

# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

#### REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, February 26, 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 – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

# ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

**REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.** 

# GOLETA CITY HALL 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 3:00 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.

February 26, 2008 Page 2 of 15

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Laura Vlk, 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 January 23, 2008

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that legal counsel advised that a quorum did exist at the last meeting when the DRB voted to approve the minutes for January 23, 2008; therefore, the minutes were approved. Vice Chair Wignot stated that when he reviewed the Design Review Board minutes for January 23, 2008, he noticed that there was a duplicate sentence on the last page under Item M-3, and recommended that the sentence be deleted as an edit to the minutes.

MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Abstain: Brown) to reconsider approval of the Design Review Minutes for January 23, 2008, and to grant approval of the minutes as amended.

B. Design Review Board Minutes for February 12, 2008

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Abstain: Herrera, Wignot) to approve the Design Review Minutes for February 12, 2008, as amended.

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

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner called the Street Tree Subcommittee meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. He stated that there was a quorum but the meeting was not held because Bill Millar, Parks and Open Space Manager, was unable to attend due to a scheduling conflict. The next Street Tree Subcommittee meeting was scheduled for March 25, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) On February 19, 2008, the City Council conducted the final reading and adoption of ordinances regarding the Village at Los Carneros project. The DRB will conduct final review of the project. 2) The Haskell's Landing project is scheduled for DRB review on March 25, 2008. 3) Applications are being accepted by the City Clerk's office for appointment to fill the DRB terms of Members Messner and Schneider which will expire in May.

#### C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

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

February 26, 2008 Page 3 of 15

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the applicant for Item H-3, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, requested a continuance to March 11, 2008.

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 March 11, 2008, per the applicant's request.

#### E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Chair Branch stated that Item F-1, No. 08-021-DRB RV, 5814 Cathedral Oaks Road, will be reviewed today by the full DRB on the Final Calendar.

#### F. CONSENT CALENDAR

#### F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-021-DRB RV

5814 Cathedral Oaks Road (APN 069-090-049)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a 5,623-square foot church and a parsonage (residence of pastor) of 1,200 square feet, a detached 480-square foot garage for the parsonage, 648 square feet of detached storage buildings, a detached 305-square foot trailer, and a 115-square foot detached storage shed on a 2.6 acre lot in the 20-R-1 zone district. The original approval was for the construction 1,072-square feet in additions to the church, consisting of a 740-square foot entry hall, and 332-square feet consisting of a new lobby, reception area, kitchen and bathroom additions on the first-floor. Two, detached, as-built storage buildings near the Western property line were also proposed. The resulting 2-story church structure was 6,695 square feet. All materials used for this project matched the existing church.

The applicant proposes the construction of a 162.5-square foot chapel addition to the west side of the existing structure, and the addition of stone veneer to the front and side elevations. The project was filed by Rino Dattilo of South Coast Church, property owner. Related cases: 05-175-SCD, 05-175-LUP. (Laura VIk)

The plans were presented by Rino Dattilo of South Coast Church, property owner. He stated that during the remodel of the church the front brick of the building came off, which was taken down for safety. The applicant stated that they then considered changing the stucco and changing the wainscot materials on the building to match the fountain and the other areas around the building.

#### Comments:

 Member Schneider commented that he prefers the old version of the plans when the whole gable form was stone, but he believes the new design is fine and understands why the applicant wants to use the proposed material.

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

February 26, 2008 Page 4 of 15

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Revised Final Approval of Item F-1, No. 08-021-DRB RV, 5814 Cathedral Oaks Road, as submitted.

#### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Schneider stated that the Sign Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-1, No. 07-172-DRB; Item H-2, No. 07-241-DRB; Item H-4, No. 07-234-DRB; and Item H-5, No. 08-008-DRB.

#### H. SIGN CALENDAR

#### H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-172-DRB

6860 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-015)

This is a request for *Final* 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 Park) zone district. Tenant spaces A and B occupy the front industrial building, totaling approximately 25,000 square feet. Tenant space C occupies the warehouse building on the northern property line totaling approximately 5,000 square feet of warehouse space. A Chemical Storage Building in the rear of the property comprises the final 1,800 square feet of development.

