



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, April 8, 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 – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

Members:

Scott Branch (Architect), Chair

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Branch at 3:07 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Scott Branch, Chair; Bob Wignot, Vice Chair; Cecilia Brown; Simon Herrera; Carl Schneider; Thomas Smith.

Board Members absent: Chris Messner.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Laura Vlk, Associate Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician; Contract Planner; Natalie Heifetz

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 2 of 21

Campbell, Contract Planner; Dan McLaughlin, Interim Building and Safety Manager; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Meeting Minutes for March 25, 2008

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to approve the Design Review Board Meeting Minutes for March 25, 2008, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Member Wignot reported that the next Street Tree Subcommittee meeting will be held on April 22, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) The City Council will conduct interviews of the three applicants for appointment to the Design Review Board on April 15, 2008. 2) The Building Official has recommended the following items for discussion with the DRB at an upcoming meeting: a) lighting; and b) rules and regulations with regard to placement of various utility boxes.

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 staff recommends that Item H-1, No. 08-013-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, be continued to May 13, 2008; staff recommends Item H-2, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, be continued to April 22, 2008; the applicant for Item H-4, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, requested a continuance to April 22, 2008; the applicant for Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast Corner of Los Carneros/Camino Real, requested a continuance to May 28, 2008; and the applicant for Item N-1, No. 05-037-DRB, Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange, requested a continuance to May 13, 2008.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item H-1, No. 08-013-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, to May 13, 2008, per staff's recommendation; to continue Item H-4, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, April 22, 2008, per the applicant's request; to continue Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast Corner of Los Carneros/Camino Real, to May 28, 2008, per the applicant's request; and to continue Item N-1, No. 05-037-DRB, Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange, to May 13, 2008, per the applicant's request.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider; Absent: Messner) to continue Item H-2, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to April 22, 2008, per staff’s recommendation

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Chair Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-1, No. 08-023-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, with Assistant Planner Shine Ling; and Item F-2, No. 08-030-DRB, 7357 Elmhurst Place, with Assistant Planner Shine Ling.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-023-DRB

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

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. On the eastern parcel of the HBP the applicant proposes to augment the landscape and lighting plans, to construct a new park/seating area on a grassy area at the northeast corner of the eucalyptus barranca, to construct a new access ramp and door on the western elevation of Building 5, to convert the water treatment building into a fitness activity center, to construct a new basketball court next to the fitness activity center, and to convert existing water storage tanks into thermal storage tanks. No changes in building height, building coverage, or floor area are proposed. The materials for the revisions to the exterior elevations of Building 5 and the fitness activity center would match existing materials. The project was filed by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 08-023-SCD; -08-023-LUP. (Last heard on 03-11-08, 2-26-08) (Shine Ling)

ACTION: Chair Branch reported that he met with the applicant today and reviewed Item F-1, No. 08-023-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, with Assistant Planner Shine Ling, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted with the following conditions: 1) the color of the canopy at the Activity Center shall be changed to Chevy Silverado Gray; and 2) a gate that matches the other two proposed gates on the Activity Center will be added to the recycling center enclosure that is adjacent to the Activity Center.

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-030-DRB

7357 Elmhurst Place (APN 073-224-002)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 1,080-square foot residence and an attached 480-square foot two-car garage on a 5,775-square foot lot in the DR-10 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 100-square foot sunroom addition to the rear of the building. The resulting one-story structure would be 1,660 square feet, consisting of a 1,180-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 480-square foot two-car garage. The project was filed by Ed Martin of Ace Awning, agent, on behalf of Mary Medberry, property owner. Related cases: 08-030-DPAM and 08-030-LUP. (Last heard on 3-25-08) (Shine Ling)

ACTION: Chair Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-2, No. 08-030-DRB, 7357 Elmhurst Place, with Assistant Planner Shine Ling; that the exterior door light submitted by the applicant was downward lit; and that that Final Approval was granted as submitted. Chair Branch stated that he did not review the interior ceiling fan light, which was mentioned in the motion granting Preliminary Approval, because he does not believe a lighting fixture for the interior of the house is within the purview of the DRB.

Vice Chair Wignot stated that his concern regarding the interior lighting being added as part of this addition was that it would shine outwards over the fence; however it seems like the height of the fan would preclude this from being a problem.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Member Schneider reported that the Sign Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-3, No. 08-024-DRB, 7408-8412 Hollister Avenue.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-013-DRB

6860 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-015)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes three buildings totaling approximately 31,800 square feet of industrial building, warehouse, and chemical storage space on a 4.4-acre parcel in the M-RP (Industrial Research Park) zone district. The applicant proposes to install a monument sign at the front of the building. The dimensions of the monument structure would be 8' long by 4'-6" tall with an area of approximately 36-square feet. The sign attached to each side of the monument would be approximately 6'-2" long by 2'-11" tall, with an area of approximately 18-square feet. The non-illuminated signs would have pin-mounted bronze color letters for the building address, pin-mounted bronze colored suite numbers, and pin-mounted aluminum plates with bronze colored vinyl for the tenant names. The CMU monument structure will have 8" by 8" patterns cut into it, and paint to match the building. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 07-191-OSP, -DRB, -CUP, -DPAM. (Last heard on 3-25-08, 3-11-08) (Brian Hiefield)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item H-1, No. 08-013-DRB, 686- Cortona Drive, to May 13, 2008, per staff's recommendation.

