



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, June 24, 2008**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.**

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### **SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 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 – COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

#### **Members:**

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair	Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)
Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair	Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Scott Branch (Architect)	Carl Schneider (Architect)
Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)	

---

#### **A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Wignot at 3:10 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

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

Board Members absent: Thomas Smith, Vice Chair.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Cindy Moore, Senior 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 Revised Minutes for May 28, 2008

**MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Abstain: Schneider; Absent: Smith) to reconsider approval of the Design Review Board Meeting Minutes of May 28, 2008, and to approve the Design Review Board Revised Minutes for May 28, 2008, as amended.**

B. Design Review Board Minutes for June 10, 2008

**MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, to consider approval of the Design Review Board Minutes for June 10, 2008.**

Member Brown stated that some of the members have not had the opportunity to read the Design Review Board Minutes for June 10, 2008, which were e-mailed to them but inadvertently were not mailed.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Abstain: Herrera; Absent: Smith) to continue approval of the Design Review Board Meeting Minutes for June 10, 2008, to the next DRB meeting on July 8, 2008.**

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

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the Subcommittee met today and discussed with City Arborist Bill Millar the Urban Forestry Grant that was recently awarded to the City from the California Department of Forestry. He stated that Goleta Valley Beautiful will be working on the grant in developing an urban forest mapping plan. Member Messner stated that the discussion items regarding Nursery Standards and Items in the General Plan Related to the Urban Forest were continued to the next Subcommittee meeting which will be held on July 22, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

**B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT**

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) there have been no Planning Commission or City Council actions related to DRB items since the last DRB meeting; 2) the discussion regarding a separate Sign Subcommittee will be held at the end of the meeting (Item O-1); and 3) Senior Planner Cindy Moore will attend the next DRB meeting on July 8, 2008, in his absence.

**C. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

No speakers.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

June 24, 2008

Page 3 of 16

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) the applicant for Item F-1, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, requested a continuance to July 22, 2008; 2) staff recommends that Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, be continued to July 22, 2008; and 3) the applicant requests that Item L-1, No. 05-045-DRB, 7885 Langlo Ranch Road, be moved to the end of the agenda for today.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to continue Item F-1, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to July 22, 2008, per the applicant's request; to continue Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, to July 22, 2008, per staff's recommendation; and to move Item L-1, No. 05-045-DRB, 7885 Langlo Ranch Road, to the end of the agenda for today.**

### E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

### F. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

5575 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-090-085)

This is a request for *Final* 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. The 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 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 4-22-08, 3-25-08, 2-26-08, 9-18-07, 08-21-07) (Cindy Moore)

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to continue Item F-1, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to July 22, 2008, per the applicant's request.**

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

June 24, 2008

Page 4 of 16

### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Schneider reported that the Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-1, No. 08-089-DRB, 5801 Calle Real.

### H. SIGN CALENDAR

#### H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-089-DRB

5801 Calle Real (APN 069-110-097)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 55,669-square foot shopping center on a 1.28-acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a new freestanding monument sign using elements from the existing monument sign. New façade elements of the sign would consist of new off-white stucco top cap, pole covers, and bases. The applicant proposes to re-use the existing 100-square foot sign panel. The sign would be an internally illuminated cabinet sign. The height of the sign structure would be 21'-6". The project was filed by Kelli Ingber of Lighting Contract Service, agent, on behalf of Jack Jakosky, property owner, and Albertsons, store owner. Related cases: 08-089-SCC. (Shine Ling)

*Sign Subcommittee Review on June 24, 2008:*

The plans were presented by Kelli Ingber of Lighting Contract Services, agent, on behalf of Jack Jakosky, property owner, and Albertsons, store owner.

Comments:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended Preliminary Approval with the following conditions: a) the size of the letters shall match the size of the existing letters; b) push-through letters shall be used; c) the background shall be opaque and painted Sherwin-Williams Navajo White; d) the color of the letters shall be Albertsons' blue color; and e) no landscaping around the sign is acceptable; however, the use of some type of permeable materials such as gravel or pavers is requested.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-1, No. 08-089-DRB, 5801 Calle Real, with the following conditions: 1) the size of the letters shall match the size of the existing letters; 2) push-through letters shall be used; 3) the background shall be opaque and painted Sherwin-Williams Navajo White; 4) the color of the letters and logo shall be Albertsons' blue color; 5) no landscaping around the base of the sign is approved, however, the use of some type of permeable materials such as gravel or pavers is requested; and to continue Item H-2, No. 08-089-DRB, to July 8, 2008, for Final review.**

