



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, February 12, 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**

**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; Cecilia Brown; Chris Messner; Carl Schneider; Thomas Smith.

Board Members absent: Simone Herrera, Bob Wignot, Vice Chair.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

February 12, 2008

Page 2 of 15

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

### B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

#### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for January 23, 2008

**MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 3 to 0 vote (Abstain: Brown, Schneider; Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for January 23, 2008, as submitted.**

(NOTE: The DRB minutes for January 23, 2008, will be on the next DRB agenda for approval because of concern that a minimum of four members needed to vote for quorum purposes.)

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

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the next meeting will be on February 26, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

#### B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) The City Council reviewed the Village at Los Carneros project on February 5, 2008, and the second reading of the ordinance is scheduled for February 19, 2008. The DRB will then conduct Final review of the project. 2) The DRB meetings will be held on a Tuesday, when possible, when there is a holiday on the same week of the meeting. He distributed the updated schedule for DRB meetings in 2008 and stated that the only change to the previous schedule is that the second meeting in May will be held on May 27 which is a Tuesday. 3) The DRB terms for Member Messner and Member Schneider will expire in May and they may consider reapplying. The City Clerk's office will begin the application process. 4) It is anticipated that there will be some upcoming discussions with staff to consider security measures for public meetings at the City. 5) The slide presentation and discussion regarding approved and constructed projects will be held on February 26, 2008.

Member Brown requested that the presentation regarding constructed projects include landscaping at Diogi and an overall look at landscaping at the Hampton Inn including the creek revegetation and narrow strip in the parking lot behind the inn. Chair Branch requested that lighting be added as a category and that some pictures be provided of the lighting fixtures during the daytime and the effects at night for discussion of what worked and what was not successful. Member Brown suggested reviewing some examples that were on the lighting site visit made by the DRB in December.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

February 12, 2008

Page 3 of 15

### **B-4. REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY STORE FRONT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PRESENTATION (30 MINUTES)**

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the Redevelopment Agency Store Front Improvement Program Presentation has been cancelled for today due to scheduling conflicts.

### **C. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No speakers.

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the applicant for Item H-2, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, requested a continuance to February 26, 2008; the applicant for Item J-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte, requested a continuance to February 26, 2008; and the applicant for Item K-2, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, requested a continuance to April 8, 2008.

**MOTION:** Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to continue Item H-2, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to February 26, 2008; to continue Item J-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte, to February 26, 2008; and to continue Item K-2, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, to April 8, 2008, per requests from the respective applicants.

### **E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Chair Branch reported that he reviewed Item F-1, No. 08-018-DRB RV, 6056 Berkeley Road; and Item F-2, No. 08-019-DRB RV03, 420 South Fairview Avenue, and that he referred both items to the full DRB for review.

### **F. CONSENT CALENDAR**

#### **F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-018-DRB RV**

6056 Berkeley Road (APN 077-510-040 & 077-500-056)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a 112-unit Planned Unit Development in the DR-4.6 zone district. The applicant proposes to revise their lighting plan on the HOA owned grounds of the subdivision. The project was filed by Robert Young on behalf of The Meadows HOA, property owner. (Brian Hiefield)

Site visits: Made by Member Brown and Member Messner. Member Schneider said he did not visit the site specifically but he is very familiar with it because he rides his bike through the site. Member Smith stated that he did not visit the site specifically for this hearing but he is familiar with the site.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

February 12, 2008

Page 4 of 15

Documents: 1) Letter from Tom Wise, dated February 12, 2008, following up on his conversation with the applicant's representative regarding possible mitigation of his concerns. 2) Letter from Tom Wise, dated February 12, 2008, regarding DRB Permit No. 08-018-DRB-RV. 3) E-mail from Tim Knight, dated February 12, 2008, agreeing with Tom Wise that the proposed new 8' light fixtures are way out of line for their intended use.

The plans were presented by the following members of The Meadows HOA: Maria Cabrera, secretary; Ben Allfree, president; and Robert Young, board member. Maria Cabrera stated that the goal of the project is to upgrade the lights that are twenty-three years old which have corrosion and are not aesthetically pleasing. She stated that all homeowners were notified that the HOA was considering changing the lights. Robert Young stated that the proposed plans are to replace the existing eight-foot tall lights with new poles and new fixtures. He said that the proposal also includes extending the heights of the existing three-foot pathway to eight feet, stating that frequently the lamps are hidden by automobiles and shrubbery, and do not provide enough lighting to keep the property well-lit. There are no plans to change the Malibu lights. Brad Allfree commented that there is an overall concern that the neighborhood is dark at night and that the goal is to broaden some of the lighting. For example, all residents in the horseshoe shape area have commented regarding how dark the driveway is because the lights are not taller. Mr. Allfree said that the height of the lighting for each residence may depend on the specific characteristics of each site and requested that the DRB comment regarding whether the height of all poles should be uniform.