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

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 5 of 21

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. Related case: 74-CP-39, 07-211-SCC. (Last heard on 3-11-08*, 2-26-08*, 2-12-08*, 1-23-08*, 1-08-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider; Absent: Messner) to continue Item H-2, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to April 22, 2008, per staff’s recommendation

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-024-DRB

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

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Hollister Business Park. The proposed OSP provides for two (2) different types of signs: wall signs and directional/informational signs. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 08-024-OSP; -CUP. (Last heard on 3-25-08, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review on April 8, 2008:

The plans were presented by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, and the project team, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online.

Comments:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended the following changes to the draft Overall Sign Plan:
 - a. The following language shall be added to Section II. Signage Allowances - A. Monument Signs on Page 2, and Section III. Sign Specifications Item #7, and shall be shown on the plans: “The light source shall be shielded so there is no light trespass beyond the sign.”
 - b. The plans need to show that the face of the proposed Informational Signs is 30-square feet, not the cabinet. The applicant shall provide a diagram for clarity.
 - c. The language shall be changed from “28-square foot wall sign” to “35-square foot wall sign” in Section II. Signage Allowances - C. Wall Signs, for clarity.
 - d. “Item 1) e) The eastern elevation of the Activity Center” shall be removed from Section II. Signage Allowances - C Wall Signs because this wall sign was deleted from the plans at the last hearing.

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 6 of 21

- e. The following language shall be added to B. Informational Signs (Directory Signs) Items B. 1) and B. 2) for clarity: “The sign shall be internally illuminated with opaque backgrounds with push-through copy.”
- f. Item C) 4) shall be deleted from Section II. Signage Allowances - C Wall Signs because it is a duplicate of Item C) 5).
- g. The language “creative, exciting, imaginative” shall be removed from the first sentence in Section III. Sign Specifications, #1, because it is subjective.
- j. Staff shall add language in Section III. Sign Specifications #8 that requires all signs to be made from durable, quality materials.
- k. The language regarding temporary signs in IV. Prohibited Signs #8 needs to be very clear. Staff shall note that portable signs are prohibited and also add language that addresses temporary signs related to construction as well as temporary signs for occupied tenants until permanent signs are permitted, for clarity
- l. Staff shall add punctuation, such as a colon, after the headings for the items in IV. Prohibited Signs.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item H-3, No. 08-024-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, with comments to May 13, 2008, for Preliminary review.

H-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-028-DRB

5730 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property consists of a commercial property for multiple retail tenants on an approximately 8,500-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district (Retail Commercial). The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan for the building. The proposed Overall Sign Plan (OSP) provides for wall signs for individual tenants and for the shopping center. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by David Lemmons of Central Coast Signs, agent, on behalf of Jerry Anderson, property owner. Related cases: 08-028-OSP. (Last heard on 3-25-08*, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item H-4, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, April 22, 2008, per the applicant’s request.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

I-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. (Last heard on 3-25-08*, 2-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 7 of 21

The plans were presented by John Maloney, electrical engineer and lighting designer, who stated that the applicant requested that he recommend some modifications to the proposal for the lighting plan. He provided a diagram showing the revised proposal for a louvered lighting fixture system with a Type 5 distribution which he said cuts the light off at forty-five degrees and directs it downward. He stated that the pole heights have been lowered to eight feet and that the light fixtures, which are approximately fifteen inches in height, would be installed on top of the poles. He also clarified that a disadvantage of using an opaque material for the lenses is that it cuts the output by forty percent. He stated that as the lamps and clear lenses age there will be some discoloration and that the lighting would then become more obscure.

Speakers:

Tom Wise stated that his primary concern is that replacing the three-foot tall lighting fixtures that are immediately adjacent to the residences with an eight-foot tall pole light will cast light into the residences. He requested that if the DRB approves the lighting project, a condition of approval be included that appropriate measures be taken to shield the residences from light trespass, either in the form of light shielding or with poles of an appropriate height, to make sure the light trespass does not occur.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, suggested for consideration that a fixture with a lower angle rather than forty-five degrees could be located at a lower height and then the light would be cast further out and would be much more evenly distributed. He requested that the DRB consider the character of the light when selecting the light bulb, stating that the last light fixture that was proposed had a high pressure sodium bulb.

