

# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

#### REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, March 11, 2008

# CONSENT CALENDAR

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:

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 3:12 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.

March 11, 2008 Page 2 of 18

Staff present: Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager; Laura VIk, Associate Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

#### **B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

#### **B-1. MEETING MINUTES**

A. Design Review Board Minutes for February 26, 2008

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to approve the Design Review Board minutes for February 26, 2008, as submitted.

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

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the next Street Tree Subcommittee meeting will be on March 25, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

#### **B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT**

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller reported: 1) applications for the DRB are due on April 3, 2008, to fill one licensed landscape professional position and one licensed architect position, both of which will be expiring; 2) a DRB work session will be held to discuss changes to the DRB Bylaws which staff anticipates may be recommended to the City Council in the May/June timeframe; 3) the Planning caseload is increasing, including requests for discretionary permits, which will result in an increase in volume of the DRB reviews; and 4) the City Initiated General Plan Amendments in Track 2 will be considered at a special meeting of the Planning Commission to be held on March 24, 2008, at 6:00 p.m..

# C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

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

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller reported: 1) the applicant for Item H-3, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, requested a continuance and staff recommends that the continuation date be April 8, 2008; 2) staff recommends that Item K-1, No. 07-103-DRB, 26 Coromar Drive, be taken off calendar to allow time for processing actions that need to be taken; and 3) staff requests that Item N-3, Project Approval v. Built Slideshow, be continued to March 25, 2008. She stated that Item L-2, No. 07-229-DRB, 10 South Kellogg Avenue, was continued to be held at a 3:15 p.m. time certain at today's meeting.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to continue Item H-3, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to April 8, 2008, per the applicant's request and staff recommendation to continue to April 8, 2008.

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

March 11, 2008 Page 3 of 18

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to take Item K-1, No. 07-103-DRB, 26 Coromar Drive, off calendar per staff's request; and to continue Item N-3, Project Approval v. Built Slideshow, to March 25, 2008, per staff's request.

#### E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

#### F. CONSENT CALENDAR

None

#### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Schneider reported that the Subcommittee reviewed today Items H-1, No. 07-234-DRB; Item H-2, No. 08-008-DRB; Item H-4, No. 08-013-DRB: Item H-5, No. 08-024-DRB; and Item H-6, No. 08-028-DRB.

#### H. SIGN CALENDAR

#### H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-234-DRB

6740 Cortona Drive (APN 073-150-024)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes an approximately 55,302-square foot industrial building on a 3.14-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The building is divided into two tenant spaces; tenant space A occupies 36,412-square feet, while tenant space B occupies 18,890-square feet.

The applicant proposes to install a new wall sign for tenant space B. The sign would read "LCOGT" and would contain a globe logo. The dimensions of the sign would be 60" wide by 26" high, with a sign area of approximately 11-square feet. The wall sign would have ¾ " deep pin-mounted aluminum lettering painted blue, red, yellow, and green with enamel paint. The 26" high globe logo will be painted grey. No lighting is proposed. The project was filed by Dave Jones of Lenvik & Minor Architects, on behalf of Arnon Blau, property owner. Related cases: 07-184-OSP. (Last heard on 2-26-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on March 11, 2008:

Planning Technician Brian Hiefield stated that Item H-1, No. 07-234-DRB, was granted Preliminary Approval as submitted on February 26, 2008.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Subcommittee Member Brown moved, seconded by Subcommittee Member Schneider and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to grant Final Approval of Item H-1, No. 07-234-DRB, 6740 Cortona Drive, as submitted.

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

March 11, 2008 Page 4 of 18

#### H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-008-DRB

55 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-007)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 32,800-square foot single-story commercial property on a 1.95-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to install a new wall sign. The sign would read "FLIR", with 18" tall letters and a double-diamond shaped logo 30" tall. The overall area of the sign is 18 square feet. The wall sign would be constructed of 0.063"-thick aluminum letters painted dark blue (PMS 287C). No lighting is proposed. The project was filed by Christian Muldoon of Vogue Sign Company, agent, on behalf of 55 Castilian LLC, property owner, and FLIR Systems, tenant. Related cases: 08-008-SCC. (Last heard on 2-26-08) (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on March 11, 2008:

Assistant Planner Shine Ling stated that the applicant reduced the height of the letters to 15 inches in response to the DRB's condition of Preliminary Approval.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Subcommittee Member Brown moved, seconded by Subcommittee Member Schneider and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to grant Final Approval of Item H-2, No. 08-008-DRB, 55 Castilian Drive, as submitted.