### SPEAKER:

Tom Wise, resident of the Meadows, stated that he agrees that replacing the lighting fixtures with new fixtures that more aesthetically pleasing and environmentally sound is a good idea and that he has no problem with replacing the roadway lights. His only objection is regarding the pathway lights, stating that the eight-foot tall pole lights are out of proportion to the scale of the location and are too tall, that they are too close to the residences, and that they will generate an extraordinary amount of light shining directly into the living rooms and bedrooms of the adjacent homes.

### Comments:

1. The goals and intent of the project are good.
2. Member Schneider commented that to prevent glare, the light source needs to be shielded or the lighting fixtures need to be lowered, or a combination. Member Smith commented that generally the higher the pole, the broader the light emission, and the shorter the pole the narrower light emission.
3. By consensus, the members agreed that there does not need to be consistency regarding the heights of the poles at the different residences. It was suggested that the applicant analyze the physical characteristics of each site to determine what height is needed to perform the desired function of the lighting.
4. Member Messner stated that from his experience regarding low voltage lighting, the use of certain wattages and color tones can change the effects of lighting at

night, and that some types of lighting can be just as effective on a lower pole like a full moon.

5. The applicant is requested to restudy and work with a lighting consultant or manufacturing representative who is knowledgeable regarding lighting issues and dark sky lighting. Consider dark sky practices particularly when the lighting is close to residences.
6. The applicant is requested to provide information regarding the existing lighting for reference when reviewing the project
7. The style of the fixture is acceptable but the applicant needs to provide cut sheets from the manufacturer showing that the lighting is shielded.
8. Member Brown commented she believes that all of the goals will be achieved with the appropriate selection of lighting that will light the pathway without the problem of light shining into homes.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to continue Item F-1, No. 08-018-DRB-RV, 6056 Berkeley Road, to March 25, 2008, with comments.**

**F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-019-DRB RV03**

420 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-130-061)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The project site is located within the Fairview Corporate Center (FCC), which includes 17.31 acres gross (16.67 acres net) addressed as 420, 430, and 490 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-130-057, 071-130-061 & 071-130-062). Two existing buildings are located on site. 430 South Fairview Avenue is a 60,797-square foot structure and 500 South Fairview Avenue is a 108,000-square foot structure (the 11,000 square foot loading dock is to be demolished). A third 73,203-square foot 30-foot tall 2-story shell building located at 420 South Fairview Avenue is under construction. The project site will have associated parking, landscaping, hardscape, and accessory structures such as refuse and recycling areas.

The applicant proposes to revise the approved elevations, site plan and landscape plan for 420 South Fairview Avenue as follows:

- East Elevation Changes:
  - Remove the standing seam metal hip roof and replace with flat roof; and
  - Remove the steel trellis and replace it with an awning;
- Site Plan Changes:
  - Remove requirement for enhanced color entry paving at building sidewalks;
  - Remove two stairs from sidewalk through landscape area on the west side;
  - Remove enhanced color stamped driveway pattern between the eastern side of 420 South Fairview Avenue and 430 South Fairview Avenue;
  - Replace onsite pavers along the front entrance with concrete; and
  - Remove landscape detail showing black Mexican beach pebble inlay warning strip for exterior stairs. Replace with tooled warning strips that match warning strips at 430 South Fairview Avenue.
- Landscape Plan Changes:

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

February 12, 2008

Page 6 of 15

- Plant 10 additional 5-gallon Pittosporum Nana in place of stairs on the west side.

The project was filed by Craig Minus of the Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 98-DP-024, 99-OA-024, 02-083-LLA, 02-088-OSP, 02-088-DP AM01, 03-166-PM (TPM 32,016), 02-088-DP AM02, 04-070-LUP, 04-110-LUP, 05-078-SCD, 05-075-MC, 06-122-DRB, 06-122-SCD, 06-122-LUP, 07-123-DRB RV01, 07-123-LUP RV01, 07-148-DRB RV02, 07-148-LUP RV02 & 08-019-LUP RV03. (Scott Kolwitz)

Member Schneider recused himself.

