



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, August 12, 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:

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair
Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair
Scott Branch (Architect)
Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)
Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Carl Schneider (Architect)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Wignot at 3:15 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Bob Wignot, Chair; Thomas Smith, Vice Chair; *Cecilia Brown; Scott Branch; Simon Herrera; Chris Messner; and Carl Schneider. *Member Brown exited the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Board Members absent: None.

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

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 2 of 17

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for July 22, 2008

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Abstain: Branch, Brown) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for July 22, 2008, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

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

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) Staff is in the process of scheduling a date to present a staff report to the City Council transmitting the DRB's letter regarding the sign application process and appeal point for sign applications; b) Two joint Planning Commission/DRB workshops will be held on August 18, and September 15, 2008, at 5:30 p.m., regarding Building Intensity Standards in the General Plan; and 3) On August 11, 2008, the Planning Commission adopted a resolution recommending to the City Council approval of the Marriott Residence Inn.

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 no requests for continuance have been received.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

- **NONE**

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Committee Member Brown reported that the Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-1, No. 08-125-DRB, 7020 Calle Real. She stated that the Subcommittee began the review of Item H-2, No. 08-131-DRB, 5505-5585 Overpass Road & 5410 Hollister Avenue, but there was insufficient time to complete the review prior to the DRB meeting which was scheduled to begin today at 3:00 p.m.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

There being no objections, Chair Wignot stated that the Sign Subcommittee will continue the review of Item H-2, No. 08-131-DRB, on today's Sign Calendar because there was not enough time to complete the review prior to starting the DRB meeting.

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-125-DRB

7020 Calle Real (APN 077-155-003)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,984-square foot 24'-6" high produce market currently under construction with an herb garden and associated landscaping on 0.53 acres in the CN zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 26.25-square foot halo light LED wall sign with 14" high pin mounted aluminum green lettering and a yellow background. The 2" deep lettering will be attached to a 4" deep metal box affixed to the produce market's front fascia above the entry. The project was filed by agent Hesh Ghorbanzadeh on behalf of Happy Harry's LLC, the property owner. Related cases: 46-SB-LUP; 08-125-SCC. (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on August 12, 2008:

The plans were presented by agent Hesh Ghorbanzadeh on behalf of Happy Harry's LLC, the property owner.

Comments:

1. The depth of the box shall not exceed four inches.
2. Member Brown commented that the design is nice and subtle.
3. The Sign Subcommittee recommended that Preliminary Approval be granted as submitted.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-1, No. 08-125-DRB, 7020 Calle Real, as submitted; and continue to August 26, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-131-DRB

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

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

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 4 of 17

Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, agent for Sumida Family Limited Partnership, property owner. Related cases: 08-131-OSP; -CUP. (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review on August 12, 2008.

Member Schneider recused himself.

The plans were presented by Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, agent for Sumida Family Limited Partnership, property owner; and Ron Wilkinson of Vogue Sign Company.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling requested that the applicant provide a revised site plan showing the locations of the sidewalk, property line and setbacks; and also provide the square footages for all of the proposed signs.

Comments:

1. The applicant is requested to provide a photograph of the area where the off-site monument sign will be located and also the proposed landscape plans.
2. The applicant is requested to provide a night rendering/picture to help understand the proposed illumination and intensity for the off-site monument sign.
3. Member Brown commented that the off-site monument sign should fit in with the area with regard to intensity of illumination and landscaping. The sign will change the character of the area because there are no other signs currently of similar size and illumination.
4. The applicant is requested to provide landscape plans with regard to the on-site monument sign area.
5. The applicant is requested to provide a detailed example of the front entry directory sign, showing the map information larger, and the sign somewhat smaller with less white space.
6. The applicant is requested to provide details with regard to the open space at the base of the on-site directory signs, such as landscaping, or filling in the base. Possibly consider stone veneer on the base if the material is compatible.
7. The applicant is requested to provide the plans for the reconfigured on-site directory signs.
8. The applicant is requested to restudy the entrance because it seems cluttered with too many signs that are fairly close together of the same shape with the same logo. Suggest that the rental office sign and on-site monument sign be combined. Member Brown made a suggestion with regard to combining three signs into one sign closer to the sidewalk.
9. The proposed temporary model number signs are fine; however, there needs to be clarification as to the duration and location of these signs.
10. The applicant is requested to provide a picture to help understand the location of address plaques for buildings and address plaques for units, which will be helpful for review when shown on the plans.
11. The proposed pool signage plans are fine.
12. The proposed parking signage plans are fine.
13. The proposed miscellaneous signage plans are fine.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 5 of 17