#### H-3. 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 will have 4½ -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 2-26-08\*, 2-12-08\*, 1-23-08\*, 1-08-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to continue Item H-3, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to April 8, 2008, per the applicant's request, and staff recommendation to continue to April 8, 2008.

# H-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-013-DRB

6860 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-015)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes three buildings totaling approximately 31,800 square feet of industrial building, warehouse, and chemical storage space on a 4.4-acre parcel in the M-RP (Industrial Research

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

March 11, 2008 Page 5 of 18

Park) zone district. The applicant proposes to install a monument sign at the front of the building. The dimensions of the monument structure would be 8' long by 4'-6" tall with an area of approximately 36-square feet. The sign attached to each side of the monument would be approximately 6'-2" long by 2'-11" tall, with an area of approximately 18-square feet. The non-illuminated signs would have pin-mounted bronze color letters for the building address, pin-mounted bronze colored suite numbers, and pin-mounted aluminum plates with bronze colored vinyl for the tenant names. The CMU monument structure will have 8" by 8" patterns cut into it, and paint to match the building. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 07-191-OSP, -DRB, -CUP, -DPAM. (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on March 11, 2008:

The plans were presented by Dan Michealsen, property owner.

#### Comments:

- 1. Member Brown expressed concern regarding the potential for light trespass problems with up-light fixtures, stating that the lighting fixtures need to be installed correctly to prevent light spillage.
- 2. The pampas grass should be removed as a condition of approval.
- 3. The Sign Subcommittee recommends Preliminary Approval with the above comments.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-4, No. 08-013-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, with the following conditions: 1) the lamp should be mounted so there is no light spillage above or beyond the sides of the monument sign; 2) the applicant shall add appropriate groundcover area to soften the sign; and 3) the pampas grass shall be removed; and to continue to March 25, 2008, for Final review.

# H-5. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-024-DRB

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

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

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on March 11, 2008:

The plans were presented by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. He stated that their intent is that the same sign program would be

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

March 11, 2008 Page 6 of 18

continued on the parcel to the west in the Hollister Business Park which has a separate owner. He clarified that the surfboard design for the directory signs has been removed for consideration and that the new design would be something that is not necessarily a surfboard but may be iconic of a surfboard, or possibly a schooner.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling stated that there are two separate parcels in the Hollister Business Park complex that have two separate owners which is somewhat complex when considering an Overall Sign Plan. He recommended that the DRB make Conceptual comments during the review regarding the number of signs, sizes, locations and design of the signs for the Citrix Online parcel. He stated that staff will prepare an Overall Sign Plan for consideration.

#### Comments:

- 1. Monument Signs: a) the monument sign is fine; b) the stone base shall be added on the second monument sign; c) only the tenant's business name should be listed on the monument sign for identification purposes, not descriptors or details which add clutter; and d) the maximum height of the Citrix letters needs to be defined, with the recommended height of approximately twelve (12) inches, which may be further considered when the applicant provides information verifying calculations of the dimensions.
- 2. <u>Directory Signs:</u> a) the size of the sign seems too big and tall relative to driving through the project; b) the sign appears too busy although the arrows are appreciated; c) only the tenant's business name should be on the sign, not logos or descriptors; d) the applicant is requested to study lowering the height of the sign, downsizing the scale and making it not appear so busy; e) the addresses should remain but the text regarding building numbers, for example "BUILDING 5" should be eliminated; f) some of the negative space at the top should be removed; g) usually the letter heights are uniform on signs internal to a complex; h) for consideration, one of the Directional Signs may not be needed; and i) Member Schneider commented that the previous surfboard design seemed interesting although it was too big and, being vertical, it would be difficult to lower the height.
- 3. <u>Building Identification Signs</u>: a) there is concern that the Citrix Online sign does not need to be so big because it is located internal to the complex; b) consider whether the signage on the building needs to be seen from Hollister Avenue; c) the applicant is requested to study reducing the maximum height of the address lettering to a height between ten (10) inches and twelve (12) inches, with the emphasis on the lower height; d) consider the proportionate relationship of the address lettering with the Citrix Online sign; and e) Member Schneider commented that a problem with designing signage to be in scale with a building is that the signage becomes too big.
- 4. Staff is requested to research and report back regarding the separate ownerships of the two parcels in the Hollister Business Park and how this relationship would be addressed in an Overall Sign Plan.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-5, No. 08-024-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, to March 25, 2008, with comments.