Site visits: Made by all members present.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Craig Minus of the Towbes Group, property owner, and Inaki Villarin, project architect. Craig Minus stated that when the project was initially approved it was intended for the buildings at 420 South Fairview and 430 South Fairview Avenue to have the same tenants and to interface. However, he said the building at 420 South Fairview has been sold and that the goal is to further articulate the west entrance as being the main entrance to the building and not the east entrance. Inaki Villarin stated that another goal is to give the east elevation more of an identity to show that it is separate from the building at 430 South Fairview.

Comments:

1. Chair Branch stated that his preference is for the hipped roof because he believes its appearance breaks up and softens the elevation which is very linear. However, he did not oppose the proposed revisions and requested input from the full DRB. He did not have concerns regarding the proposed site and landscaping revisions.
2. Member Smith stated that he did not have a concern regarding the proposed revisions to the east elevation. He noted that the changes are an obvious fix that can be made to help differentiate between the two buildings.
3. Member Brown stated that her preference is for the hipped roof as suggested by Chair Branch; however she did not have concerns regarding the proposed revisions as submitted by the applicant
4. Member Messner stated that he did not have concerns regarding the proposed revisions.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider; Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to grant Revised Final Approval of Item F-2, No, 08-019-DRB-RV03, 420 South Fairview Avenue, as submitted.**

### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Schneider reported that the Subcommittee reviewed today Item H-1, No. 07-172-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive; and Item H-3, No. 07-241-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive.

## 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 *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 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. (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from the Sign Subcommittee review on February 12, 2008:*

The plans were presented by Dan Michealsen, property owner.

Comments:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended Preliminary Approval as submitted.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-1, No. 07-172-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, as submitted; and continue to February 26, 2008, for Final review.**

### H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-211-DRB

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

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

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

February 12, 2008

Page 8 of 15

Related case: 74-CP-39, 07-211-SCC. (Last heard on 1-23-08\*, 1-08-08, 12-18-07)  
(Brian Hiefield)

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to continue Item H-2, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to February 26, 2008, per the request from the applicant.**

### H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-241-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 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 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. (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from the Sign Subcommittee review on February 12, 2008:*

The plans were presented by Dan Michealsen, property owner.

Comments:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended Preliminary Approval as submitted.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-3, No. 07-241-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, as submitted; and continue to February 26, 2008, for Final review.**

## I. FINAL CALENDAR

- None

## J. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

7121 Del Norte (APN 077-113-003)

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



## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

February 12, 2008

Page 9 of 15

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an existing approximately 36-square foot balcony, an existing approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, and a 390-square foot 2-car carport on a 6,300-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to permit a 120-square foot garden shed, 76-square foot fire pit and 50-square foot Jacuzzi, to construct a 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis, and to expand the approximately 36-square foot balcony to an approximately 108-square foot balcony that would be partially supported by the existing carport. Access from the proposed second-story balcony extension to the top of the carport is not proposed. The resulting 2-story structure would be a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an approximately 108-square foot balcony, an approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, a 390-square foot 2-car carport, a 120-square foot garden shed, a 76-square foot fire pit, a 50-square foot Jacuzzi, and 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis. This existing permitted structure is above the recommended maximum allowable floor area for this property, which is 1,984 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage; however, as the proposed project consists of non-habitable structures, the situation will not be exacerbated. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Victor Alvarez on behalf of Juan & Lola Zaragoza, property owners. Related cases: 05-095-LUP. (Continued from 1-23-08\*, 1-08-08, 10-16-07\*, 09-05-07\*, 08-21-07, 12-18-05\*) (Scott Kolwitz)

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to continue Item J-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte, to February 26, 2008, per the request from the applicant.**

### **J-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. (Brian Hiefield)

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

Site visits: Made by all members present.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

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

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

February 12, 2008

Page 10 of 15

### Comments:

1. The architectural design aspects of the project are fine, except for the colors.
2. The applicant needs to provide a better rendering showing the colors and materials.
3. Member Smith stated that unfortunately many of the buildings in the area appear drab and that a color such as yellow would be nice as a bright accent color and would create more visual interest with the yellow and the darker color.
4. Member Schneider stated that because of the material, the shadow will tone down the yellow color, and that his preference would be yellow rather than gray.
5. Member Brown commented that a combination of red and yellow would be a very fresh appearance.
6. Member Messner commented that if yellow is used, the side with the flat surface would be more reflective and that the other side would not reflect back so it would not have a bright appearance.
7. Chair Branch said that the yellow seems appropriate considering the context of the building and the area where it is located.
8. The element should return on the west elevation.
9. The applicant is requested to resolve the concern regarding the existing parapet in the back on the site plan.
10. The light fixtures and the floodlight shown in the photographs shall be removed.
11. Member Messner requested that some type of landscaping, approximately three trees, or greenery, be added to help soften, blend and balance the site. He suggested that the trees would not need to be the same height or species.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to continue Item J-2, No. 07-206-DRB, 163 Aero Camino, to March 11, 2008, with comments.**