Robert Young, Board Member, The Meadows HOA, clarified that there are some Malibu lights on the property that are wearing out which will not be replaced when they wear out. He stated that all of the other three-foot tall lights will be raised to eight feet in height.

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Wignot commented that the light beneath the lamps may appear surprisingly brilliant because of the clear polycarbonate material for the lenses, although accomplishments have been made with the selection of the louvered fixtures to address lighting concerns. He suggested that the applicant consider the possibility of using an opaque material for the lenses rather than the clear lenses to soften the lighting.
2. Member Brown commented that if the height of the fixture is raised, with the cut-off at the horizontal level, there would be broader light coverage and that this would not conform to Dark Sky goals.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to grant Revised Final Approval of Item I-1, No. 08-018-DRB RV, 6056 Berkeley Road, with the light fixture as submitted, and with the condition that if there is any light intrusion into the neighbors' windows, the

applicant shall place a shield on the fixture to ensure there is no light trespass into the neighbors' property or window.

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- **NONE**

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- **NONE**

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-230-DRB

7154 Tuolumne Drive (APN 077-104-019)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,254-square foot residence with an attached 441-square foot 2-car garage on a 7,245-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 787-square feet in additions, consisting of a 664-square foot second-floor addition, and a 123-square foot interior stairwell leading up to the second-floor addition. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,482 square feet, consisting of a 2,041-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 441-square foot 2-car garage. This proposal is within the maximum floor area guidelines for this property, which is 2,241 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence; however the existing aluminum sliding windows will be replaced with vinyl. The project was filed by agent Fernando Vega on behalf of Maria Teresa and Jose Castillo, property owners. Related cases: 03-093-DRB, -LUP; 07-230-LUP. (Last heard on 2-26-08) (Brian Hiefield)

The plans were presented by agent Fernando Vega on behalf of Maria Teresa and Jose Castillo, property owners, stated that the square footage of the project was reduced and that the wall mass facing the neighbor to the east was deleted at the same time the floor area was reduced. He clarified that the window on the east elevation has been removed and will be facing north.

Speaker:

Elizabeth Brooks, adjacent neighbor to the east since 1960, stated that she is very concerned regarding her privacy if a balcony is installed. She also expressed concern regarding how much effect the second story addition would have on the amount of sunshine in her backyard. She said that the one window in the bathroom, which is not looking into her bedroom, is fine, but she would be concerned if more windows were placed on the elevation adjacent to her bedroom except for the very small windows for the bathroom.

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) a solar study would be helpful to understand the orientation of the sun and the effect of the second-story addition on sunlight with regard to the neighbor to the east; b) a site plan showing the adjacent houses is needed for review; and c) the changes made by the applicant are appreciated.
2. Member Smith said he believes the only logical place for a second-story addition with regard to this type of house would be in the corner as proposed. He appreciates that the applicant reduced the floor plan mass in the back which addressed his concern regarding the massive appearance of the second story elevation. He suggested that the applicant may wish to refer to the City of Santa Barbara's method for determining solar access on a property which is fairly straight forward.
3. Chair Branch commented: a) a site plan showing the relationship of the project to adjacent projects would be helpful especially when reviewing a second-story addition; b) the changes made by the applicant are appreciated; c) overall, the plans are beginning to take shape; d) rectangular windows would seem to fit better in the stair tower rather than the proposed arched windows; e) it appears that the afternoon sun would get blocked with regard to the neighbor's property; and f) suggested the applicant consider a hip roof in the rear, from a solar access point of view, noting that a hip was introduced over the stair tower.
4. Vice Chair Wignot commented: a) he appreciates that the applicant scaled back the mass of the building; b) the project architect has tried to accommodate DRB Finding #19 that the project will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access; c) the applicant is requested to provide a solar study with respect to the property to the east; d) it seems like the shading aspect may not be a problem in the morning and noontime but may occur more later in the day, possibly over the house rather than the backyard, although more information is needed; and e) he is mindful that the property owner, who had a previous project that was approved by the DRB and the permit expired, has accommodated the DRB request to scale back the massing of the building.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item L-1, No. 07-230-DRB, 7154 Tuolumne Drive, to May 13, 2008, with the following comments: 1) the applicant shall provide site plans showing the relationship of the project to adjacent properties; and 2) the applicant shall provide a solar study to better understand how the second-story affects the property to the east with respect to shading as the sun moves to the west in the afternoon.

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 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

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 10 of 21

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 an 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 2-12-08*, 01-23-08*, 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast Corner of Los Carneros/Camino Real, to May 28, 2008, per the applicant's request.

RECESS HELD: 5:25 P.M. TO 5:30 P.M.