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

March 11, 2008 Page 7 of 18

#### H-6. 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. (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on March 11, 2008:

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

#### Comments:

- 1. The applicant shall define in the Overall Sign Plan the locations in the building of the major tenants and the minor tenants; and also define the type of sign materials for the major tenants and the minor tenants.
- 2. Member Schneider recommended a maximum height of ten (10) inches for the letters on the signs for the major tenants facing Hollister Avenue, stating that the Goleta Heritage District Architecture & Design Guidelines suggests that letter heights shall be limited to a maximum of ten (10) inches.
- 3. The height of the letters for the tenant signs located inside the courtyard, which includes the minor tenants, shall be a maximum height of eight (8) inches.
- 4. The applicant shall study the "LA PLACITA DE GOLETA" sign in the courtyard on the Inner North View elevation to understand the best relationship with regard to the letter size and location of the sign on the building, possibly making it larger.
- The maximum height shall be ten (10) inches for the "5730" address in the courtyard on the Inner North View which would match the other ten-inch letter heights.
- 6. The applicant shall study possibly omitting the "LA PLACITA DE GOLETA" signs on the east facing and west facing sides of the building.
- 7. The tenant signs shall not contain descriptors.
- 8. The applicant shall provide more details regarding the proposal for a tenant directory on the east side and the west side of the building, including text size and materials.
- 9. The Overall Sign Plan will need to address all signs including standards for the use of temporary signs, such as banners, at certain times.
- 10. A condition of approval should be added that the applicant shall remove all unpermitted signs before the Overall Sign Plan is approved.
- 11. Member Brown expressed concern that many of the unpermitted signs have been allowed to proliferate by owners in Old Town, stating that on this particular building there are banner and window signs that detract from the building's appearance.
- 12. The applicant's efforts to clean up the building with regard to signs are appreciated.

March 11, 2008 Page 8 of 18

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-6, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, to March 25, 2008, with comments.

#### I. FINAL CALENDAR

#### I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-006-DRB

5746 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-008)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 700-square foot retail commercial building on a 2,000-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to remodel the front façade and construct a new wall sign. New materials for the façade include a tile roof parapet, a new forest-green cloth awning, dual glazed windows with red ceramic tile accents, a glass front door with dark brown wood trim, and smooth trowel plaster (La Habra Eggshell 73/Base 100 stucco). The new awning would project 4' from the face of the building. The wall sign would be constructed of 1"-thick injection-molded plastic letters in Times Roman face. The sign would read "DEL VALLE GRILL" on the top line, with 8"-tall red letters, and "MEXICAN RESTAURANT" on the bottom line, with 4"-tall black letters. The overall area of the sign is 10 square feet. The sign would be lit by a gooseneck wall-mounted light fixture (Teka DWM5160). The project was filed by Jorge Escamilla of sTitch Studio, agent, on behalf of Solita Velazquez, property owner, and Ruben Del Valle, tenant. Related cases: 08-006-LUP; 08-007-SCC. (Last heard on 2-12-08) (Shine Ling & Jaime Valdez)

The plans were presented by Jorge Escamilla of sTitch Studio, agent, on behalf of Solita Velazquez, property owner, and Mrs. Del Valle, tenant. Jorge Escamilla stated that the light fixture to the left on the front elevation was removed. He provided the cut sheet for the lighting being proposed for the sign and a sample of the tile to replace the tile that will be removed at the sidewalk level. He stated that the tenant is comfortable with the screen door being removed and has decided not to install a door with a screen inside the door because of the cost for the door. He also said that the detail was revised to show that the roof tile was angled.