14. Any other proposed signs such as off-site signs or banner signs associated with the project would need to be presented for review.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to continue Item H-2, No. 08-131-DRB, 5505-5585 Overpass Road & 5410 Hollister Avenue, with comments, to September 9, 2008.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-082-DRB

7526 Calle Real (APN 079-121-005)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 5,300-square foot church on a 74,052-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 177-square foot covered entry and demolish an existing 247-square foot carport roof. The existing mansard roof parapet on the front facade will be replaced with a new sloped roof to tie in with the proposed covered entry. The existing windows will be replaced with new wood windows. A new colored concrete patio is proposed beneath the new covered entry, and minor repairs will be done to existing concrete walkways to improve accessibility. New lighting will consist of three (3) wall sconces along the front façade and two (2) hanging pendant lights beneath the proposed covered entry. There is no new habitable square footage proposed. The project was filed by agent Thomas Hashbarger on behalf of El Camino Presbyterian Church, property owner. Related cases: 68-CP-43; 08-082-LUP. (Continued from 7-08-08) (Brian Hiefield)

The plans were presented by agent Thomas Hashbarger on behalf of El Camino Presbyterian Church, property owner. He stated that the applicant responded to the conditions in the motion that granted Preliminary Approval as follows: 1) the plans now show that the exterior colors, finishes, and the roofing materials shall match existing; 2) the applicant studied the landscaping and walkway with regard to the lighting and decided to remove the landscaping; and believes, therefore, that the wall sconces will provide the best distribution of light; 3) the piers were lowered and will be poured from the same concrete as the patio, which will be integral color concrete (the piers will not be tiled); and 4) a few minor modifications were made to the roof plans.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented that the project is a very nice addition and a relatively simple project, but there should be construction drawings provided by the applicant that show details for review.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, to grant Final Approval of Item J-1, No. 08-082-DRB, 7526 Calle Real, as submitted.

AMENDED MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item J-1, No. 08-082-DRB, 7526 Calle Real, to August 26, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar with the following comments: 1) the applicant shall provide construction drawings showing details for Final review on the Consent Calendar; and 2) the applicant shall add a notation to the landscape plans that the existing landscaping will be removed and replaced.

J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-108-DRB

475 Camino Laguna Vista (APN 077-422-006)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 2,576-square foot residence and an attached 423-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,250-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 179.5 square feet in additions on the first-floor as well as to permit an as-built 205-square foot patio cover. The resulting 2-story structure would be 3,383.5 square feet, consisting of a 2755.5-square foot single-family dwelling with an attached 205-square foot patio cover, and an attached 423-square foot 2-car garage. All materials used for this project aside from the doors, windows, and exterior lighting are to match the existing residence. Details of new doors and new exterior lighting can be found within the plan set. The project was filed by agent Martha Gray on behalf of Stacey & Alex Matson, property owners. Related cases: 08-108-LUP. (Continued from 7-22-08) (Brian Hiefield)

The plans were presented by agent Martha Gray and Stacey & Alex Matson, property owners. Martha Gray stated that the applicant responded to the DRB conditions as follows: 1) the applicant restudied the proportions of the new front windows on the east elevation and combined the three windows into one fixed window with an arch on top, which works better with the proportions; 2) the material will be plaster for the roof over the new bay window; 3) the existing patio canopy in the rear was added to the elevations; 4) the landscape plan was presented showing that the existing grass and pavers will be removed; 5) the east elevation drawing, which was not in scale, was corrected; and 6) the color board was provided for review, noting that the shingles match existing. After further discussion with the DRB, Martha Gray stated that the applicant will use asphalt shingle roof material for the roof over the new bay window.

