as part of the phased build out of the Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 12A would be a one-story, 10,000-square foot structure and Building 12B would be a one-story, 7,500-square foot structure. Associated improvements for each building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, and parking. New materials consist of metal, concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out the Cabrillo Business Park as proposed to be amended would total 948,782 square feet, including 707,100 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. The project was filed by agent Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 08-107-DP AM, 08-039-LUP, 08-040-LUP, 08-041-LUP, 08-042-LUP, 08-160-LUP, 08-119-LUP, 08-025-LUP, 07-144-MC, 07-236-MC, 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN. (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by agent Troy White, Dudek, on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC, property owner, and members of the project team including Steve Fedde, Sares-Regis Group; Derek Kitabayashi, project architect; Don Donaldson, Penfield and Smith, project civil engineer; and Lauri Romano and Bob Cunningham, project landscape architects, both of Arcadia Design. Derek Kitabayashi presented the architecture plans for Building 12A and Building 12B, the lighting plans, and the site plan. Lauri Romano presented the landscape plans. She stated that the paving, the design and patterning are designed to help draw people from the main parking area into the site. Troy White stated that the DRB previously reviewed and the overall grading and drainage plans for the site during review of the prior application for Building 1 and Building 2, and that Preliminary Approval was granted.

Speaker:

Bill Shelor, Goleta, requested that consideration be given, during the planning process, to incorporate the use of photovoltaic panels on the roofs of the new structures. If this is currently not economically feasible, he suggested the applicant research whether it is possible to design the project with a pre-designed rooftop arrangement so that it can be easily retrofitted in the future to add panels.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 12 of 18

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) He appreciates that the buildings are oriented towards Hollister Avenue because it brings activity to the street; b) From a landscaping standpoint, the continuation of the circular plaza works fairly well, and the landscaping works well to connect to the parking lot; c) The proposed water fountain at the entry should remain, however he would support removing the second water feature; d) The metal cap element needs to be studied; e) The trellis element between the two sections of the building would work well; e) The architecture seems very bland on the east elevation of Building 12 B, facing Los Carneros Road after turning the corner, and should have a better design statement because this is the signature corner of the project; and f) On the south elevation, there needs to be some architectural enhancement to reinforce the location of the walkway portion of the building.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The metal cap elements do not seem appropriate and should be removed; b) The concept of the sandstone curving is appreciated. Also appreciated is the gradient effect of the glazing with the lighter color at the bottom and graduating to darker at the top; c) He supports addressing the overall concepts of green roof architecture and photovoltaics in the plans; d) Suggested considering that the west side on Building 12A would be designated as the back of the building; e) The proposed landscape plan is appreciated, including the multi-layered texture between the hardscape and softscape; and f) Requested that amenities be provided to facilitate use of the outdoor plaza area for outdoor eating and for musical performances; for example, install electrical outlets for musical instruments.
3. Member Brown commented: a) The lighting fixtures should be mounted with the light facing downward; b) The lighting needs to be addressed to make sure it is sufficient for the pathway; c) The light needs to be appropriate depending on its intended use, for example outdoor dining and pathways; d) Consider adding large trellises and vines for relief along the south side of Building 12A; e) The landscaping which appears rich and robust is appreciated; f) There needs to be enough chairs provided and outdoor places for people to sit and enjoy the open space even if people bring their lunch; and g) The view of the mountains from the outdoor area is important to many people.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Overall, the project is fine; b) The landscape plan is appreciated; c) The metal cap element seems ambiguous and should be removed; d) The secondary water feature should be retained on the south side; e) The south elevation architecture needs to be enhanced particularly to reinforce the walkway portion of the building; f) The architecture on the east elevation of Building 12B, facing Los Carneros, needs to be enhanced; and g) He appreciates that the setback widens as one approaches the intersection.
5. Member Messner commented: a) Overall, the landscape plan is appreciated, including the groundcovers; b) The tree species located around Building 12A need to be called out on the plans; c) Requested that one or two more Monterey Cypress trees be added on the Los Carneros Road side for balance; for example, in front of Building 12 to tie in with the other two trees, forming a triangle; d) Both water features should be retained; e) Vines on the trellis would be fine considering there will maintenance for the landscaping; f) Suggested that consideration be

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 13 of 18

given with regard to some type of street art; for example, placing figurines at certain locations; g) The applicant will need to follow standards with regard to root barriers; and h) There are new cost breaks associated with photovoltaic applications.