#### Comments:

1. It would be more attractive for the grout for the sidewalk tile to be the same color as the tile because over time the lighter color proposed for the grout may turn color.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item I-1, No. 08-006-DRB, 5746 Hollister Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) the light fixture shall be the same fixture shown on the cut sheet submitted by the applicant [the TMS Lighting Sign Light Model H100]; and 2) the color of the grout shall be the same color as the tile.

# J. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

None

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

#### K. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

#### K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-103-DRB

26 Coromar Drive (APN 073-150-013)

This is a request for Conceptual/Preliminary review. The property includes a 33,600square foot manufacturing building, a 360-square foot compressor room, a 400square foot storage garage, a 1,000-square foot hazardous materials building, and a 2,160-square foot covered storage area on a 155,580-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct additions on site in three phases. Phase I, a 1,000-square foot hazardous materials building, was previously constructed under case number 06-093-SCD & 06-093-LUP. Phase II consists of a new 8,800-square foot clean room addition to the main manufacturing building, two 400-square foot outbuildings, and the demolition of 1,760-square feet of the covered storage area. A landscape plan is also a part of this proposal, and all materials used for this phase are to match the existing commercial property. Phase III proposes a 10,400-square foot office addition to the existing manufacturing building. This phase also includes its own landscape plan, and all materials used for this phase are to match the existing commercial property. The project was filed by agent David L. Burke on behalf of Renco Encoders, property owner. Related cases: 06-093-SCD, 06-093-LUP, & 07-103-DP. (Continued from 1-08-08) (Laura VIk)

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to take Item K-1, No. 07-103-DRB, 26 Coromar Drive, off calendar per staff's request.

#### K-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-206-DRB

163 Aero Camino (APN 073-070-004)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* 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 2-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

The plans were presented by agent David Jones with Lenvik & Minor Architects on behalf of Marc Winnikoff, property owner. He stated that the following two minor changes have been made to the plans since the last review: 1) one bay has been cut back from the proposed arcade to provide an area which will be used by the tenant to install a picnic table; and 2) the arcade proposed in the front is now a free-standing arcade rather than touching the building. He proposed using the yellow color at the entrance with a backing wall of red, and keeping the gray color for the

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

March 11, 2008 Page 10 of 18

enclosures around the liquid nitrogen tank and around the fire sprinkler riser. He proposed minimal lighting that is fully shielded and shines downward for safety purposes in the arcade area.

#### Comments:

1. Vice Chair Wignot requested that the applicant provide information at Final review to confirm that the cladding material is UV-resistant and designed for exterior use so that it will not begin to disintegrate over time. He expressed concern that some compounds do not stand up to exposed sunlight over time.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-2, No. 07-206-DRB, 163 Aero Camino, with the following conditions: 1) the lighting fixtures shall be fully shielded and downward oriented; 2) the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets at Final review; and 3) the applicant shall provide cladding material spec sheets at Final review that confirm that the material is UV-resistant and designed for exterior use; and to continue to April 22, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

#### K-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-023-DRB

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. On the eastern parcel of the HBP the applicant proposes to augment the landscape and lighting plans, to construct a new park/seating area on a grassy area at the northeast corner of the eucalyptus barranca, to construct a new access ramp and door on the western elevation of Building 5, to convert the water treatment building into a fitness activity center, to construct a new basketball court next to the fitness activity center, and to convert existing water storage tanks into thermal storage tanks. No changes in building height, building coverage, or floor area are proposed. The materials for the revisions to the exterior elevations of Building 5 and the fitness activity center would match existing materials. The project was filed by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 08-023-SCD; -08-023-LUP. (Continued from 2-26-08) (Shine Ling)

The plans were presented by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant; and Don Wynn, project landscape architect. Steve Rice provided lighting cut sheets and also . He clarified that the storage tanks will be protected by a six-foot high wall. Don Wynn presented the landscape plans and stated that he has addressed most of the concerns expressed by the DRB at the last hearing.

# Comments:

- 1. The project is moving in a good direction.
- 2. The landscape plans and the changes that have been made are appreciated.