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

Ex-parte conversations: None reported since the last hearing.

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) recommended using the same roof material on the new bay window that is proposed for the roof of the addition, expressing concern that from his experience whenever stucco or plaster has been used the insides have become rotted out.
2. Member Brown commented: a) it would be appropriate that the roof material over the new bay window matches existing; and b) suggested replacing the *Stipa Tenuissima* species which are weedy and self sow very easily, and replacing the *Eaton Canyon* species which are very weedy.
3. Member Branch commented: a) reiterated Vice Chair Smith's comment with regard to the potential for the roof over the bay window to leak if the roof material

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 7 of 17

is stucco; and b) the applicant will need to carefully consider the roof details over the new bay window.

4. Member Messner commented: a) recommended that the applicant refer to the City's current Recommended Planting Guidelines with regard to proposed plantings shown close to the right-of-way, to protect the sidewalk in the future; for example, consider root barriers.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item J-2, No. 08-108-DRB, 475 Camino Laguna Vista, with the following conditions to be verified by staff: 1) the roof details over the new bay window shall be worked out with staff (with regard to the applicant's agent stating that asphalt shingle roof material will be used); and 2) the plans shall include the notation that any invasive grasses shall be removed.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-087-DRB

266 Spruce Drive (APN 079-530-027)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,061-square foot residence and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,968-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 1,734 square feet in additions, consisting of a 159-square foot first floor addition, a 325-square foot new second story, and a 1,250-square foot basement. The resulting 2-story structure with basement would be 4,245 square feet, consisting of a 3,795-square foot single-family dwelling with basement and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage. As the proposed project exceeds 3,000 square feet of habitable square footage, a third enclosed parking space would be required per Ordinance No. 03-05. When the basement is included, the proposed habitable square footage would be 3,795 square feet which exceeds the maximum allowable floor area (FAR) guidelines for this property, which is 2,642 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. When the basement square footage is removed, the proposed habitable square footage would be 2,545 square feet, which is within the maximum allowable FAR guidelines for this property. A total of 629 cubic yards of cut for grading is proposed for construction of the basement. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence aside from new doors, windows, and exterior lighting as shown on plans. The project was filed by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. Related cases: 08-087-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

Site visits: Made by all members except Branch, Messner and Schneider.

Ex-parte conversations: None reported.

The plans were presented by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner, and Robert Cambron who was present. Brian Nelson presented a map of the neighborhood, stating that the site is located near an area near Evergreen

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 8 of 17

where two-story homes and duplexes were built, and which references the two-story homes in the neighborhood. He also presented a photo simulation and site photographs from the internet. The plans include a basement that is completely subterranean with two separate stairwells for entrance and exit. Robert Cambron stated that the purpose of the loft concept is to provide an area for the children to use as a work station for their computers.

Planning Technician Brian Hiefield discussed the following two issues with regard to the project as listed in the Staff Report for consideration by the DRB: 1) whether to include subterranean square footage in FAR calculations; and 2) the proposed habitable square footage exceed 3,000 square feet thus requiring by ordinance three enclosed parking spaces within a minimum 650-square foot garage.

Documents: Letter from Michael Ray, dated August 12, 2008, expressing concern that the proposed expansion intrudes on his privacy.