6. Member Herrera commented: a) Recommended that the plans include as many permeable pavers as possible; b) The landscape plan is very good; and c) The two water features are appreciated.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) He believes the whole design should be flipped so that parking and service areas are located between Hollister Avenue and Building 12A and Building 12B; and the food court areas are located to the south in the current parking area, which would address his concern that the people in the outdoor area would be subjected to the hustle and bustle of traffic, especially during noontime; b) The metal cap element should be removed; c) The east elevation of Building 12B and the south elevation of both buildings need some treatment to relieve the blandness; d) Recommended that provisions be built into the current design for future photovoltaics and green roof applications; and e) The applicant is requested to provide a rendering of the intersection of Hollister Avenue and Los Carneros Road, looking southwest towards the project, that would illustrate the amenities and the plans for screening.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-4, No. 08-169-DRB and 08-170-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to November 12, 2008, with comments.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 04-226-DRB

7388 Calle Real (APN 077-490-043)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The project has been increased by two units following the Planning Commission hearing on September 8, 2008. The revised project includes a Final Development Plan for 12 condominium units totaling 20,952 square feet, including two affordable units, associated infrastructure, and common open space on approximately .94 acres in the DR-12.3 zone district. Five residential unit types are proposed within three, three-story structures (Buildings A-C) arranged along the eastern portion of the site. The buildings would have a maximum height of 34 feet 3 inches and would each contain four attached units consisting of three, three-bedroom units and one two-bedroom unit. The units in Building A would range from 1,043 square feet to 1,463 square feet. The units in Buildings B and C would range from 869 square feet to 1,512 square feet. Access to the site would be via Calle Real. Parking would include 12 one-car garages at 248 square feet each and 24 parking spaces, for a total of 36 spaces. The project was filed by Detlev Peikert, representing 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner. Related cases 04-226-TM, -DP. (Last heard on 7-08-08) (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by Lisa Plowman, planning manager, Peikert Group Architects; Detlev Peikert, representing 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner; and April Palencia, project architect. Lisa Plowman stated that in response to review by the Planning Commission, the applicant has prepared refined conceptual plans for

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 14 of 18

review by the DRB. She clarified that this project is a State bonus density project under State law. Detlev Peikert discussed the details with regard to the revised plans including the Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, and Sections. He provided an aerial photograph showing how the development is configured on the site, and existing footprints of the adjacent condominium; and also photo simulations showing the view of the project from Calle Real.

Senior Planner Cindy Moore stated that the Planning Commission continued the public hearing on this project to November 10, 2008, to allow time for the DRB to respond to the revised plans.

Documents: Letter from Karen Lovelace, Goleta, dated October 14, 2008, Re: October 14, 2008, DRB Agenda Item M-1, 7388 Calle Real, AKA "Citrus Village".

Speakers:

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, discussed the history of previous development plans for the site and expressed concern that the current DR-12.3 zone district would allow the potential for a very high Floor Area Ratio (FAR). She expressed her concerns which included: a) In comparison to adjacent development, this project is way out of scale; b) There would be too much development on the site; c) The items in the landscape plan appear too crammed together; d) The existing landscaping along the east side of the property is not within the control of the project and is located on an elevation approximately five feet lower than the site. e) The landscaping along the west side between the commercial and residential properties would not be adequate; f) The drainage plan shows that the lot slopes between Building A and Building B, and the lot slopes between Building B and Building C, which is not conducive to providing a comfortable open space; g) The tot lot is located in a drainage basin area; h) The craftsmen design is not appropriate for this site and will stand out; i) Suggested an architectural style that blends in better, with a lower height; j) Recommended story poles for this project site; k) She noted that the Planning Commission did not review the specific details of the revised plans which were provided by the applicant at this review; and m) Requested the DRB make sure the project is compatible with the neighborhood.