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

June 24, 2008

Page 5 of 16

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

### L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

#### L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-045-DRB

7885 Langlo Ranch Road (APN 079-570-070)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 3,041-square foot two-story residence and an attached 390-square foot two-car garage on a 8,712-square foot lot in the DR-4 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 358 square feet in additions on the first floor. The resulting two-story structure would be 3,789 square feet, consisting of a 3,399-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 390-square foot two-car garage. The proposal is not consistent with the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by Fred Gonzales, agent, on behalf of Roy Romp, property owner. Related cases: 05-045-LUP. (Shine Ling)

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to move Item L-1, No. 05-045-DRB, 7885 Langlo Ranch Road, to the end of the agenda for today, per the applicant's request.**

Site visits: Made by all members present except Messner and \*Schneider. \*Member Schneider stated that he made a site visit when the project was initially submitted.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Fred Gonzales, agent, on behalf of Roy Romp, property owner. Mr. Gonzales discussed the history of the project, stating that it started in 1958 as a proposal to construct an addition of 1,300 square feet to a single-family residence which received tentative approval by the County of Santa Barbara. Thereafter, there were some economic difficulties for the applicant and the time period for completion expired. Mr. Gonzales stated that the applicant later proceeded with a proposal to increase the square footage in his home, after the City's incorporation, and submitted plans that were reviewed by the DRB with the direction that the project be restudied. The applicant, then contacted Mr. Gonzales, and decided to reduce the size of the project down to 358 square feet in the master bedrooms, in response to the DRB review.

SPEAKER::

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, stated that the drawings are much more intelligible than the plans previously submitted and that the inclusion of the adjacent properties on the plans are helpful. In his opinion, the proposed porch adds interest to a very plain front exterior of the building, but it pulls the mass of the house out closer to the street, so

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

June 24, 2008

Page 6 of 16

he believes there is a plus and a minus with regard to the proposed porch. He expressed curiosity with regard to the purpose and location of the proposed second water heater at the rear of the house.

Documents: Assistant Planner Shine Ling presented the following documents which were received: a) letter from Bernie Schaeffer, neighbor, dated June 18, 2008, not in support of the project; and b) e-mail from Lisa and Steve Kus, neighbors, dated June 23, 2008, and received on June 24, 2008, expressing concerns regarding the project.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling pointed out the land use and zoning issues that are stated in the staff report. He noted one correction to be made to the staff report is that there is a City requirement for an enclosed three-car garage once there is more than 3,000 square feet of habitable area. Mr. Ling stated that the project has only two parking spaces rather than the required three enclosed spaces, and that he provided this information to the applicant last week. He clarified that the applicant's drawings show a 10-foot front setback which should be a 20-foot setback per R-1 zoning requirements. Assistant Planner Shine Ling also stated that the applicant has not formally requested a Zoning Modification at this time.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated for clarification with regard to the proposed front yard porch, that the front yard setback may be exceeded by a total of three feet if eaves extend into the setback but the extension would not be allowed if it was for footings.

### Comments:

1. Member Schneider expressed the following concerns: a) the project size is over the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district; b) the project is currently over 3,000 square feet and the parking requirement would need to be addressed if there was an addition; c) he cannot support encroachments into the required side yards; and d) the proposed porch element may improve the character of the house, but there are other problems with regard to parking requirements, FAR guidelines and setbacks.
2. Member Brown expressed the following concerns: a) the existing house covers a large amount of the property and appears imposing on this site; b) the proposed project does not meet FAR guidelines, the three-car parking requirement and setbacks; c) with regard to bringing the porch forward, there is already a lot of development on the front elevation, particularly with the fence in front; d) an encroachment into the side yard setback would likely impact the neighbor; and e) the proposal to decrease the sizes of the garage seems inappropriate when there would be a 3-car enclosed parking requirement.
3. Member Branch commented: a) agreed with comments made by Member Schneider and Member Brown with regard to the size, bulk and scale of the existing house; b) the proposed porch cover in the front is one positive element that seems to work, which would not add square footage, and would be allowed with regard to the setback; c) the elevations do not show the existing walls in front; and d) he does not believe the project can meet findings with respect to the

setbacks, parking requirements and development standards, or that modifications would be appropriate.