### **J-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-006-DRB**

5746 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-008)

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

Site visits: Made by all members present except Schneider and Smith.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

February 12, 2008

Page 11 of 15

The plans were presented by Jorge Escamilla of sTitch Studio, agent, on behalf of Solita Velazquez, property owner, and Ruben Del Valle, tenant. Jorge Escamilla stated that he did refer to the Goleta Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines.

### Comments:

1. The existing screen door will distract from the appearance and should not be placed back on the building. Member Messner suggested exploring adding an opening on the door itself, possibly adding a screen in the window on the door.
2. The decorative light on the left side on the Hollister elevation does not seem necessary and does not add to the architecture. Member Messner has seen decorative lights with a low glow that have a nice effect but he would not recommend that the light illuminates the street.
3. The lights that project out to light the sign should reflect down. Two lights may be needed.
5. Member Brown stated that in her opinion the existing building is probably the original design and that the addition of the tile at the top of the building is unnecessary and is an artifice that does not add anything to the building. She commented that she appreciates that this is a nice, clean storefront in Old Town.
4. Member Smith appreciates the appearance of the cornice with the tile at the top stating that it is a decorative feature and that he has seen this type of element in buildings from that time period.
5. Member Schneider stated that if the tile is added at the top of the building it should be down flat so that the edge can be seen and not similar to the adjacent property which has the tile on an angle. S-tile should not be used if there is an edge.
6. Chair Branch stated that the tile on the roof should be different from the tile on the adjacent property such as a different height or with an edge.
7. Chair Branch suggested that the corner on the side should be flush.
8. Member Messner suggested that the applicant may want to consider adding tile that is diamond-shaped to replace the tile on the ground that will be removed to provide aesthetically more of a flow stating that there are boxy squares in front.
9. Overall, the design, colors and awning are fine.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item J-3, No. 08-006-DRB, 5746 Hollister Avenue, as submitted with the following conditions: 1) The light to the left on the front elevation (Hollister Avenue elevation) shall be removed; 2) the applicant shall provide cut sheets for the lights that will light the sign portion; 3) the applicant shall provide the resolution regarding the tile colors and materials to replace the tile that is to be removed at the sidewalk level; 4) the existing screen door shall not be re-installed; 5) the roof tile shall either be eliminated or flat as shown in the section so the edge treatment can be seen; and 6) the location of the gooseneck lights shall be shown on elevation; and to continue to March 11, 2008, for Final review on the full DRB agenda.**

## **K. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR**

### **K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-171-DRB**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ex-parte conversations: Member Brown stated that she spoke briefly with Suzanne Elledge in very general terms in her office yesterday.

The plans were presented by Fernando Ablaza, SWA Architects, and agent Suzanne Elledge, on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Suzanne Elledge presented a brief overview of the history of the DRB review regarding the project and stated that the proposed MOB is now a two-story design as a result of comments and response to the two meetings with the ad hoc subcommittee. She pointed out that there has been a significant reduction in square footage of the building of more than 4,000 square feet which is meaningful to the MOB and hospital. She requested that the DRB consider during Conceptual review the concept of this

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

February 12, 2008

Page 13 of 15

building being acceptable in terms of location, mass, bulk and scale, so the project can move forward with the development review process. She stated that the applicant will continue to work with the DRB regarding the architectural details. Fernando Ablaza, project architect, presented the plans and exhibits with the two-story design showing the responses made since the ad hoc subcommittee meeting last Friday.

Diane Wisby thanked the DRB and the ad hoc subcommittee for their cooperation and advice while doing their job and still being sensitive to the applicant's needs. She stated that as a result the MOB is a better building and will continue to get better as the project moves forward.