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-180-DRB

5737 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-033-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property consists of an existing single family dwelling and detached garage on a 6,227-square foot lot in the R-2 zone district. The existing single family home and garage will be demolished, to be followed by the construction of a two-story duplex. The proposed project is a one-lot subdivision of a 0.14-acre lot for condominium purposes to create a duplex structure, consisting of two (2) attached residential airspace units. Unit #1 (front unit) will be 3 bedrooms, 2.75 baths and would total 1,999 square feet, while Unit #2 (rear unit) will be 3 bedrooms, 2.5 baths and would total 1,735 square feet. The proposed building coverage on site will be 2,077 square feet or 33% of the 6,227 square foot lot. Landscaping will consist of 2,495 square feet or 40% of the existing lot; paved areas

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 11 of 21

consist of 1,665 square feet or 27% of the existing lot. The proposed Floor-to-Area ratio (FAR), including garage areas, is 0.60. The maximum height of the structure is 25'-7". Discretionary approval for a Modification to required front and rear yard setbacks is also requested. The project was filed by Troy White of Dudek Engineering and Environmental, agent, for Eva and Silvino Guerrero, property owners. Related cases: 07-180-TPM; -M; -LUP. (Last heard on 03-11-08) (Shine Ling)

The plans were presented by Troy White of Dudek Engineering and Environmental, agent for Eva and Silvino Guerrero, property owners, and by Keith Nolan, ON Design, project architect. Troy White provided plans which he said were slightly revised from the plans that were submitted one week ago, stating that the only change was that Unit #1 was cut back approximately three feet which allowed the driveway width to be increased from ten-feet to twelve-feet and also allowed for a three-point turn movement within the driveway. He also provided a FAR sheet. Keith Nolan stated that the building façade is the same on the revised plans and that the building square footage has been reduced slightly.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling stated for the record that staff has not yet seen the revised plans that were submitted at today's meeting.

MOTION: Member Brown moved that the DRB consider the revised plans that were submitted by Troy White at the hearing today. There were no objections to the motion.

The revised plans that were submitted today were made available for public review.

Troy White, agent, discussed changes that were made in response to the DRB comments which included: a) the required parking for four cars has been placed in alignment; b) the entry for Unit #2 was reconfigured; c) the plans demonstrate that the turning movements work for both garages; d) trash enclosures were identified on the plans; e) the units sizes have been reduced by ten percent in the front unit and by seven percent in the back unit; f) the bedroom count was reduced to two bedrooms in Unit #2; g) the habitable square footage is 1295 s.f. for Unit #1 and 1159 s.f. for Unit #2; h) the rear yard modification encroachment was reduced from 13.3% to 7.4%; i) the front yard setback encroachment was increased from 134 square feet to 140 square feet; j) all of the hardscape has been changed to permeable materials; k) bioswales are still included; and l) the site will drain to itself and any remaining residual in large storms will drain to the street and not affect adjacent properties.

Keith Nolan, project architect, discussed the floor plans and architecture. He stated that changes were made in response to DRB comments to align the parking to the west side which helped pull the mass away from the west property line. He clarified that the bedroom window in Unit #1 that is affecting the west side the most is pushed back; and that the windows in the bedrooms in Unit #2 will not directly impact the neighbors to the west. He provided a diagram that identifies windows on one-story and two-story adjacent properties, stating that this information was a design consideration regarding maintaining neighbors' privacy.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 12 of 21

Member Brown expressed concern that the use of garages for living spaces would force more cars to be parked on the street and suggested that the DRB may wish to consider possible methods that might meliorate some of the neighbors' concerns regarding parking, such as a deed restriction or removing the doors of the garages making them carports.

Assistant Planner Shine Line discussed parking requirements and indicated that staff will conduct additional research with regard to garages and carports, and requests for modifications to parking design requirements in the zoning ordinance.

Troy White, agent, stated that a condition of approval regarding parking requirements would be acceptable.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz clarified that the current parking regulations require that each dwelling unit will need two parking spaces and that all spaces must be in a garage.

Dan McLaughlin, Interim Building and Safety Manager, stated that the Notice of Land Use Restrictions and Conditions is a useful tool to address the problem of people living in garages that do not have a legal conversion, which is an enforcement issue.

Speaker:

Spike Moore, Goleta, expressed concern regarding the impacts in the neighborhood associated with past garage conversions and room rentals. He requested that the size, bulk and scale of the project be scaled down a little more stating that he believes it will lessen the potential for a large number of residents and the associated violations and parking problems. He spoke in support of removing the doors on the garages stating that the garages are sheltered from the weather. He believes that small condominium conversions do not help the affordable housing problem. He expressed concerns regarding the grading and retaining walls located on the rear of the applicant's property and requested that the applicant scrape the lot flat to be equal to his lot and the lot next door.