Speakers:

Michael Ray, Goleta, neighbor directly behind the applicant, referred to his letter dated August 12, 2008, stating that his concern is that there is a proposed row of windows that would be facing directly into his upstairs bedroom and a deck that is completely private. He suggested perhaps windows that are not quite so large that are placed a higher elevation, and skylights for the purpose of providing light into the loft area without intruding upon privacy. He has no other concerns with regard to the proposed addition. He noted that the drawings are conceptual and he would appreciate viewing the real plans. He noted that there is not much of a view above the current ridge line that could be blocked so this is not much of a concern for him.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, commented that he believes the plumbing should not be installed in the basement because it would invite the potential for conversion to an unpermitted unit at some point in the future. He suggested that the second floor open loft space be considered as a real second floor, noting the possibility that it would take a few hours of labor to convert the loft space without a permit.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz clarified that there are two joint workshops of the Planning Commission and Design Review Board scheduled for August 18, and September 15, 2008, to consider Building Intensity Standards in the General Plan.

Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) the concept of adding a subterranean basement is a creative idea to add space that does not impact neighbors, noting that it is a big task and must be done properly; b) it appears in the plans that there is not a significant use for the lofts other than to create light for the space below; c) it is appreciated that the second-story addition is centralized in the plans; d) the proposed window pattern seems somewhat boring and repetitive although it is understood that the purpose is for light and ventilation; and e) he suggests that

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 9 of 17

light could be created by dormers which would reduce the square footage from the plans with regard to the FAR Guidelines.

2. Member Schneider commented: a) if the basement is habitable space, he would not support a modification with regard to the parking space requirement because the size of the house exceeds 3,000 square feet; b) agreed with Member Branch that there is a lot of apparent mass and volume with regard to the loft area which needs to be restudied; c) the submerged basement would solve size, bulk and scale concerns because it would not be visible, however it would be located in the setback; and d) at this point, the bigger issues need to be considered other than the architecture and design.
3. Member Brown commented: a) agreed with Members Branch and Schneider regarding the massing of the second floor, and stated that there may be other ways to achieve the lighting and ventilation, and requested that the applicant restudy the second-story massing; b) expressed concern that there are no second-story homes shown on the streetscape and that the proposed second story element is fairly big, although something smaller may be acceptable; c) the basement, which seems somewhat large, affects the intensity of the use on the site; and d) the basement square footage adds complexity with regard to the City's parking requirement.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) he would support excluding the square footage from the FAR in this particular project because the basement is completely subterranean; b) he does not have a concern with regard to the proposed two-story house on this street; and c) suggested that the horizontal mass on the upper roof be reworked so there would be a three-gable element facing the street, noting that all of the homes on the street have prominent gable features within a certain size range facing the street so there is more of a balance.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) expressed concern that there are too many windows on the south elevation facing the neighbor's property; b) he has no concerns with regard to the basement; and c) he could support not counting the basement square footage as habitable space, although it is not an issue for consideration; .
6. Member Messner commented: a) agreed with many of the comments from Members Schneider and Brown; b) the basement square footage should be included in the FAR calculations; and c) expressed concern regarding the windows on the south elevation facing the neighbor's property which need to be addressed.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) agreed with comments from the DRB architect members; b) there seems to be a huge amount of mass and bulk being added on the second floor for the purpose of just providing light and ventilation, and suggested consideration of a clerestory feature or dormers; c) suggested that the privacy concern regarding the windows on the south elevation could be addressed by making the windows in the loft area smaller and higher up; d) the basement concept is an innovative approach to add some space that is not counted towards the FARs, but expressed some concerns that it would be habitable in a sense and not located just under the garage; e) the exterior staircase for the basement allows the opportunity for a door and windows, but suggested that the area over the door and window be roofed-over as part of the driveway for liability purposes, not having the total area exposed; f) the applicant should consider how water would

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 10 of 17

be removed from the exterior stairwell area; and g) noted that the concept to locate the washing machine and utility sink in the basement is workable.

STRAW VOTE ON ISSUE #1 IN STAFF REPORT:

How many members believe that some percentage square footage of the fully submerged subterranean basement should be included in FAR calculations?

Members voting affirmative: Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider (5).

Members not voting in the affirmative: Smith, Wignot. (2).

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 08-087-DRB, 266 Spruce Drive, to September 9, 2008, with comments.