Bill Shelor, Goleta, appreciates that the revised plans will include affordable housing units, stating that the plans are an improvement over the previous plans. He said he is always concerned regarding the potential loss of mountain views. He expressed concern regarding the proposed building height and requested that story poles be installed that fully gauge the visual impact. He questioned whether the trees that are proposed to be located in the front of the buildings will eventually obscure the third levels.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) He understands that including affordable units is desirable, noting that the site plan appears somewhat dense based on the number of units. b) While he understands the desire to add additional parking

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 15 of 18

spaces, he suggested considering whether it would be more efficient to use one or two parking spaces for a central trash collection area for all units rather than requiring each unit to place bins along the road on collection day and to store bins in each garage; c) The proposed architectural character of the design is fine and works relatively well, noting that it is a friendly style and would be better than trying to match adjacent styles; d) The roof on Building A is softened by keeping the unit a two-bedroom unit, and it softens Building A facing Calle Real quite well; e) He suggested that the northern rear unit in Building C be changed to a two-bedroom unit, softening the roof form, which will address his concern that Building C appears to loom over the adjacent Brookside Condominiums to the north.

2. Member Branch commented: a) He agreed with Member Schneider's suggestion to change the northern unit to a two-bedroom unit to help soften the building mass adjacent to the condominium development; b) He acknowledged the need for a centralized trash collection methodology with regard to the concern that there will be a large number of individual trash cans set out for trash collection; c) He cannot support the reduction of parking spaces, noting that parking is important for this particular site which has no street parking; d) The proposed architecture is a style that would help accommodate a third story; and e) The architectural style is fine, stating that it may be counter productive to try to match existing styles.
3. Member Brown commented: a) There should be a way to find space on the site for recycling and trash collection purposes without reducing parking; b) The placement of the utilities, which makes a difference in the appearance of the final product, needs to be shown on the plans and reviewed; c) In her opinion, the proposed architecture style appears somewhat too stylized; d) Details such as fences will need to be reviewed at the appropriate review level; e) Moving the units away from the west property line is appreciated; and f) In general, infill site are difficult with regard to project development and review.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The proposed plans for twelve units seem to try to place too much development on this site; b) He believes that an eleven-unit project would be more appropriate for the site; c) A centralized trash collection area would be beneficial; d) A central mail area may be beneficial; e) He agreed with Members Schneider and Branch that softening the architecture on Unit 12 on the north elevation is needed; and f) Moving the units away from the west property line is appreciated.
5. Member Messner commented: a) He expressed concern that the Unit 12, with the three-story element, will appear to tower up over the adjacent property; and agreed with the DRB comments to consider softening the architecture; b) Story poles may be useful; and c) The site plan appears tight; and suggested finding ways to reduce this; for example consider a centralized trash collection area and centralized location for mail.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) He suggested reducing the number of units from twelve to eleven; and b) Suggested that an area near the tot lot, located between the first garage and catch basin, be considered for the location of a central trash area.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) It would be beneficial to erect story poles that would show the dimensions of the buildings, particularly the height of Building C in the back; b) He expressed concern with regard to circulation, for example, visitors who park on the west side of the property would need to walk along a foot path to the

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 16 of 18

east side of the property to enter the units; c) He suggested splitting the garages into two two-car garages with a central alley and gates which would allow visitors to enter the residences from the yard, and also allow the residents to keep their trash containers inside the yard and place them out on collection day; d) He recommended that numbered parking spaces be assigned for each unit and be located as close to the unit as possible; e) Visitor parking spaces should be designated and labeled for use by visitors; f) He requested that a walkway be added along the north side, between Unit 12 and the property line, and also along the south side, between Unit 1 and the detention basin, if there is room; and g) He agreed with DRB comments suggesting that the mass of Unit 12 in Building C be scaled back, noting that there is a large window in Unit 12 looking down into an adjacent yard.