Documents: Assistant Planner Shine Ling provided copies of the following e-mails: 1) from Bill Kelley, neighbor on Armitos Avenue, received March 26, 2008; 2) from Jo Ann Villanueva-Salvador, on behalf of Orlando Bautista and Amiel Salvador, neighbors, received April 7, 2008; 3) from Bill Kelley, received April 7, 2008; and 4) from Alicia Riotoc and Stephanie Kelley, neighbors, received on April 8, 2008.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) overall, the project is fine and he could support the minor setback modifications requested; b) he understands the parking problems in the neighborhood and would be in favor of not having doors on the garages to prevent the possibility using the garage for living space; c) recommended that the small gable form on Page A.2.1, on the east elevation for Unit #1, be removed for simplification, stating that it would not be of use or be

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 13 of 21

seen from the street; d) recommended that the alignment be reworked on the floor line as the two-story form goes up where the one-story roof runs in, on the south elevation; e) suggested the applicant consider whether window looking down into the foyer area is appropriate as shown on the floor plan for Unit #2 in the second bedroom.

2. Member Smith commented: a) agreed with the architectural comments made by Member Schneider; b) did not support removing the doors on the garages making them carports because of security concerns; c) supported language that would restrict a garage conversion; d) appreciates the reduction of square footage; e) expressed concern that the parking for Unit #1 would demolish the 'Tom Thumb' *Pittosporum* species to be planted along that side of the property; and f) the site is difficult and he is surprised that the vehicle turn movements were possible.
3. Member Brown commented: a) the type of material used for the pavers needs to ensure permeability (for example porous concrete) and requested that the description of proposed materials be provided by the applicant; b) the architecture is fine; c) the reduction in the size of the development is appreciated and helpful for the development; d) privacy issues with regard to windows overlooking neighbors to the east, west or south have not been fully discussed; e) suggested that a deed restriction with regard to garage conversions or removing the doors of the garages making them carports might ameliorate neighbors' concerns regarding parking; and f) expressed concern that there is so much development on the site, even though it is allowed, which adds more density to an area that is already dense.
4. Vice Chair Wignot commented: a) the changes made to address DRB comments are appreciated; b) the orientation of the bedrooms and bathrooms between the two units is troublesome; possibly consider extensive soundproofing; c) the orientation of the windows needs to be reviewed with regard to whether there is a view from windows onto adjacent properties; and d) expressed concern regarding the short timeframe to review plans submitted today.
5. Chair Branch commented: a) the reduction in scale makes the project better and more in scale with other developments in the neighborhood; and b) the notice to property owner type of documentation would be useful with regard to restricting the use of garages for living space.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) the changes including the size reduction are appreciated; b) recommended the use of permeable pavers as much as possible on the site; and c) recommended that the grading in the back of the property be scaled back to appear uniform throughout the area.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded Smith by and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item M-2, No. 07-180-DRB, 5737 Armitos Avenue, to May 13, 2008, for Preliminary review, with the following comments regarding architecture: a) remove the small gable form on Page A.2.1 on the east elevation for Unit #1; b) re-work the alignment on the floor line as the two-story form goes up where the one-story roof runs in, on the south elevation; c) consider whether the window looking down into the foyer area is appropriate, which is shown on the floor plan for the second bedroom in Unit #2; d) the orientation of the windows needs to be considered with regard to neighbors' privacy; and e) suggested consideration of the orientation of the bedrooms and

bathrooms between the two units; and with the following comments to the Zoning Administrator: a) the DRB supports the modification request; and b) the DRB requests that staff consider a Notice of Land Use Restrictions and Conditions documentation at the appropriate time.

M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-208-DRB

401 Storke Road (APN 073-440-019)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is a vacant 3.02 acres (131,551 square feet) commercial property in the Retail Commercial (C-2) zone district with an Airport Approach Zone F(APR) overlay. The applicant proposes to construct a 73,828-square foot two-story 99-room service hotel. The hotel is proposed to have a Spanish architectural design to compliment the Camino Real Marketplace.

The first-floor is proposed as 42,480 habitable square feet with 7,043 square feet of decks, and the second-floor is proposed as 31,348 habitable square feet with 2,705 square feet of balconies. The proposed building coverage is 32.3%, and the proposed Floor-Area-Ratio is 56.1%. The proposed mean height of the structure is 32 feet, proposed second-story peak roof heights range from 25 to 35 feet, and proposed tower peaks are 38 and 48 feet.