RECESS HELD FROM 5:34 P.M. TO 5:40 P.M.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-090-DRB

7837 Langlo Ranch Road (APN 079-600-030)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 3,086-square foot two-story residence and an attached 446-square foot 2-car garage on a 7,533-square foot lot in the DR-4 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 174-square feet in additions on the first-floor, consisting of a 44-square foot bathroom, a 24-square foot living room, 53-square foot garage, and a 53-square foot attached utility shed. The applicant also proposes to convert 133 square feet of the existing garage into habitable square footage for a bathroom and laundry room. The resulting 2-story structure would be 3,260 square feet, consisting of a 2,814-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 446-square foot 2-car garage. This proposed project exceeds the maximum allowable Floor Area Ratio Guidelines (FAR) for this property, which is 2,313.25 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. The project was filed by agent Lawrence Thompson on behalf of James Kirwan III, property owner. Related cases: 89-V-028 J; 90-LUS-136; 08-090-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by agent Lawrence Thompson on behalf of James Kirwan III, property owner, and James Kirwan. Lawrence Thompson clarified that he presented the following corrected data to staff: a) the size of the garage will be basically reduced; b) the proposed bathroom infill is 24 square feet instead of 44 square feet; c) the proposed size of the structure is 3,083 square feet; and d) the habitable size of the proposed structure is 2,670 square feet. Lawrence Thompson stated that currently there are six bedrooms and only two bathrooms in the house; therefore, there is a need for decent sanitary facilities, as well as a need by the family for a handicapped accessible bathroom. He believes there is no intensity question because there are no upper floor additions, no new bedrooms, and the same number of occupants. He stated that based upon his calculations, the project exceeds the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) by 357 square feet. James Kirwan III, property owner,

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 11 of 17

commented that the proposed project would only add 24 new square feet to the existing building. He stated that he wants to work with his neighbors regarding the parking concerns. He noted that the occupants of his property park their vehicles in front of the house or across the street where there is a creek, but do not park in any neighbors' space.

Planning Technician Brian Hiefield discussed the following two issues in the staff report for consideration: a) the proposed exceeds Floor Area Ratio Guidelines (FAR) by 500.75 square feet; and b) the proposed garage measures 19' x 19' clear (internal dimensions). He clarified that project is before the DRB for review because the proposed project exceeds the Floor Area Ratio Guidelines.

Documents: Letters received from: 1) Donald and Stephanie Wilson, dated August 8, 2008, in opposition to the project; 2) Ted and Sharon Zrelak, dated August 5, 2008, in opposition to the construction proposed in the notice; 3) Bruce and Louise Keeler, dated August 10, 2008, recommending denial of the request; 4) Vicki Slocum, dated August 5, 2008, urging denial of the project; 5) Bernie Schaeffer, dated August 5, 2008, requesting denial of the project; and 6) Kris O'Leary-Hayes, dated August 11, 2008, in opposition to the project.

Speakers:

Kris O'Leary-Hayes read her letter dated August 11, 2008, in opposition to the project. Her concerns included: a) the proposed exceeds the maximum allowable Floor Area Ratio Guidelines; b) the existing structure is inconsistent with current City ordinance and design standards due to its size, height and setbacks in proportion to lot size; c) the current home is ostentatious and does not blend in with the existing neighborhood; d) the project does not meet required Finding 1 with regard to appearance of the neighborhood, Finding 17 that the project will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood, and Finding 20 with regard to adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests; e) the removal of square footage from the garage will make it inadequate and insufficient for two cars to fit; f) the existing driveway is quite short making multiple vehicle parking and access difficult; g) she believes that the intent of the design review process was to address the issue of on-street parking within the residential areas; h) the intensity of use is a key issue because of the current high number of occupants on the property there have been between 9 and 13 cars parked in the driveway, but never in the garage, and on the surrounding neighborhood streets; i) noted that there are several unregistered vehicles associated with this property; j) allowing the garage conversion will limit any future owner's ability to park vehicles under cover and off the street; k) conversations with several neighbors reveal they are frustrated by the vehicles parked on the public street and not on the property; and l) presented photographs of the project site.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, requested that a bathroom not be allowed within the garage or immediately adjacent, opening into the garage, which he believes would invite the potential for a non-permitted garage conversion. He recommended that the rules should be followed.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 12 of 17