Detlev Peikert, applicant, stated that the DRB comments were very constructive; including the following suggestions: a) change Unit 12 to a two-bedroom unit to soften the architecture to the north; b) explore possible solutions to create a central trash area; c) consider splitting the garages into two two-car garages, (if there is room); and d) consider adding walkways or stepping stones along the south and north side of the site. He said that reducing the number of units from twelve to eleven would not be possible at this time without losing one affordable unit.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 04-226-DRB, 7388 Calle Real, with comments, to December 9, 2008.

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

Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road (APN 079-210-049)

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

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

Common open space would total approximately 302,282 square feet (48%) exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated to the City of Goleta, and includes a children's play area and trail, with benches throughout the proposed Devereux Creek restoration area. A conceptual landscape plan includes restoration of the Devereux Creek corridor. The 87 eucalyptus and 8 cypress trees to be removed would be replaced with a total of 282 drought tolerant Mediterranean and native tree species, both ornamental (e.g., Melaluca, London Plane Tree, etc.) and indigenous to the area (e.g., coast live oak and sycamore).

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 17 of 18

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

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

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

The project was submitted on May 8, 2007 by agent Mary Meaney Reichel, Lucon Inc., on behalf of the Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership, property owner. Related cases: 07-102-GP, 07-102-DP, 07-102-VTM. (Last heard on 8-26-08, 7-22-08, 6-10-08, 4-22-08, 3-25-08) (David Stone)

The plans were presented by agent Mary Meaney Reichel, Lucon Inc., on behalf of the Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership, property owner, and Mark Scheurer, project architect. Mark Scheurer stated that he met with DRB Member Schneider and Member Branch who provided good suggestions during the revision process. He presented and discussed the document entitled, "Haskell's Landing, Goleta, California, October 2008 Revisions".

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The revisions are very good; b) He appreciates that the rendering on the front cover of the document is back in the plans; and c) The concept of having a toolbox and mixing certain parts is appreciated.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The California architecture design is reflective of the area's unique living styles both current and past, and more appropriate than European architecture; b) The revisions will make a difference and the applicant's efforts are appreciated.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The revisions are much-appreciated; b) The three architectural styles work very well together; and c) Removing the "S-tile" is a big improvement.
4. Member Branch commented: a) The revisions are a vast improvement and present a creative solution for the site; and b) He has reservations with regard to the relationship of the awnings on the buildings.
5. Member Messner commented: a) The revised plans are good.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) The revised plans are an improvement and the project is very attractive.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) The appearance of the Coastal architecture design elevations, shown on page 7, would benefit by being an earth-tone color rather than white. b) Suggested that the chimney shrouds be smaller and appropriate in scale; and 3) Recommended that steps be taken to address fire concerns when designing the roofs and selecting materials.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 14, 2008

Page 18 of 18

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to take of calendar with comments Item M-2, No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Aramas Road, to be forwarded for Planning Commission review.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. DENSITY DISCUSSION

There being no objections, Chair Wignot stated that Item O-1, Density Discussion, will be continued to October 28, 2008.

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Member Brown requested that staff schedule an agenda item to conduct a year-end review of selected projects that were completed during this year.

O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Member Herrera expressed concern that there is an overgrowth of trees where South Patterson Avenue intersects the bike path at Maria Ygnacio Creek which obstructs the motorists' view of the bike path area.

Chair Wignot stated that this area along South Patterson Avenue is within the County's jurisdiction. He will send an email to County staff advising of the situation.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 7:45 P.M.

Minutes approved on October 28, 2008.

Design Review Board Agenda

October 14, 2008

Page 19 of 19