The applicant proposes to install two new wall signs for tenant space B at the front and rear (locations B1 & B2 on the site plan) of the building. The dimensions of the two identical signs would be 6'-1/8" long by 2'-6" tall, with an area of approximately 15-square feet. The non-illuminated signs would have 1" deep pin-mounted aluminum lettering painted grey. The 2'-6" high vinyl GE logo will be painted white. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 07-191-OSP, 07-191-DRB, 07-191-CUP, & 07-191-DPAM. (Last heard on 2-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on February 26, 2008:

The plans were presented by Dan Michealsen, property owner.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item H-1, No. 07-172-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, as submitted.

#### H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-241-DRB

6860 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-015)

This is a request for *Final* 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 Park) zone district. Tenant spaces A and B occupy the front industrial building, totaling approximately 25,000 square feet. Tenant space C occupies the warehouse building on the northern property line totaling approximately 5,000 square feet of warehouse

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

February 26, 2008 Page 5 of 15

space. A Chemical Storage Building in the rear of the property comprises the final 1,800 square feet of development.

The applicant proposes to install two new wall signs for tenant space A at the front and rear (locations A1 & A2 on the site plan) of the building. The dimensions of the two identical signs would be 5'-6" long by 2'-6" tall, with an area of approximately 14-square feet. The non-illuminated signs would have 1/2" thick pin-mounted acrylic lettering painted black. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 07-191-OSP, 07-191-DRB, 07-191-CUP, & 07-191-DPAM. (Last heard on 2-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on February 26, 2008:

The plans were presented by Dan Michealsen, property owner.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item H-2, No. 07-241-DRB, 6860 Cortona 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 2-12-08\*, 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 March 11, 2008, per the applicant's request.

#### H-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-234-DRB

6740 Cortona Drive (APN 073-150-024)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* 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.

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

February 26, 2008 Page 6 of 15

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. (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on February 26, 2008:

The plans were presented by Dave Jones of Lenvik & Minor Architects, on behalf of Arnon Blau, property owner. He stated that the sign is consistent with the Overall Sign Plan that was approved on January 8, 2008.

#### Comments:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended Preliminary Approval as submitted.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-4, No. 07-234-DRB, 6740 Cortona Drive, as submitted; and continue to March 11, 2008, for Final review on the Sign Calendar.

#### H-5. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-008-DRB

55 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-007)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* 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. (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on February 26, 2008:

The plans were presented by Christian Muldoon of Vogue Sign Company, agent, on behalf of 55 Castilian LLC, property owner, and FLIR Systems, tenant.

#### Comments:

- 1. The applicant shall add the words "if applicable" to the generic note on the plans regarding connecting to existing dedicated sign circuit.
- 2. The height of the letters should be reduced to 15 inches or possibly reduced more.
- 3. Member Smith commented that there may not be that much difference regarding reducing the height of the letters on a building of this size because either the 18inch letters would bracket with the window above or the 15-inch letters would bracket with the doorway below.

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

February 26, 2008 Page 7 of 15

- 4. The proposed design and colors are fine.
- 5. The Sign Subcommittee recommended Preliminary Approval with the condition that the height of the letters be reduced to 15 inches, and possibly reduced more.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-5, No. 08-008-DRB, 55 Castilian Drive, as submitted with the condition that the applicant shall study reducing the height of the letters from 18 inches to 15 inches, and possibly reducing the height more; and continue to March 11, 2008, for Final review on the Sign Calendar.

#### I. FINAL CALENDAR

None

#### J. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

#### J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-059-DRB

5575 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-090-085)

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

The plans were presented by John Polanskey, Director of Housing Development, County of Santa Barbara; Robert Ruiz, of Sid Goldstein Civil Engineer Inc., project civil engineer; and Jason Rojas, project coordinator, Santa Barbara County Housing Authority. John Polanskey stated that since the last DRB hearing, the project has been reviewed by the Zoning Administrator. Mr. Polanskey believes that the neighbors are satisfied that their considerations have been met. He stated that the applicant has responded to all of the DRB comments from the last hearing on September 18, 2007. Robert Ruiz, project civil engineer, stated that in response to a comment from the DRB at the previous meeting regarding whether the swale could be shifted to allow planting along the fence, the project landscape architect indicated that

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

February 26, 2008 Page 8 of 15

the swale should be located up against the retaining wall because it provides more options with regard to plantings; and that the material should be concrete because the grade is very flat which has the potential for the water to pond if the material is not hardscape.