4. Chair Wignot commented: a) agreed with comments made with regard to the existing size, bulk and scale of the house; b) the surrounding houses in the area are all single-story houses; c) the project already exceeds the maximum floor area ratio guidelines and it is not consistent with setback requirements; and d) he could not support adding additional square footage or encroachment into the setbacks.

Fred Gonzales, agent, responded to the comments, stating that he believes that the request for an addition of 358 square feet is a minimal amount and that there are approximately ten two-story houses in the area that have large square footage. He noted that the purpose of the project is to increase the size of the small master bedroom which is needed to help meet the personal needs of the property owner's wife. He expressed his general concern that the size of a house cannot be increased. He also stated that the proposed front porch could be deleted. He commented that he was not aware of the three-car enclosed parking requirement until last week.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to deny Item L-1, No. 05-045-DRB, 7885 Langlo Ranch Road, based upon determination that the following DRB Findings cannot be made: Findings 1, 3, 16, 17, 19 and 20.**

Member Schneider commented that he does not want to be insensitive to the applicant's situation and need for space, stating that he believes there could be other solutions done within the existing footprint without expanding beyond the existing footprint area.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the denial of the project may be appealed within ten calendar days following the action, and that the project planner may be contacted for details regarding the appeal process.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling clarified that a planning review is not necessary for an interior remodel if square footage is not added and elevations are not changed.

**L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-083-DRB**

5980 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-051-024)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,260-square foot commercial building on an approximately 7,800-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to change the colors of the existing Taco Bell building to a new color palette, with a dark brown color as the dominant color for the exterior walls (Sherwin Williams SW2823 "Rockwood Clay"). No changes in building height, building coverage, signage, or floor area are proposed. A new landscape plan is also proposed, with new plantings consisting of *Phoenix robelinii*, *Arctostaphylos hookerii*, and other plant species. The project was filed by Tim Friedrich of T. L. Friedrich, Inc., agent, on behalf of Robert M. Coe, property owner, and Taco Bell of Lompoc, tenant. Related cases: 08-083-LUP. (Shine Ling)

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

June 24, 2008

Page 8 of 16

Site visits: Made by all members present.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Tim Friedrich of T.L. Friedrich, Inc., agent, on behalf of Robert M. Coe, property owner, and Taco Bell of Lompoc, tenant. He stated that in addition to changing the color of the building, the applicant proposes to update the landscaping. He showed a photograph of the colors on the exterior of another Taco Bell building located in Santa Barbara and clarified that the color that is noted as “Amber Wave” is actually white on the building in Santa Barbara.

Comments:

1. Chair Wignot expressed concern that it appears that the center *Phoenix robelinii* palm tree is located in front of the center window which is being used for display signage. He suggested consideration of having four palm trees or having a tree on either side of the center arch.
2. Member Messner commented: a) recommended that the location of the center *Phoenix robelinii* tree be offset which would be more attractive than an equal spacing for the three trees; and 2) recommended increasing the size of the *Phoenix robelinii* trees to minimum 36” brown trunk height (if the tree is multi-trunk, at least one trunk must be at least 36” tall brown trunk height), which would be more substantial and would blend better with the landscaping because the 15-gallon size is too small and slow-growing.
3. Member Brown commented that she does not believe the proposed “Amber Wave” color is appropriate in Old Town. She noted that she appreciates the color selection on the Taco Bell building located in Santa Barbara.
4. Member Schneider commented: a) agreed with Member Brown that the “Amber Wave” color is not an appropriate color, stating that doesn’t resolve itself well with the proposal; b) recommended that “Amber Wave” be eliminated, “Camelback” be used for the body, “Rockwood Clay” be used as the base color, “Iron Ore” be restricted to any wrought iron or metal (not including parapet caps), the parapet caps should match the adjacent body color, and “Alabaster” be used for the white brick trim; and c) agreed with Member Messner’s comments with regard to increasing the size of the *Phoenix robelinii* trees and moving the middle tree to a location that is off-center.
5. Member Branch agreed with the above comments. He noted that the plans imply that there are four arches on the front of the building, however, there are only three existing arches.
6. Chair Wignot agreed with the above comments.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 08-083-DRB, 5980 Hollister Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) the proposed colors are approved with the exceptions that the #2 color “Amber Wave” shall not be used, and that use of the #5 color “Iron Ore” shall be limited only to accent metals, if there is any wrought iron on the building, but not used on the parapet caps; 2) the color of the parapet caps shall be painted out to match the adjacent body color; 3) the size shall be minimum 36” brown trunk height for the three**