A total of 99 rooms would be constructed, of which 47 rooms would be located on the first-floor and 52 rooms would be located on the second-floor. The majority of rooms would be 464 square feet in size with some larger rooms of 639 square feet, and a large 1,445-square foot two-bedroom suite would be provided. A porte cochere is proposed at the front lobby. No restaurant is proposed within the service hotel, but a service area to prepare continental breakfasts and afternoon snacks would be available for guests. Additionally, a meeting room, small board room, fitness room, business center, lounge, pool, spa, fire pits, fountains and patios are proposed as guest amenities. Noise attenuation measures, which include insulation in the exterior walls and roof and insulated glass, are proposed. The applicant anticipates the hotel to be LEED certified. New materials consist of the following:

- A plaster (smooth trowel) finish with the following colors:
 - Wall: White (Frazee #001)
 - Trim, Surround & Cornice: Staghorn (Frazee #8731W)
 - Wainscot: Walnut Wash (Frazee #8733M)
 - Windows, Doors & Railing: Peppercorn (Frazee #8615D)
- Roof Tile
 - Clay Mission Tiles (Two-piece blended clay barrel tiles)
- Wood Trellis
 - Taupe – Olympic Stain
- Stone
 - Cantera Stone

Vehicular ingress and egress is proposed from Storke Road and Phelps Road. A 40-foot wide driveway apron would front on Storke Road, and a 30-foot wide driveway apron would front on Phelps Road. A landscaped buffer along Storke Road and Phelps Road would be expanded and replace landscaping currently installed. A bus

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 15 of 21

stop would be improved as required by MTD. No additional frontage improvements are proposed to Storke Road or Phelps Road as frontage improvements, which included street lights, utilities, and meandering sidewalks, were installed during construction of the Camino Real Project in the late 1990s.

Onsite vehicular circulation would be provided by a 24-foot wide drive aisle with a minimum of a 14-foot height clearance. A total of 112 parking spaces, of which 5 parking spaces would be ADA compliant, are proposed. An additional storage area has been proposed for a total of 14 bicycles. Pedestrian circulation would be provided through 4-foot wide sidewalk segments, and would connect the hotel entrances and exits to Storke Road, Phelps Road, and the adjacent park.

An architecturally screened trash/recycling and an electrical transformer area is proposed near the northwest corner of the parcel.

Additional proposed grading would consist of 2,500-cubic yards of cut and 2,500-cubic yards of fill. The applicant proposes stormwater catch basins/drains and pollution prevention interceptors onsite and bioswales both onsite and within the right-of-way to avoid cross lot drainage.

A Mediterranean landscape palette is proposed and was in part design to compliment landscaping at the Camino Real Marketplace. The proposed landscape coverage is 24.5%, which is not inclusive of the 16,000 square feet of landscaping located within the right-of-way.

The applicant is requesting a modification under Article III, Section 35-317.8.1 to allow 28 parking spaces to encroach into the southern front yard setback and to allow 30 parking spaces to encroach into the rear yard setback.

The project was filed by Kimberly A. Schizas on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 95-SP-001, 96-EIR-3, 07-208-GP, 07-208-SP, 07-208-DP, 07-208-LUP. (Scott Kolwitz)

Site visits: Made by all members present.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Mark Linehan, property owner, and Kimberly A. Schizas, the planner for the project, along with members of the project team which include Lee & Sakahara Architects and Sydney Baumgartner, landscape architect.

Kimberly Schizas, project planner, discussed the background of the project and the Specific Plan. Mark Linehan stated that the intent of the hotel ambience is for a bed and breakfast in a 5-star hotel, with spacious rooms consisting of a bedroom and bathroom, with no kitchen facilities. He stated that the Camino Real Specific Plan specifies a Spanish Mediterranean style for future development, which he considers more of a "California" type style and not necessarily a "Santa Barbara" style. He further stated that he would prefer that the hotel architecture has a residential ambience. Mark Linehan also stated that in conjunction with building the shopping

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 16 of 21

center, a bioswale and natural retention area was created that can store an entire one-hundred years flood on their property which helps control any downstream issues. He stated that the drainage on the site drains into their natural retention area, going subterranean and not by sheet flow, which is picked up and taken underneath the soccer field.

Ron Sakahara, member of the Camino Real Hotel Team presented the site plans and elevations. Sydney Baumgartner, project landscape architect, presented the landscape plans including an overview of the plant palette list. She stated that the City's current Recommended Street Tree List was reviewed and that all street trees are included on the list.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz discussed the staff report with regard to issues related to the project, if applicable. He clarified that the architectural guidelines for the Specific Plan for the Camino Real Marketplace established the Spanish Mediterranean architecture as a single style of architecture for the development within the Specific Plan site.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) overall, the site plan and massing of the building have been done fairly well but he does have some concerns; b) recommended that the finger planters be added, possibly eliminating a few parking spaces; c) expressed concern regarding the small amount of space between the County Fire Station property with the chain link fence and the site, and suggested finding some way to address this situation; d) expressed concern regarding the water feature in the fountain on the corner with regard to the concept of water conservation; e) the massing with the two-story elements in the rear and the one-story elements to the corner are done well; f) expressed concern that the tower element is too big and seemed to be that large only for purposes of advertising; g) the two rectangular openings at the end or the porte cochere do not seem like they belong with the style; h) the elements with the parapets do not integrate well architecturally when turning the corner and need to be addressed; i) generally, there are some architectural massing and detailing items that need to be worked out with regard to the balconies and other elements; k) the size of the showers seems too small; l) the applicant needs to define the level of commitment with regard to meeting the LEED standards; and m) there is an assumption that Phelps Road will never be widened but if it were widened there would be a problem.
2. Member Brown commented: a) there are many items she appreciates about the project but she also has some concerns; b); the size of the units seems too big, suggesting slightly reducing the footprint and making the rooms smaller; c) to requested that the applicant provide cut sheets showing lighting at the appropriate time d) requested the applicant specify the plans with regard to the LEED standards and encouraged striving to meet the highest standards; e) expressed concern that each unit will have both a shower and tub with regard to water conservation which she believes may be one of the LEED standards; f) suggested the diminishment of the some of the architectural projections such as the towers would help create the illusion that it is a smaller, more intimate 'bed and breakfast'