### Comments:

1. The DRB members expressed appreciation that the applicant worked with the ad hoc subcommittee and that the height of the building was reduced from three stories to two stories.
2. Member Brown expressed concern regarding the MOB being so close to the corner. She also expressed concern that the MOB looks just like any office building with no distinguishing features, stating that it needs character.
3. Member Smith expressed appreciation that architectural elements were incorporated into the MOB design that fit with the hospital. He stated that he is comfortable with the massing and scale of the MOB.
4. Member Schneider noted that the canopy entry is located very close to the corner. He would prefer that the corner has more landscaping to soften the building. He suggested studying the potential for relocating the entry which would start to break down the building and also help the building design to appear not as symmetrical.
5. Member Schneider appreciates the changes on the west elevation where the stair tower has been rotated and with the canopy which helps soften the building when driving east along Hollister Avenue. He also appreciates that the central portion being recessed in and the landscaping that helps soften the building to Hollister.
6. Member Schneider commented that the horizontal fins on the glass curtain wall on the north elevation are not needed because their purpose is to act as a sun shade device, which works well on the east, south and west elevations.
7. Member Schneider commented that the stair tower on the east elevation is not successful with the glass panel in the Santa Barbara stone which appears to be a foreign material. There is a similar situation on the west elevation.
8. Member Schneider commented that the use of stone on the low wainscot bases does not work and that the stone is more successful as a whole form on the south elevation. He also commented that it appears that the horizontal pattern is missing one element at the top on the south elevation which seems odd if the pattern is to be similar to the hospital pattern.
9. Member Schneider stated that there needs to be consideration regarding the architectural design of the entry so that people can better view how they would enter the building from the parking lot. He said that the location of the entry appears to be in the right place from a site plan standpoint. He also commented that the entry form on the west elevation is not working architecturally and does not resolve itself at the end very well, and that there would be heat gain in the

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

February 12, 2008

Page 14 of 15

- lobby from the west-facing glass. He commented that the building still needs architectural detailing and subtle pushing and pulling to be successful.
10. Member Schneider recommended that the limitations regarding the potential for development on the hospital parcel of the campus development plan be documented for future reference, for example as a condition of approval.
  11. Member Messner requested that the canopy which stops at the edge on the south elevation, on the far left, and on the north elevation, on the far right, be changed to cantilever out beyond the edge of the building, stating that in the current design the drop off has a hard line.
  12. Member Messner suggested for consideration that the shape of the pillars with the stone be rotated to a diamond shape instead of a square shape which would break down the flat lines.
  13. Chair Branch suggested consideration of locating the access to the building closer to the bus stop to shorten the walk to the lobby.
  14. Chair Branch expressed a preference for more asymmetrical architecture on the north elevation. He appreciates the vertical aspects with the palm trees.
  15. Chair Branch commented that the stair tower could be solid, or possibly recessed tile could be added rather than glass.
  16. Chair Branch stated that it is important that the south elevation relates to the hospital and that there is some play that needs to happen.
  17. Chair Branch stated that from a bulk and scale standpoint the project has come a long way.

### STRAW POLL

**How many DRB members are comfortable with the proposed mass, bulk and scale of the Medical Office Building at this point?**

**Members voting in the affirmative: Branch, Messner, Schneider, Smith (4).**

**Members abstaining: Brown (1).**

**Members absent: Herrera, Wignot (2).**

Member Brown commented that she appreciates that the applicant has reduced the height of the Medical Office Building OB from three to two stories which makes a big difference. She stated that she would prefer that the MOB be moved back.

**MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to continue Item K-1, No. 07-171-DRB, 351 South Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue, to May 13, 2008, with comments.**

### K-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 03-051-DRB

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

This is a request for further *Conceptual* review. The project site is undeveloped. The applicant proposes a new 8,184-square foot, three-story Islamic Center. The proposed center would include a 3,468-square foot first floor, 3,792-square foot second floor, and 468-square foot third floor, and a 456-square foot mechanical dome. The first floor would include a 635-square foot prayer area, 646-square foot meeting room, 574-square foot restrooms, 433-square foot entry/foyer/vestibule, 192 square feet kitchen and 988-square foot of additional storage and circulation areas.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

February 12, 2008

Page 15 of 15

Additionally, a 1,046-square foot entry court, 414 square foot loggia and 1,107 square foot play area would be available for non-habitable exterior use. The second floor would include a 1,431-square foot dining room, 537-square foot lecture room, 303-square foot office, 270-square foot storage area, 393-square foot of circulation, and a 858-square foot residence. The third floor would include the final 468-square foot residence with 456-square foot of additional mechanical areas above.

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

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

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

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

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to continue Item K-2, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, to April 8, 2008, per the request from the applicant.**

### L. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- None

### M. DISCUSSION ITEMS

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

No requests.

#### M-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

No announcements.

### O. ADJOURNMENT: 5:30 P.M.

Minutes approved on February 26, 2008.

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

**Design Review Board Agenda**

February 12, 2008

Page 16 of 16