***Phoenix robelinii* palm species in the front (if the tree is multi-trunk, at least one trunk must be at least 36” tall brown trunk height), and 4) the position of the center *Phoenix robelinii* tree shall be relocated so it is offset and not in front of the central arch; and to continue Item L-2, No. 08-083-DRB, to July 8, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

**L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-088-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 construct a new façade around the existing entry. The 18'-6" high by 19'-9" wide curved plaster façade will be painted Frazee color "Wise Crack" green to contrast the color on the remaining front façade. The existing accent lighting adjacent to the entry will be reused on the new façade, and there will be new down lighting added to the overhang above the entry. The existing steel sculpture and storefront doors are to remain. There will be pathway lighting added adjacent to the existing steel sculpture. There is no new square footage proposed. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 04-229-LUP, -DRB; 03-073-DP, -DRB. (Brian Hiefield)

Site visits: Made by all members present.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Rex Ruskauff, project architect, and Dan Michealsen, property owner. Rex Ruskauff provided photographs of the building and stated that the purpose of the new façade is to provide something for the existing steel sculptural element to float off of, as well as to call a little more attention to the front doors for two separate tenants. He stated that the applicant proposes that two additional bollards be placed along the pathway to light the path, which can be updated on the drawings for the next review. He clarified that the light source to be used for both the cam lights and the bollards will be Metal-Halide lighting.

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the bollard lighting is not shielded and will direct light downward; and b) requested that the applicant check the photometrics.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) expressed concern with regard to the bollard lighting that relates to the light source and brightness of the reflector; and b) green color could be a little deeper.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-088-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, with the following comments: 1) the applicant shall check the photometrics and provide illumination details that address the concerns with regard to shielding the light illumination from the bollards; and 2) there is the possibility that the applicant may explore a green color that is a little more deeper which may be reviewed for approval at the Final review; and to continue Item L-3, No. 08-088-DRB, to July 8, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

## **M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR**

### **M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 03-051-DRB**

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

This is a request for *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. 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. (Last heard on 5-28-08, 4-8-08\*, 2-12-08\*, 01-23-08\*, 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to continue Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, to July 22, 2008, per staff's recommendation.**

**M-2. 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 5-28-08, 5-13-08\*, 2-12-08, 01-23-08, 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

The plans were presented by Bruce Bartlett, project architect; Fernando Ablaza, project architect; Martha Degasis, project landscape architect; and by Claudia Sigona, representing agent Suzanne Elledge on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Fernando Ablaza discussed the final renditions of the elevations as a result of the most recent ad hoc meeting. Martha Degasis presented an overview of the existing and proposed landscaping. She stated that the plans for the temporary parking lot show the hedging, sidewalk alignment and bioswales.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

June 24, 2008

Page 12 of 16

Senior Planner Cindy Moore clarified that the application for the project was determined complete on June 19, 2008.

Bruce Bartlett, project architect, presented the working drawings for the hospital. He stated that last year there were comments with regard to the front entry canopy of the hospital by a few members who were hoping to have perhaps some openings or punctuations. Since that time, he said there has been a change in the plans that eliminated the complete circular driveway. Therefore, the area is now all landscaped and the applicant is satisfied with the solid form of the canopy. In response to some previous minor comments regarding the color of the canopy, he clarified that the white color tones were reserved to denounce the entries on both buildings as opposed to the softer tones. Mr. Bartlett stated that there are several screening walls to screen equipment on the elevation with the entry to the southern parking lot. He said that the equipment screens have been set back in-board to the perimeter of the building so that the parapet walls are not extended up.