March 11, 2008 Page 11 of 18

- 3. The proposal for the artwork and painting on the water tanks is supported. The DRB looks forward to reviewing the artwork design plans.
- 4. Member Messner suggested blending one picture between two tanks, and that a homogeneous vision be considered for the artwork.
- 5. Member Schneider recommended using colors for the artwork which will offset the basic appearance of the building.
- 6 The applicant is requested to consider using bollards that provide downward lighting, not horizontal; for example, louvered bollards.
- 7. Member Smith commented that the proposed gray color for the fitness activity center building seems "colder" than the other buildings.
- 8. Vice Chair Wignot requested that staff update the project description to clarify that the access ramp is existing and that a new ramp will not be constructed.

MOTION: Chair Branch moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-3, No. 08-023-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, with the following conditions: 1) the bollards shall be louvered bollards; 2) a warmer gray color shall be used for the fitness activity center building; 3) the final plans shall include a note that all *vinca* species shall be removed; and 4) the applicant shall provide all plans required for Final review including irrigation and landscape plans; and to continue to continue to April 8, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

#### RECESS HELD FROM 5:00 P.M. TO 5:10 P.M.

#### K-4. 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 Dexign Systems, agent, on behalf of Robert Andre, property owner. Related cases: 08-026-LUP. (Shine Ling)

<u>Site visits</u>: Made by all members present except Messner, Schneider and Smith. Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Tony Xiques of Dexign Systems, agent, on behalf of Robert Andre, property owner; and Robert Andre, property owner. Tony Xiques stated that there are approximately fifteen to twenty homes that have two stories in the neighborhood. Robert Andre stated that the portion of the existing garage that was converted to an office will be reconverted back to a garage use.

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

March 11, 2008 Page 12 of 18

Assistant Planner Shine Ling presented a letter received today from Donald and Stephanie Wilson, dated March 8, 2008, regarding this project. Shine Ling stated that no other correspondence or telephone calls have been received regarding the project.

Chair Branch read the letter received from Donald and Stephanie Wilson in opposition to the second-floor addition, which expressed concerns with regard to issues of privacy loss, blocked views and retaining the character of the neighborhood.

#### SPEAKER:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, stated that he appreciates that a portion of the garage will be reconverted because he was concerned regarding parking. He requested that the DRB address the neighbor's concerns regarding privacy. He expressed the following concerns: 1) the drawings do not show enough detail regarding the adjacent structures to be able to review with regard to privacy; b) the photographs do not provide a clear picture of the views from various windows because the photos are taken from on top of the main house rather than on top of the garage; and 3) the proposed wetbar may provide for the potential use of the room as a studio apartment.

#### Comments:

- 1. Vice Chair Wignot stated that he cannot support the addition where it is proposed: He commented: a) the proposed addition in front would be too much mass located too close to the street and it is unappealing visually from the street; b) the design does not fit with the configuration of the existing house; c) the views from the second story may not necessarily impact the adjacent neighbors because the view would be onto their roofs and not their backyard; d) a second-story addition set further back on the property may work because the property is elevated immediately in the back; e) he drove around the entire San Miguel tract today and observed approximately six or eight two-story homes located intermittently within the tract; and f) most of the better designed two-story residences in the neighborhood are set back from the street.
- Member Brown commented that the addition needs to be better integrated with the house and expressed concern that the proposed design appears to be a box on top of the garage.
- 3. Member Smith stated that the two-story addition needs to be pushed back from the garage, brought off the street, and possibly centered above near the living room and garage mass.
- 4. Member Schneider agreed with the previous comments from DRB members.
- 5. Chair Branch agreed with the previous comments from DRB members. He noted that the hill to the back of the property would be advantageous with regard to pushing back the second-story addition. Window issues can be addressed regarding privacy concerns.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-4, No. 08-026-DRB, 7859 Rio Vista Drive, with comments, to April 22, 2008.

#### L. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

#### L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-180-DRB

5737 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-033-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property consists of an existing single family dwelling and detached garage on a 6,227-square foot lot in the R-2 zone district. The existing single family home and garage will be demolished, to be followed by the construction of a two-story duplex. The proposed project is a one-lot subdivision of a 0.14-acre lot for condominium purposes to create a duplex structure, consisting of two (2) attached residential airspace units. Unit #1 (front unit) will be 3 bedrooms, 2.75 baths and would total 1,999 square feet, while Unit #2 (rear unit) will be 3 bedrooms, 2.5 baths and would total 1,735 square feet. The proposed building coverage on site will be 2,077 square feet or 33% of the 6,227 square foot lot. Landscaping will consist of 2,495 square feet or 40% of the existing lot; paved areas consist of 1,665 square feet or 27% of the existing lot. The proposed Floor-to-Area ratio (FAR), including garage areas, is 0.60. The maximum height of the structure is 25'-7". Discretionary approval for a Modification to required front and rear vard setbacks is also requested. The project was filed by Troy White of Dudek Engineering and Environmental, agent, for Eva and Silvino Guerrero, property owners. Related cases: 07-180-TPM; -M; -LUP. (Shine Ling)