William Campbell, Goleta, neighbor immediately across the street, for thirty-five years, commented that there have been many people living in the house and he does not believe the garage has been used for parking cars since it was purchased by the current owners. He expressed concern that if the house is expanded any further it would invite the potential for an apartment use for more occupants. He recommended that the application be denied and strongly urged consideration of the present use which he believes can be verified by the neighbors. He noted that there have been some nice second-story additions in the neighborhood that were needed for families that have grown because the initial houses were small. He provided a photograph of parked vehicles.

Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) the impacts to the neighborhood have already occurred with regard to the project's current size, bulk and scale; b) the intensity of use already exists with the current bedrooms, making note that no more bedrooms are being added; c) there is a need for more bathrooms with regard to the many bedrooms; d) the proposed size of the square footage is not significant, noting that the current project exceeds the FAR Guidelines; moreover, the square footage existed prior to the institution of the FAR guidelines; e) noted that the public comment indicates that there are a lot of neighbors who expressed concerns; and f) he could probably support the project.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) agreed with Member Branch's comments with regard to existing impacts to the neighborhood and intensity; b) the proposed architecture is fine and it continues with the appearance of the existing architecture; c) extending the depth of the garage would hopefully accommodate the parking of cars; d) there have been a lot of issues expressed by neighbors in the area with regard to the applicant's property; e) he is cognizant of the comments made by speaker Gary Vandeman with regard to the handicapped bathroom; and g) he would probably support the project.
3. Member Herrera commented: a) expressed concern that new square footage would be added to the project which already exceeds the FAR Guidelines; and b) the neighbors' comments indicate they have concerns with regard to problems in the neighborhood.
4. Member Messner commented: a) upon review of the photographs, noted that there is a trench covered with boards; however permits have not been issued yet to install the sewer line.
5. Chair Wignot commented: a) the proposed amount of square footage to be added to the footprint is not a substantial change and could be considered for approval; b) the neighbors' comments in opposition to the project express concerns with regard to the applicant's property, particularly parking issues; and c) although the parking issues are not within the DRB's purview, he would support the applicant making the choice to address the neighbors' concerns as a "good neighbor".
6. Member Schneider commented: a) agreed with Member Branch that the intensity of use already exists; b) the proposed addition of square footage for the bathroom in the southeast corner is reasonable, not visible, and does not add to the mass, bulk, and scale; c) he cannot support the proposed garage conversion, the

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 13 of 17

addition of the handicapped bathroom in the garage, or compromising the existing garage space, particularly since the garage is not currently being used for vehicle parking, and the neighbors have concerns with regard to parking for cars generated by the project site; and d) he understands the need for the handicapped bathroom and suggested there may be another place in the house to locate the handicapped bathroom.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown) to continue Item L-2, No. 08-090-DRB, 7837 Langlo Ranch Road, to September 9, 2008, with the following comments: 1) the proposed addition for the bathroom in the rear, in the southeast corner, is acceptable; 2) the applicant is requested to restudy the bathroom, laundry, and garage area in an effort to maintain at least a 20' depth, or possibly more, in the garage to reduce the impact to the garage; and 3) the applicant is encouraged to restudy relocating the handicapped bathroom in another location in the interior space of the house; and to continue to September 9, 2008.