### Comments:

#### Comments Regarding the Medical Office Building (MOB) Conceptual Plans:

1. Member Branch commented: a) overall, the progress made with the design is appreciated and he believes the MOB will be very complementary with the hospital; b) requested that the windows on the north elevation be pushed back/recessed and all of the horizontal members go back with it, but the top member remains in place, which would provide for an “eyebrow” feel and shadow line; c) on the west elevation, with regard to the elements on the bottom that protrude and throw a shadow, the proportion and design seems somewhat off; and d) the use of stucco material for the transformer enclosure is the best solution.
2. Member Brown commented: a) requested that the applicant provide a grading plan, including the location of trees, and a lighting plan; b) requested consideration of stormwater issues in terms of curb cuts with regard to the parking lot areas for the MOB and hospital; c) on the east elevation, the set-back design is appreciated and will add some interest, as well as the round element on the northern elevation; d) the east elevation will be improved by the proposed landscaping; e) the west elevation is very handsome and successful; f) suggested that some street trees be planted now with regard to the parking lot that can grow over time; g) suggested planting trees along the creek bank area such as *Toyons*, *Lemonade Berries*, or *Sycamore species* considering the amount of asphalt that will be installed on the site; h) the parking lot landscaping needs to be more interesting with more variety in addition to the row of *Catalina Cherry* species which just looks like its trying to screen the parking lot; i) requested consideration be given to the probability that pedestrians will be walking in the grove area with regard to planting appropriate groundcover; and j) the applicant should meet with the Community Services staff prior to the next review to discuss and understand the permanent as well as temporary requirements with regard to the temporary parking lot.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) overall, the building design is much better, including the entry, resolutions, round form and color; b) agreed with Member Branch with regard to recessing the window forms, particularly on the elevation

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

June 24, 2008

Page 13 of 16

facing Hollister Avenue, stating that the depth needs to be in the 12" to 18" range; c) also, on the stair tower forms, there needs to be a significant recess in the 12" range for the design to function and work; d) agreed with Member Branch that the proportions of the openings on the west elevation would be better as a square form; e) expressed concern that the pipe rail may look clunky if not done properly and suggested the applicant study the size and proportions; f) suggested adding a center island in the entry driveway to separate incoming and outgoing traffic; g) suggested that the applicant meet with the Community Services Department staff now regarding the permanent requirements for the parkway and sidewalk as well as what would be accepted on a temporary basis, which will be useful for the DRB review and help understand what could be installed that would be viable on a permanent basis (it is important for the two street frontages to have some significance - the creek frontage is of less concern); h) with regard to a suggestion by Member Messner to consider using gravel in the temporary parking lot for permeability purposes, he would be leery and noted his concerns related to dust and inconvenience for pedestrians; and i) the elevations with regard to the glass corners in the courtyard will need to be shown at the appropriate review level.

4. Member Herrera commented: a) the design has come a long way and is appreciated; b) the corner with the round element is attractive; c) agreed with the other DRB members that trees should be planted on the parkway and inside the parking lot; and d) expressed support for providing an appropriate method for safe pedestrian crossing at the temporary cross walk.
5. Member Messner commented: a) overall, the plans are fine; b) the entry area and the big planter area are appreciated on the south elevation; c) there needs to be a little more stone work on the north elevation, noting that there is a square pillar and suggesting something a little larger such as a rectangle, possibly cantilevering out from the overhang, to help visually draw attention to the entrance; d) adding trees on the outside would be nice; e) suggested that benches be added in the grove area; f) agreed with Member Schneider's suggestion to consider a center divider at the entrance; and g) suggested consideration of the cost-ratio with regard to the use of gravel rather than asphalt for the temporary parking lot, stating that gravel may cut down on certain problems with having runoff and would have a lot of permeability, noting that the size and location of the gravel may vary, or possibly use gravel just in the overflow area.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) the work of the applicant and ad hoc committee resulted in a more interesting design and good changes on all elevations for the MOB; b) agreed with DRB comments made today; c) the relocation of the transformer is appreciated; d) recommended that the applicant works with Goleta Water District regarding placement of the backflow preventer devices, which need to be shown on the plans, and screen this equipment with hedges or other landscaping/materials that will be approved by the Goleta Water District; e) the trash enclosures will need to be shown on the plans and be screened; f) the water hydrant locations along Hollister Avenue and/or Patterson Avenue will need to be shown on the plans; g) supported the use of the asphalt paving as proposed for the temporary parking lot, stating that the bioswale collection of runoff is good; h) requested some planting of flowers in the boundaries of the temporary parking lot for the projected three-year period; i) the applicant shall provide cut sheets for the

proposed lighting plans at the appropriate level of review; and j) it appears that the traffic flow will work fine.

Comments Regarding the Hospital Conceptual Plans:

1. Member Schneider requested that the applicant provide sections and roof plans showing the location of the mechanical screenings, the distance from the face of the building and the visibility.
2. Chair Wignot commented that the line-of-sight perspective view on Sheet A-7 seems to show that the equipment is pretty adequately shielded.
3. Member Messner commented that he understands the changes made with regard to the hospital front entry and the applicant's preference for a solid canopy.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to continue Item M-2, No. 07-171-DRB, 351 S. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue, to July 8, 2008, with comments, including minor changes suggested with regard to architecture, and to review landscaping and roof/mechanical screenings.**

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that from staff's perspective the re-submittal of a complete set of current conceptual plans by the applicant would be helpful to understand the entirety of the project by staff, the DRB and the public.