#### Comments:

- 1. Chair Branch stated that the applicant did a fine job matching the new architecture with the existing architecture.
- 2. Member Schneider commented that the colors are fine except the teal seems too bright.
- 3. The applicant has addressed all of the comments from the DRB review on September 18, 2007, with the following exceptions: a) Comment #2 {note: the project civil engineer explained that the concrete was needed due to the flatness of the slope and the landscape architect recommended against relocating the swale or changing the swale material from concrete}; and b) the applicant will respond at the next DRB hearing to Comment #5 {that the applicant shall show fixed windows on the side of the building facing Kellogg Ranch}, and to Comment #9 {that the applicant shall provide plant counts and ground cover information}.
- 4. The lighting plan for the site needs to be provided by the applicant for review before Preliminary Approval can be granted.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item J-1, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to March 25, 2008, with the following comments: 1) the windows on the side of the building facing Kellogg Ranch shall be fixed windows and shall be documented on the building plans; 2) the landscape plan shall include plant counts and ground cover information; 3) the applicant shall provide a lighting study and plan that includes the types of fixtures and light distribution; and 4) the applicant is requested to consider changing the teal color, which seems too bright, to a color that is slightly more deeper and richer, however, the other colors are fine.

# K. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an existing approximately 36-square foot balcony, an existing approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, and a 390-square foot 2-car carport on a 6,300-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to permit a 120-square foot garden shed, 76-square foot fire pit and 50-square foot Jacuzzi, to construct a 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis, and to expand the approximately 36-square foot balcony to an approximately 108-square foot balcony that would be partially supported by the existing carport. Access from the proposed second-story balcony extension to the top of the carport is not proposed. The resulting 2-story structure would be a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an approximately 108-square foot balcony, an approximately 50-square foot exterior

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

February 26, 2008 Page 9 of 15

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

<u>Documents</u>: E-mail from Gary Vandeman, dated February 25, 2008, stating that he reviewed the drawings dated February 19, 2008, and providing comments which include: a) he believes the detail is not sufficient for the DRB to make a reasoned decision; b) the massive columns are foreign to the existing architecture and not in character with the neighborhood; and c) the balcony should not be used as a bridge to the carport roof because there would be no reasonable way to keep the carport roof from being used as a living space, once the bridge is built.

The plans were presented by Juan Zaragoza, property owner. He stated that the email from Gary Vandeman was just brought to his attention today. He does not believe that the carport should be an issue at the hearing, but if it is, he would not replace or rebuild the carport although it was made in 1960 and is in dire straits, creating a liability for his vehicles. He clarified that the proposed depth of the balcony would be nine feet. Juan Zaragoza stated that he would consider agreeing with a condition of approval that would restrict the access and use of the carport roof.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz distributed the color boards, streetscape and photographs taken of the site.

# Comments:

- 1. The plans need to accurately reflect the existing conditions and show the proposed plans including the dimensions and materials. Accurate plans at the carport level and the balcony level are needed to understand the sizes. The front elevation needs to be consistent with the side elevations. There is a railing detail on the last page that does not show the existing detail, which need to match.
- 2. Member Smith commented: a) he does not have a concern with the design but there is a problem with the way the plans are presented; and b) the proposed square columns would be better than having something spindly which currently exists
- 3. Chair Branch commented: a) suggested the applicant may consider pitching the carport roof to match the pitch of the house's roof which would suggest that the carport roof would not be used as a habitable area or for storage.
- 4. Member Brown requested that staff provide a condition of approval that would restrict access and use of the carport roof unless for temporary repair and maintenance, and possibly prohibit storage.

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

February 26, 2008 Page 10 of 15

5. Member Schneider commented: a) accurate plans are needed; and b) the proposed blue color does not seem to fit with the rest of the color scheme.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, to April 22, 2008, with the following comments: 1) the applicant needs to provide clear and accurate architectural drawings that reflect both the existing conditions and the proposed plans, including the columns, and the balcony and its relationship to the carport; 2) the trellis and all other items not being proposed should be removed from the project plans; 3) the applicant shall provide clarity regarding what color will be painted on the structures; and 4) staff is requested to provide a condition of approval that would restrict access and use of the carport roof and not allow use for habitable purposes.