<u>Site visits</u>: Made by all members present except Branch, Schneider and Smith. <u>Ex-parte conversations</u>: None.

The plans were presented by Troy White of Dudek Engineering and Environmental, agent for Eva and Silvino Guerrero, property owners; and by Keith Nolan, ON Design, project architect. Keith Nolan stated that the design concept is to create two relatively small units with the primary living spaces downstairs with the bedrooms upstairs. Troy White stated that a licensed civil engineer was hired with regard to the plans for the project's drainage and clarified that there will not be drainage to any adjacent sites and that the drainage will comply with NPDES requirements.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling clarified for the record that the row of information entitled "Maximum FAR Guidelines" in the Zoning Consistency Table on Page 2 of the staff report, which was inadvertently included in the table, should be deleted, stating that the R-2 zone district does not currently have FAR guidelines. Shine Ling read an excerpt of the DRB comments on July 5, 2006, regarding the final decision of a previous project proposal on the site.

# SPEAKERS:

Spike Moore, Goleta, next door neighbor, expressed concerns regarding impacts from over-utilization in the neighborhood which include parking problems and traffic congestion. He would consider supporting a nice project, possibly a duplex, if it is much smaller and more appropriate for the Old Town neighborhood. He stated that there are ongoing problems with regard to grading and drainage issues related to the applicant's property that affect his property, and requested that these issues be addressed as part of the project.

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

March 11, 2008 Page 14 of 18

Dennis Mastagni, Goleta, stated that he has lived across the street from the project for fifty-five years, and expressed concern with regard to over-utilization of the property in the past and potential for future problems in the neighborhood without some methods of enforcement.

Mike Zika, neighbor, requested that the DRB members visit the site at approximately 9:00 p.m. to observe parking and traffic problems from over-utilization in the neighborhood. He expressed concern regarding more impacts in the neighborhood from the addition of another big complex on a small lot.

#### Comments:

- 1. Member Brown commented: a) the size of the project cannot be supported in this neighborhood of smaller houses; b) the project is rather ambitious and the square footages are generous; c) no modifications are supported particularly when large structures and sidewalks are added which affect the proportionality of the scale of the neighborhood; d) a bigger single-family home would be preferred; e) concern that there would be a lot of hardscape, therefore, not be much room for landscaping; f) the architecture is nice; and g) the addition of bioswales is appreciated; and h) condominiums are a new concept in the neighborhood.
- 2. Vice Chair Wignot agreed with the comments made by Member Brown regarding the ambitiousness of the project. He commented; a) the lower entry layout to Unit #2 does not appear very attractive; b) the projects seems to give more attention to the garages and cars than to Unit #2; c) concern that the turning area for the cars seems to be very difficult; d) suggested a way to address the turning issue would be to eliminate the garage to the west of Unit #2 and provide four parallel parking spaces underneath the building; and e) there is too much floor space and the parking is problematic.
- 3. Member Schneider commented: a) the modifications and setbacks are acceptable; b) overall, the design is pleasant including the character and some detailing although he has suggestions regarding some architectural details; c) some potential privacy problems could be resolved by addressing the windows; d) with regard to the neighborhood, consider reducing the project, possibly decreasing the number of bedrooms in one or both units; e) staff is requested to research possibilities for modifications to parking design that could improve the appearance of the entry to Unit #2; and f) the neighbor's concerns regarding utilization of the property are somewhat beyond the purview of the DRB and may need to be addressed at the Zoning Administrator level.
- 4. Member Smith concurred with Member Schneider's comments. He commented:
  a) the turning room and accessibility to the garages seem problematic; b) there needs to be consideration with regard to providing room on the site for trash purposes; c) he supports the modifications; and d) the style of the massing is fine.
- 5. Member Messner commented: a) he has concerns regarding safety and Fire Department accessibility with the ten-foot wide driveway and a long, narrow way to the back unit; b) the bioswale solution does not seem to serve the purpose; c) the turn-around area for cars in the driveway does not seem to have enough room; and d) the project needs to be scaled back to fit in the neighborhood.