**RECESS HELD: 5:12 P.M. TO 5:21 P.M.**

**N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- NONE

**O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**O-1. SEPARATE SIGN COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz presented a chart showing the number of Sign Applications for both Overall Sign Plans and Sign Certificates of Conformance, received by the City as of June 6, 2008, which was compiled in response to a previous DRB request. He clarified that the number of applications received from 2002 through June 6, 2008, indicates an annual increase. He also provided information with regard to the technical changes that would be needed if a separate sign committee were formed, stating that there would be no need to make changes in the General Plan. Scott Kolwitz stated that currently staff is not advocating a separate Sign Committee process, which is mostly with regard to workload issues. However, he said that the DRB may choose to continue this discussion.

Member Brown expressed concern that currently the same DRB members are serving on the same subcommittees without flexibility and that the meetings sometimes simply last too long. She commented that there was more opportunity for flexibility when there were nine DRB members.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

June 24, 2008

Page 15 of 16

Chair Wignot suggested for consideration that the Sign Subcommittee meet just once a month rather than two times per month, if it would not slow down the process. For example, the Street Tree Subcommittee meets once a month.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the Street Tree Subcommittee discusses items that are not necessarily as critical with regard to timing as the sign applications.

Chair Wignot suggested that possibly a member of the Street Tree Subcommittee could attend the Sign Subcommittee meeting on the first DRB meeting date of the month to share the review process.

Member Brown stated that continuity of the membership on the Sign Subcommittee is important with regard to reviewing sign applications and it also best serves the public.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz suggested possible consideration that the Sign Subcommittee could meet on another day rather than on a Tuesday DRB meeting date.

Member Schneider and Member Brown expressed their preference to attend the meetings on the same day.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that staff appreciates the time the DRB members spend on the Board, particularly the extra time participating on the subcommittees.

Member Schneider stated that while it would be good to have a separate Sign Committee at this time, he believes that it would be very important to have a separate committee if and when the City adopts a new Sign Ordinance.

Member Brown stated that it would be functional to include some members from the business community on the membership of a Sign Committee because businesses are affected by decisions of this subcommittee. Member Schneider agreed with Member Brown.

Member Branch commented that one way to streamline the process would be to provide a document to sign applicants that specifies the requirements in the City's ordinance.

### SPEAKER:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, suggested that perhaps having one DRB member serve as the Chair of the Sign Subcommittee, with two members on the Subcommittee who are not DRB members, such as a person from the business community, would be of benefit and provide a fresh approach.

Member Schneider commented that part of the problem at this time is that there are not enough DRB members to rotate on the subcommittees, allowing members a break; however, he would not want to increase the number of members on the DRB.

## **Design Review Board Minutes – Approved**

June 24, 2008

Page 16 of 16

He suggested that a good solution with regard to the membership of a Sign Committee would be to have a DRB member serve as a liaison.

Member Brown stated that there are steps in the sign review process that could be modified for efficiency, for example, combining the levels in the sign review process. She stated that part of the overall problem is that the City needs to adopt a new Sign Ordinance that is more robust. She noted that the DRB members have expressed concerns regarding some sign enforcement issues.

Member Schneider stated that he believes the most important change that would be useful at this time would be to change the appeal point for signs from preliminary approval to final approval which would reduce the number of hearings for applicants, speed up the review process, and help with regard to staff's workload. He noted that there are still bigger overall issues that need to be addressed with regard to a new Sign Ordinance which has not yet been considered by the City Council.

By consensus, the DRB members directed that Member Schneider draft a letter to the City Council, for review by the DRB, that focuses on the aspect that the DRB believes that changing the appeal point for signs from preliminary approval to final approval, would provide for an opportunity to conduct Conceptual, Preliminary and Final review concurrently, which would streamline the process. By consensus, the DRB members requested that staff research and provide technical information to Member Schneider for use in preparation of the draft letter.

### **O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

No requests.

### **O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

No announcements.

### **P. ADJOURNMENT: 6:21 P.M.**

Minutes approved on July 8, 2008.



**Design Review Board Agenda**

June 24, 2008

Page 17 of 17