#### K-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-230-DRB

7154 Tuolumne Drive (APN 077-104-019)

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

<u>Site visits</u>: Made by all members except Herrera and Smith.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

<u>Documents</u>: E-mail received from Gary Vandeman, dated February 25, 2008, stating that the information provided in the application is not complete and does not include photos that allow the DRB to make determinations regarding the impact on neighbors privacy. The e-mail also requests consideration that the applicant needs to provide all information that is required for submittal of a 2-story conversion.

The plans were presented by agent Fernando Vega on behalf of Maria Teresa and Jose Castillo, property owners. He stated that the property owners prefer that the architecture matches existing and not match the Spanish style that was approved in the previous permit. He said that the only changes from the previous plans are the exterior detailing which will remove the Spanish features. He clarified that there is no exterior access to the stairwell.

Planning Technician Brian Hiefield clarified that the project had previously been submitted with different architectural details on June 3, 2003; however, the

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

February 26, 2008 Page 11 of 15

construction never began and the permits have since expired. At the request of Member Brown, Brian Hiefield read the DRB motion from August 17, 2004, that approved the project that was previously submitted.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Chair Branch called on Elizabeth A. Brooks, next-door neighbor, who submitted a speaker slip but was not present when she was called on to speak.

#### Comments:

- 1. Member Brown stated that she is not supportive of the plans as submitted. She commented: a) the project seems too massive for the neighborhood; b) some of the mass should be scaled back; and c) there may be parking issues with the number of bedrooms.
- Member Smith expressed concern that the wall on the east elevation seems like a huge blank wall, stating that it would be nice to have something to break it up, although windows should not be looking down into someone's yard.
- 3. Member Schneider suggested the applicant study removing the upstairs TV room which hangs over the porch and adds mass to the building. This would cut off some of the building and it would become less massive to the neighbor, and would also provide for more lighting below. The massing from the front elevation is fine.
- 4. Chair Branch commented: a) the project seems too massive and should be scaled back; b) the suggestion to remove the TV room would solve the concern that the massing should be scaled back; c) there are other two-story homes in the neighborhood; d) the mass from the front (street) elevation is fine; and e) the east elevation is somewhat stark.
- 5. Member Herrera recommended adding the detail to the front part because of the situation of the columns.
- The elevations needs to be better delineated to make them read easier.
- 7. Chair Branch advised that if a second-story deck is proposed by the applicant, privacy concerns would probably need to be addressed.
- 8. Member Messner commented that if a deck is considered, from his observation the neighbor's backyard is situated somewhat above the site, and that the applicant may want to consider the relationship of the deck to the neighbors.
- Vice Chair Wignot commented that he believes the DRB needs to be mindful when making a decision that the property owner and applicant have put some time and money into a previous project, in a slightly different style, that was approved by the DRB.
- 10. Staff is requested to contact the next-door neighbor, facing the east elevation mass, who submitted a speaker slip but was not present to speak, regarding the continuation of the hearing. (Note: Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz encouraged the applicant to contact the neighbor directly to discuss the project prior to returning with plans.)

#### **STRAW VOTES:**

How many DRB members are in favor of keeping the floor plan mass as the project is currently proposed?

Members voting in the affirmative: Herrera, Smith, Wignot. (3).

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

February 26, 2008 Page 12 of 15

> How many DRB members are in favor of reducing the floor plan mass? Members voting in the affirmative: Branch, Brown, Messner, Schneider. (4).

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-2, No. 07-230-DRB, 7154 Tuolumne Drive, to April 8, 2008, with the comment that the applicant shall study the removal of the TV room upstairs and also the covered portion of the downstairs patio area to reduce the mass of the second-floor addition, and discuss the plans with the property owners.