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

March 11, 2008 Page 15 of 18

- 6. Member Herrera commented: a) suggested locating the parking to the west side of the property underneath Unit #2 with all four cars parked in a row underneath the structure where there would be enough room to turn around; b) consider removing one bedroom, and possibly one bathroom, from Unit #2; and c) consider permeable pavers in the driveway or split concrete to allow drainage.
- 7. Chair Branch commented: a) agreed with comments from Members Schneider and Smith, and with Member Brown that the project is too big; b) the project appears to be an improvement from the previous proposed project on the site and well thought-out; c) the entry area to Unit #2 needs some reconfiguration; d) the modifications seem appropriate; and e) the drainage concerns will need to be mitigated; and f) the lot is small for an R-2 zone.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 07-180-DRB, 5737 Armitos Avenue, to April 8, 2008, with comments.

#### L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-229-DRB

10 South Kellogg Avenue (APN 071-090-082)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 4,400-square foot, two-story warehouse/office, an 875-square foot garage, and a 1,750-square foot carport for a total of floor area of 7,025-square feet on an 89,628-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes the demolition of all existing structures and grading involving approximately 610-cubic yards of cut and 1,950-cubic yards of fill to prep the site for the construction of a 3-story self-storage facility comprised of 3 separate, 3-story buildings with both drive-up and interior storage units. The project also includes an office/sales space and an onsite manager's apartment.

Building A would be 36,055 square feet with 1,025 square feet devoted to office/sales use and include a 2-story manager's apartment of 1,428 square feet. Building B would be 37,890 square feet, all of which would be devoted to storage. Building C would be 37,785 square feet, all of which would be devoted to storage space. A total of 48 parking spaces would be provided and the property's perimeter would be fenced and gated.

The project also includes upgraded water service from the Goleta Water District, connection to the Goleta Sanitary District sewer system, electrical upgrades, grading and installation of drainage structures on the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way to improve drainage from Highway 101 and the railroad in the vicinity of the project site.

Landscaping for the project will include landscape improvements in the parking areas and around the perimeter of the property, as well as in the area adjacent to San Jose Creek. No native or specimen trees will be removed for project construction.

New materials consist of metal building panels and related trim pieces with "signature 200" siliconized polyester finishes. New colors/other materials consist of the following:

- Primary wall color: Light stone
  - Window and door trim: Colony green

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

March 11, 2008 Page 16 of 18

- Primary Accent wall color: Desert Sand
  - Window and door trim: Colony green
- Secondary accent wall color: Colony green
  - Wall coping: To match wall color
- Window and door awnings: Colony green
- Windows and doors: Dark ionized aluminum
- Roll up doors: Desert sand
- Gutters: Colony green
- Down spouts: To match wall color
- Trash Enclosures: CMU block walls with low sloping roofs to match the storage buildings.

The project was filed by agent Gregory C. Rech of Architects West on behalf of Schwan Brothers, South Kellogg Properties (Tom Schwan), property owner. Related cases: 07-229-GPAM, 07-229-DP, 07-229-CUP. (Last heard on 2-26-08) (Laura VIk)

The plans were presented by Gregory C. Rech of Architects West on behalf of Schwan Brothers, South Kellogg Properties (Tom Schwan), property owner. Sam Maphis, project landscape architect, discussed the landscape plans. He clarified that Caltrans will not allow any plantings except groundcovers on Caltrans' property and that Caltrans is adamant that the plantings are low maintenance and not tall.