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-147-DRB

111 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-025)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 21,800-square foot commercial building on a 3.6-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to remodel the façade of the building, but no changes in building height, building coverage, signage, or floor area are proposed. Features of the remodel include a new aluminum and glass storefront system on the north, south, and west elevations of the building, and an upgrade of existing aluminum glass and doors on the north, east, and south elevations. A new landscape plan is also proposed, with new plantings consisting of *Prunus cerassifera*, *Miscanthus sinensis*, *Syagrus romanzoffianum*, and other plant species. The project was filed by Dave Jones of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Mark Winnikoff of Frieslander Holdings LLC and Nederlander Holdings, LLC, property owners. Related cases: 08-147-LUP. (Shine Ling)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Jeff Gorrell, representing Dave Jones of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Mark Winnikoff of Frieslander Holdings LLC and Nederlander Holdings, LLC, property owners.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling stated that staff will request that the applicant show the entirety of the lot on the site plan.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) the applicant is requested to provide lighting cut sheets showing some type of fully-shielded light directed downward.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) the building design is fine; and b) the landscaping plans need to be reviewed in detail.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 14 of 17

3. Chair Wignot commented: a) the landscape plans need to be reviewed in addition to site drainage and lighting plans; b) the site needs more landscaping than the proposed minimal landscaping that is shown on the plans; c) the strip along the perimeter of the parking along the roadway would benefit from some shade trees interspersed among existing shade trees which would be something other than the existing "tired" shrubs; d) noted that the property across the street is well-landscaped with some shade trees; and e) noted that the larger parapet on the roof could use some repainting.
4. Member Messner commented: a) the landscape plan should include street trees all the way around the frontages of the project; and b) recommended that the applicant refer to the City's current Recommended Street Tree Planting List and planting guidelines.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with Member Messner with regard to including street trees all the way around the frontages of the project; and b) requested that the landscape plan show the location of the existing palm trees.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-147-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets showing some type of fully-shielded down light situation, and color and material boards.

AMENDED MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-147-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets showing some type of fully-shielded down light situation, and color and material boards; and b) the applicant shall provide a landscape plan showing street trees along both frontages of the property; and to continue to September 9, 2008, for Final review by the full DRB on the Final Calendar.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-075-DRB

7090 Marketplace Drive (APN 073-440-013)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The development includes 475,487 square feet of commercial development with 2,490 parking spaces on approximately 49 acres over 7 parcels in the SC (Shopping Center) zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 7,770-square foot addition to an existing 24,017-square foot building previously occupied by CompUSA and to eliminate 31 parking spaces. The entry would be relocated from the east elevations' northern end to the center of the building, and a car stereo installation bay would be created on the southern elevation. The resulting total onsite development would include 483,257 square feet, and the 1-story structure would be 31,787 square feet. Available parking throughout the entire shopping center would be reduced from 2,490 to 2,459 parking spaces with a reduction from 177 to 146 parking spaces located on this parcel. Parking stall sizes are proposed to remain in their current modified configuration. A total of 12 Bradford Pear trees, 3 Brisbane Box trees, and 1 Tipu tree are proposed to be removed, but 17 comparable trees are proposed to be planted. Minor alterations to drive aisles and

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 15 of 17

lighting are also proposed. New materials include a storefront/entry with a kynar finish/clear anodized aluminum, "Solar Gray" glazing, new metal doors to be painted to match the adjacent surfaces and new bollards with either an unspecified finish or to be painted Ben Morre #343 "Bright Yellow." All other materials (including lighting and landscaping) for this project are to match the existing commercial property. The project was filed by Kimberly A. Schizas on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 95-SP-001, 95-DP-026, 96-EIR-3, & 08-075-DP AM. (Natasha Heifetz Campbell & Scott Kolwitz)

Site visits: Made by all members.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Mark Linehan, president and owner of Camino Real Marketplace; Kimberly Schizas, partner; and the Abdul Salehi, project architect for Best Buy, tenant. Mark Linehan stated that the project architecture will match existing and that materials and fixtures on the existing building will be re-used and recycled as much as possible. A door will be added to the southeast corner for employees to move automobiles in and out of the building for installation of automobile stereos.

Document: Letter received August 12, 2008, from Gary Mosel, opposing the project and requesting further traffic studies be conducted at the intersection of Hollister Avenue and Santa Felicia Drive.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz clarified that the purpose of today's review is to provide comments prior to the Zoning Administrator hearing regarding the Development Plan Amendment, and that the project will return to the DRB for Preliminary and Final review. He said that the DRB will need to specifically review the proposed modifications with regard to the number of parking spaces and also the sizes of the parking spaces. He also clarified that traffic issues will be considered during the planning process.