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 17 of 21

- style product in the community; g) suggested diverting from the “Santa Barbara” style influence, and consider something that is more in style with Goleta; h) the planting guidelines for the trees in the parking lot is appreciated; i) requested a list of trees that will be planted on the southern property line to make sure they fit into the tree wells; k) recommended eliminating the London Plane tree species because it tends to hybridize, and eliminating the *Vinca* species because it is invasive; l) the Dark Sky standards are encouraged; and m) appreciates that the parking lot lighting is fairly evenly lit and not over-lit.
3. Member Smith commented: a) in general, he appreciates the proposed project, including the concept and the idea of larger rooms; b) agreed with Member Brown’s comments regarding landscaping; c) the drainage plan needs to provide assurance that there will be no impacts with regard to flooding; d) the Camino Real Marketplace architecture seems more Italian rather than Spanish, and ; suggested consideration of a style that is more Italian and less ‘Santa Barbara’; e) agreed with Member Schneider regarding massing and detailing concerns; f) expressed concern that the base of the main tower needs to be trimmed down because it is too broad and big with regard to the cupola on top; and g) he believes that it is doubtful that Phelps Road will be widened;
 4. Vice Chair Wignot commented: a) overall, he appreciates the site plan and project, including features such as the open courtyard, pool, spa, fire pit, and porte cochere element that is covered; b) appreciates the landscaping plan; c) requested that consideration be given to the numbers and location of palm trees with regard to the potential for debris, damage and possible injury from palm fronds, particularly in windy weather; d) suggested that alleviating some of the long interior hallways would be an improvement; e) recommended that the use of more earth tones would soften and complement the project with the Marketplace; f) suggested that the style should be less Spanish Mediterranean; g) the tower element and sign seem too large; h) requested the applicant identify lighting fixtures similar to those proposed in the area that can be viewed at night and provide an exhibit and photograph; i) recommended consideration regarding noise attenuation with regard to rooms located next to elevators; and j) requested architectural screening for the backflow preventor in the southwest corner.
 5. Member Herrera commented: a) appreciates the project including the open courtyard and landscaping; b) requested the landscape plan includes plant counts, sizes and locations; c) provided photographs of flooding problems downstream that have occurred in the past and expressed concern that there could be the potential for flooding from the addition of materials that are not pervious; and d) requested consideration that there is flooding downstream whenever there is approximately three inches of rain and that drainage problems exist.
 6. Chair Branch commented: a) overall, the design of the project is done very well; b) agreed with Member Schneider that the openings at the front of the porte cochere seem out of place and should be studied; c) the curbed parapets need to be ‘fattened up’ and not appear thin; d) agreed with Member Smith that changing the color scheme to more earth tones, possibly more brownish tiles than red, would be more in context with a style for Goleta; and e) the applicant is requested to provide more information regarding colors.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item M-3, No. 07-208-DRB, 401 Storke Road, with comments to May 28, 2008, for further Conceptual review.

RECESS HELD FROM 6:55 P.M. TO 7:05 P.M.

M-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-229-DRB

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Primary wall color: Light stone
 - Window and door trim: Colony green
- Primary Accent wall color: Desert Sand
 - Window and door trim: Colony green
- Secondary accent wall color: Colony green
 - Wall coping: To match wall color
- Window and door awnings: Colony green
- Windows and doors: Dark ionized aluminum
- Roll up doors: Desert sand
- Gutters: Colony green
- Down spouts: To match wall color

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 19 of 21

- Trash Enclosures: CMU block walls with low sloping roofs to match the storage buildings.