#### Comments:

#### 1. Member Brown commented:

- a. This project will be an improvement to what exists; however, the massing of the building is an issue. Suggest adding more architectural interest in the roofline to soften the big line of buildings seen when driving east on Highway 101..
- b. Lighting on the north side is not appropriate and would draw prominence to the building.
- c. All lighting fixtures, including bollards, need to be fully shielded, with downward facing light, with no glare or light trespass. The bollards at the Best Western Inn on Calle Real are an example of bollards with downward facing light.
- d. The lighting in the parking lot should be more evenly lighted. The lighting plan appears to have some hot and dark spots.
- e. Native plantings such as honeysuckle are encouraged.
- f. Planting canopy trees in the areas between the buildings to keep the pavement cool is encouraged.
- g. The landscape plans at the San Jose Creek area are appreciated including the canopy over the creek.
- h. The darker colors in the renderings are preferred rather than the color board.

# 2. Member Schneider commented:

- a. The massing of the building on the north side is his main concern because it is visible when seen from the freeway, particularly after the removal of the existing vegetation which will take some time to grow back up.
- b. Recommended some more architectural play of the massing on the north side, more than the proposed five feet, to soften the massing that would result in a

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

March 11, 2008 Page 17 of 18

perceived two-story element which steps up to the three-story element when viewed from the freeway.

- c. Agreed with Member Brown's comments regarding lighting.
- d. The lights on the north side are not needed.
- e. Canopy trees in the parking lot are appropriate and recommended.
- f. This site is very difficult because it is narrow and long, being "sandwiched" between the train tracks and Highway 101, however, the site plan is fine.
- g. Consider switching the color of the major mass of the building from the proposed lighter color, noting that the proposed plans also call for the darker colors on the recessed elements and the lighter colors on the forward elements.
- h. The proposed materials are appropriate.

# 3. Vice Chair Wignot commented:

- a. Agreed with the comments that there should be more effort to screen and soften the massing of the building on the north side with landscaping and architectural features.
- b. The Lash property to the west of the site provides some initial screening of the massing of the building when driving eastbound on Highway 101.
- c. The project is moving in a good direction.

#### 4. Member Smith commented:

- a. The massing of the building is appreciated. He does not have a problem with it.
- b. Overall, he appreciates that this is an industrial building in an industrial area.
- c. Agreed with comments from Members Brown and Schneider regarding the lighting items and expressed concern regarding the accent lights shining on the north side facing the freeway.
- d. Planting canopy trees in the parking area is recommended to provide shade.

#### 5. Member Messner commented:

- a. The colors on the building are fine, with some earthy tones, and blend well.
- b. Suggest the incorporation of permeable paving; however, the existing plan to catch runoff is appreciated.
- c. Recommended using plantings that act as a filter for the runoff into the creek.
- d. Consider using solar energy as an option, noting that rebates may be available.
- e. Requested another species be selected to replace the Eucalyptus plantings.
- f. The proposed plantings are appreciated except the Eucalyptus species.
- g. Planting number counts need to be included on the final drawings.

#### 6. Member Herrera commented:

- a. Recommended using plantings that act as a filter for the runoff into the creek.
- b. The proposed plans for the building and the colors are appreciated.
- c. The landscape plans are fine.

#### 7. Chair Branch commented:

- a. Overall, the project is very nice and a welcomed improvement for the site.
- b. Agreed with Member Brown that the darker colors in the renderings are preferred to the color board, stating that the earth tones come out more.

March 11, 2008 Page 18 of 18

- c. Agreed with the DRB members' comments regarding lighting.
- d. It would be worthy for the applicant to study the massing on the north side stating that the interplay of two-stories with the three-story elements could potentially change the roofline which would be helpful; hopefully without reducing square footage.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-2, No. 07-229-DRB, 10 South Kellogg Avenue, to April 8, 2008, with comments.

#### M. ADVISORY CALENDAR

None

#### N. DISCUSSION ITEMS

#### N-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Vice Chair Wignot stated that he received a call with regard to the Islamic Center project from a resident in the neighborhood who had a concern regarding parking. He requested that staff provide information at the next hearing on April 8, 2008, that outlines how the parking was calculated for that site.

#### N-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Member Messner announced that he will not be able to attend the DRB meeting on April 8, 2008.

#### N-3. PROJECT APPROVAL v. BUILT SLIDESHOW

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item N-3, Project Approval v. Built Slideshow, to March 25, 2008, per staff's request.

#### O. ADJOURNMENT: 6:40 P.M.

The minutes were approved on March 25, 2008.

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

# **Design Review Board Agenda** March 11, 2008 Page 19 of 19