Speaker:

Barbara Massey, Goleta, recommended that the garage door at the car stereo installation area be relocated so as to not interfere with the traffic aisle for through traffic. She also requested that consideration be given to finding a way to break up the long, flat, nondescript architecture, with the stair rails which she believes are unattractive, on the left side elevation. She spoke in support of Best Buy as a tenant.

Comments:

The majority of the DRB members did not object to the modification to reduce the number of parking spaces and did not believe there would be a problem. There were no objections to the modification request with regard to the size of the parking spaces.

1. Member Messner commented: a) overall the project is fine; b) expressed concern regarding vehicle accessibility to and from the store, and recommended that the two curbs at the front of the store be minimized, and that the length of the curbing be minimized at the entrance, to help with traffic flow; c) moving the door for

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

August 12, 2008

Page 16 of 17

automobile stereo installation may reduce congestion; d) recommended that larger tree sizes be used for the new trees (plant 24" box size instead of 15-gallon size) to equalize the landscaping; e) the reason why a larger size new tree may not grow as fast as a smaller size is that the roots have become root-bound; however a landscape architect can certify on the drawing specifications that a tree will not be root-bound no matter what size, and can inspect them on the site as well.

2. Member Schneider commented: a) expressed concern that automobiles would be backing out from the door into the traffic aisle on the southeast corner; b) conceptually, the plans are fine and the information presented indicates there are no problems with the reduction of the number of parking spaces; and c) the parking space sizes are acceptable.
3. Member Branch commented: a) overall, the project is fine; and b) from his experience and knowledge with regard to parking on the site, he does not believe there will be problems with parking.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) agreed with Member Messner's recommendation to minimize the length of the curbs to help facilitate traffic flow; b) he walks by the site often and has not seen a parking problem; c) the project design is fine and he appreciates that the main element of the façade was shifted over.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with the DRB members' comments; and b) he does not believe parking will be a problem, noting that from his experience parking spaces are available on the southwest corner of the Costco site.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) agreed with the DRB members' comments; b) the location of the door for automobiles to enter the building on the southeast corner seems problematic; c) suggested that the northeast corner would be more logical for the automobile door and noted there would be adjacent parking spaces for the automobiles at this location; however, the relocation of the door would not be a requirement for his decision to approve the project; d) he does not believe the reduction of parking would cause a problem; and e) from his experience he believes the proposed tenant is a reputable company.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown) to continue Item M-1, No. 08-075-DRB, 7090 Marketplace Drive, including the comment that the applicant is requested to study relocating the proposed automobile door on the southeast corner, which would be good, and noting that approval of the project would not be contingent on relocating the door; and to continue Item M-1 to September 9, 2008.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. SIGN COMPLIANCE DISCUSSION

By consensus, the DRB continued Item O-1, Sign Compliance Discussion, which was requested by Member Brown, because she was not present for this discussion. Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz will contact Member Brown regarding the re-scheduling.

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Senior Planner Scott Kolwtiz stated that Chair Wignot had made a request for a discussion regarding the density of a project when there are constraints with regard to building on a portion of the site. He noted that this issue may be discussed at the joint Planning Commission/DRB workshops on Building Intensity Standards to be held August 18 and September 15, 2008. There being no objections, Chair Wignot stated that the DRB will defer scheduling this item for discussion until after the workshops have been conducted.

O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Chair Wignot announced that he will need to leave the DRB meeting on August 26, 2008, between 5:00 p.m. and 5:30 p.m., and that Vice Chair Smith will serve as Chair in his absence.

Vice Chair Smith announced that he will not be present at the DRB meeting on September 9, 2008.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 7:30 P.M.

Minutes approved on August 26, 2008.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 12, 2008

Page 18 of 18