The project was filed by agent Gregory C. Rech of Architects West on behalf of Schwan Brothers, South Kellogg Properties (Tom Schwan), property owner. Related cases: 07-229-GPAM, 07-229-DP, 07-229-CUP. (Last heard on 3-11-08, 2-26-08) (Laura Vlk)

The plans were presented by agent Gregory C. Rech of Architects West on behalf of Schwan Brothers, South Kellogg Properties (Tom Schwan), property owner. He stated that the north elevation and the colors were studied in response to the DRB comments from the last hearing. Gregory Rech showed an example of stepping back the architecture at the end of Building A and Building B. He stated that stepping back was considered for the easterly end of Building C, but it did not seem to belong with the architecture. He said that when studying the height requirements for the elevators, some architectural elements were changed that created additional two-story elements which helps break up the mass. He stated that changing the lamp fixtures resulted in lighting that is more balanced throughout the project.

Sam Maphis, project landscape architect, presented the landscape plans. He summarized the planting scheme which will include tall, evergreen trees, native plantings, and clearing of the invasive plants in the creek area. He clarified that he will be working with Caltrans relative to their requirements in order to utilize Caltrans property as well as the project site to soften the buildings as much as possible.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider stated that his only concern regarding the project is the view from the freeway of the mass of the building, stating that the applicant's changes in response to his previous comments are not successful and that he still recommends stepping back the ends of the buildings on the north elevation to soften the massing that would result in a perceived two-story element which steps up to a three-story element. He commented: a) he is concerned about removing the existing landscaping as it will take time for the proposed landscaping to grow and provide screening; b) the height of the property as viewed when standing on the site is not a concern; c) the proposed colors work well; and d) the lighting issues can be worked out further in the review process. He asked the applicant to provide the level of the freeway vs. the level of the site for preliminary review.
2. Member Brown commented: a) the renderings show the landscaping as it would mature in approximately twenty years, but without the trees the project would appear as big, massive buildings; b) she agreed with Member Schneider that his suggestions for architectural changes on the north elevation would provide a different impression of the buildings from the freeway; c) suggested planting smaller tree species in the riparian area which tend to grow better, and consider the *tristania* species; and d) requested that the applicant provide samples of colors and materials, and cut sheets showing that the light fixtures are fully shielded.
3. Member Wignot commented that from his perspective the proposal is fine, even without the mature trees, stating that it is an improvement from the industrial

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 20 of 21

clutter that is currently seen when driving by on the freeway. He stated that the proposed lighting in the parking areas of the proposal, which is visible from the freeway, is appropriate from security and safety standpoints. He suggested the applicant consider solar energy.

4. Member Smith commented: a) the project is appreciated as it is proposed; b) he does not notice the site when driving by on the freeway because he is paying attention to driving; c) noted that the project is located on an industrial site; and d) he agreed with Member Brown's comments regarding lighting.
5. Member Herrera commented that the project is a big improvement in the area and will look better than the existing clutter that is viewed when driving on the freeway between Fairview Avenue and Patterson Avenue.
6. Chair Branch commented: a) overall, the proposal is a handsome project; b) given the project's location, he does not have a concern regarding the north elevation facing the freeway; and c) requested that the applicant plant some trees that are a little more mature, stating that the rendering looks great but shows mature trees.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 5 to 1 vote (No: Schneider; Absent: Messner) to take off calendar Item M-4, No. 07-229-DRB, 10 South Kellogg Avenue, for environmental review.

Member Schneider stated that he did not support the above motion because he has concerns regarding what is seen on the project site from the freeway; however, he does appreciate the project and the associated improvements.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

N-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-037-DRB

Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange

This is a request for further *Advisory* review. The proposed project includes the removal of the existing Cathedral Oaks Road/Hollister Avenue/US Highway 101 bridge over U.S. Highway 101 and bridge over Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and the construction of new bridges to align with the existing terminus of Cathedral Oaks Road. The proposed overcrossing (US Highway 101) and overhead (UPRR) bridges would accommodate a 12-foot vehicle lane in each direction, one 12-foot center left turn pocket lane/median, 5-foot shoulders/bike lanes in each direction, and a 6-foot sidewalk located on the west side. The project was filed by Caltrans, in association with the City of Goleta. (Last heard on 01-23-08*, 11-06-07*, 10-16-07*, 08-21-07, 07-17-07; 05-02-06) Related case: 05-037-DP. (Rosemarie Gaglione; Laura Bridley)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item N-1, No. 05-037-DRB, Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange, to May 13, 2008, per the applicant's request.

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

April 8, 2008

Page 21 of 21

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Member Brown commented that the members spent long hours at today's meeting and stated that it would be helpful for staff to consider the length of the meetings.

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Vice Chair Wignot announced that he will not be present at the DRB meeting on May 13, 2008.

Member Brown announced that she will not be present at the DRB meeting on May 13, 2008.

Member Brown requested that staff consider the quorum requirements for projects on the May 13, 2008, agenda with regard to the notices of absence by the two members.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 7:47 P.M.

Minutes approved on April 22, 2008.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 22 of 22