**RECESS HELD 4:17 P.M. TO 4:27 P.M.** 

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

7408-7412 Hollister Avenue (APN079-210-064)

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. (Shine Ling)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. His comments included: 1) the intent of the project is to create a contiguous campus that ties the buildings together, as well as to update the existing landscaping and beautify the site; 2) for clarification, the proposed plan intends to beautify an existing loading dock access ramp and, therefore, the project description is not correct that indicates a new access ramp will be constructed; 3) the lighting plan includes reconfiguring and updating the existing lighting to a more current and safer standard for parking lot lighting, and to beautify the lighting fixtures; 4) the up-lighting for the trees will be shielded and is only intended for the defined entrances to the building. Don Wynn, project landscape architect, presented the landscape plans and stated that the goal is to retain as many existing trees as possible and to supplement the landscaping around the north and west side of Building 5.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling clarified that the Overall Sign Plan for this building will be reviewed by the Sign Subcommittee at the next DRB meeting. He stated that staff

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

February 26, 2008 Page 13 of 15

understands that the Eucalyptus tree barranca area is an historic aggregation area for Monarch butterflies; therefore, an outside butterfly expert will need to be retained to evaluate the situation and a determination will be made regarding consistency with the City's ESHA policies.

#### Comments:

- Member Brown commented: a) expressed concern that the vinca species are very invasive and requested that all invasive plants be eliminated; b) requested consideration that more native plantings be incorporated; and c) recommended that the project landscape architect research what plantings would be required if there is a concern that the Eucalyptus barranca area is an area for butterflies, after a determination is made by staff.
- 2. Member Messner commented: a) the vinca species which are invasive would not be appropriate; b) the asparagus myerii species, and possibly the asparagus sprengeri, are of concern as being invasive and do not seem appropriate; c) the westringia species have different heights which should be kept in mind when calling out the appropriate size; d) expressed concern that the California Pepper trees will generate a lot of droppings and attract bees which would be undesirable, particularly located near people; and e) suggested considering the variegated Cream de Mint Pittosporum species, which would provide a variegated tone so there would not be a wall mass of green (rather than the Wheelers Dwarf Pittosporum species).
- 3. Member Schneider commented: a) overall the project is very good; b) the use of lighting bollards would be appropriate in the corner area to provide lighting for access and security, particularly since the building operates twenty-four hours per day; and c) consider adding some color into the architectural elements for the proposed fitness activity center area that is somewhat different from the color of the rest of the buildings.
- 4. Vice Chair Wignot stated that the project is moving in a good direction.
- 5. Chair Branch commented: a) the project and the overall improvement are very good; b) the addition of many trees is appreciated; c) the lighting which is his main concern seems to be moving in a good direction; and d) recommended that the net on the basketball hoop be made of cotton or nylon and not chain, and the backboard preferably be made of plexiglass.
- 6. The applicant is requested to provide plans and architectural details regarding the existing water storage tanks and the fitness activity center, including colors, and to show the existing canopy, which is shown in the photographs, on the plans.
- 7. The applicant is requested to provide the lighting plan showing fully shielded fixtures and include lighting fixtures and bollards.
- 8. The applicant is requested to revise the landscape plan in response to comments.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-3, No. 08-023-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, to March 11, 2008, and request that the applicant address all of the comments.

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

#### L. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

#### L-1. 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 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
- 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.

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

February 26, 2008 Page 15 of 15

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. (Laura VIk)

<u>Documents</u>: Letter from Michael Goldman and Gary Wissman, dated February 25, 2008, homeowners at the La Goleta Condominiums, supporting the proposed project in general and looking forward to seeing this project replace the existing uses. The letter requests that the DRB consider all potential impacts of the project as part of its normal review process and recommends that the City allocates the growth allotment under the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance (GGMO) for this project.

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; Floyd Smith, project manager; and Tom Schwan, property owner.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 07-229-DRB, 10 South Kellogg Avenue, to March 11, 2008, to be the first item on the agenda.

#### M. ADVISORY CALENDAR

None

#### N. DISCUSSION ITEMS

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

No requests.

#### N-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

None.

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the Project Approval v. Built Slideshow will be discussed at the next DRB meeting on March 11, 2008.

# O. ADJOURNMENT: 5:50 P.M.

Minutes approved on March 11, 2008.

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

# **Design Review Board Agenda** February 26, 2008 Page 16 of 16