



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, December 9, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

**GOLETA CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

Members:

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair	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 3:00 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Bob Wignot, Chair; Thomas Smith, Vice Chair; Scott Branch; Cecilia Brown; Simon Herrera; *Chris Messner; and Carl Schneider. *Member Messner entered the meeting at 3:07 p.m.

Board Members absent: None.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 2 of 16

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

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for November 25, 2008.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz read into the record an e-mail from Member Messner, dated December 8, 2008, requesting changes to the minutes for November 25, 2008, with regard to his comment, #5 on Page 7 of the minutes, regarding Item K-1, No. 07-171-DRB.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Abstain: Herrera; Absent: Messner) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for November 25, 2008, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Member Wignot reported that the next Subcommittee meeting will be on January 27, 2008, at 2:00 p.m., because the DRB meeting on December 23, 2008, was cancelled.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) The Planning Commission meeting for December 8, 2008, was cancelled due to a lack of a quorum, and the items on the calendar will be moved to a future Planning Commission meeting; 2) The DRB meeting for December 23, 2008, has been cancelled, which will be properly noticed by staff.

Vice Chair Smith stated that he will be able to represent the DRB on January 12, 2008, with regard to the appeal to the DRB approval of the project at 7837 Langlo Ranch Road.

B-4. RDA STOREFRONT FACADE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PRESENTATION

Jaime Valdez, City of Goleta Redevelopment Agency, presented an overview of the Storefront Façade Improvement Program along with a PowerPoint entitled "Storefront Façade Improvement Program (SFIP), Presentation to the City of Goleta Design Review Board, December 9, 2008".

Member Brown commented that she believes there needs to be consideration with regard to removing signs that do not comply with the City's Sign Ordinance when making façade improvements. She also commented that there needs to be a connection between the improvements to be accomplished by the Storefront Façade

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 3 of 16

Improvement Program and the “Old Town Heritage District Guidelines”. For an example, she said there should be consideration that an exterior paint color is in conformance with the “Old Town Heritage District Guidelines”.

Jaime Valdez, RDA, stated that staff checks with Planning staff regarding the improvement plans for the program. He noted, for example, that changing the exterior color of a building is one of the items that would require a DRB process.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the applicant for Item H-3, No. 08-148-DRB, 5892 Calle Real, requested a continuance to January 13, 2009; and that staff recommends that Item K-1, No. 04-226-DRB, 7388 Calle Real, be taken off calendar because the project was continued for Planning Commission review to January 26, 2009.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-3, No. 08-148-DRB, 5892 Calle Real, to January 13, 2009, per the applicant’s request; and to take off calendar Item K-1, No. 04-226-DRB, 7388 Calle Real, per the request by staff because the project was continued for Planning Commission review at a Special Meeting on January 26, 2009.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

- NONE

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Schneider reported that the Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-1, No. 08-182-DRB, 7127 Hollister Avenue; Item H-2, No. 08-186-DRB, 6021 Hollister Avenue; and Item H-4, No. 08-203-DRB, 6780 Cortona Drive.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-182-DRB

7127 Hollister Avenue (APN073-440-001 & 073-440-012)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 21,444-square foot commercial tenant space on a 9.3 acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to install two wall signs on the existing tower element, one on the east elevation and one on the north elevation. The 18-foot by 3.08-foot sign will have 24-inch blue letters reading “PACIFIC SALES”, and 9-inch red letters reading “KITCHEN, BATH & ELECTRONICS” with a total sign area of 55.44 square feet. The individually

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 4 of 16

pin mounted vinyl channel letters will be internally illuminated with white and red LED bulbs. The project was filed by agent Christian Muldoon on behalf of Islay Investments, property owner. Related cases: 23-SB-OSP; 23-SB-CUP; 23-SB-DP AM01; 23-SB-LUP. (Continued from 11-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Action on December 9, 2008:

The plans were presented by agent Christian Muldoon on behalf of Islay Investments, property owner. He reported that he received from the applicant a filing with the County of Santa Barbara for a fictitious business name as submitted for the sign which is “PACIFIC SALES” “KITCHEN BATH & ELECTRONICS”. He also stated that the plans were revised to eliminate the red LED illumination to comply with the Overall Sign Plan.

Comments:

1. The applicant responded to the DRB comments made on November 12, 2008.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item H-1, No. 08-182-DRB, 7127 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, with the legal name “PACIFIC SALES” “KITCHEN, BATH & ELECTRONICS”, and with the elimination of the red LED illumination to comply with the Overall Sign Plan.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-186-DRB

6021 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-082-028)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes an approximately 28,000-square foot hotel on a 0.7-acre lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes a change to the faces of three existing signs: a 54-square foot freestanding pole sign, an approximately 109-square foot wall sign, and a 4.3-square foot freestanding directional sign. The signs will be constructed of yellow polycarbonate with a vinyl overlay for graphics. The two faces of the freestanding sign are 9 feet tall by 6 feet wide each, and the face of the wall sign is 33 feet wide by 3.3 feet tall. The two faces of the freestanding directional sign are 25 inches tall by 25 inches wide. An as-built Conditional Use Permit is also requested for the freestanding directional sign. The project was filed by Christian Muldoon of Vogue Signs, agent, on behalf of Van Bivens, secretary for the H. Oliver Dixon Trust, property owner. Related cases: 08-186-CUP, 08-186-SCC, 08-187-SCC, and 08-188-SCC. (Continued from 11-12-08) (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review on December 9, 2008:

The plans were presented by Christian Muldoon of Vogue Signs, agent, and Van Bivens, secretary for the H. Oliver Dixon Trust, property owner. Christian Muldoon stated that the plans were revised in response to the DRB comments recommending that the existing rectangular box sign not be illuminated at night for twenty-five percent of the sign at both ends, so only the middle of the sign will be lit at night.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 5 of 16

Shine Ling, Assistant Planner, reported that the Zoning Administrator approved today the applicant's request for the as-built Conditional Use Permit for the freestanding directional sign.

Comments:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended that Preliminary Approval be granted as submitted, and that the project be continued to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.
2. The applicant responded to the DRB comments made on November 12, 2008.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-2, No. 08-186-DRB, 6021 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, and continue to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-148-DRB

5892 Calle Real (APN 069-110-061)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a commercial building occupied by Bank of America. The applicant proposes to install new signage associated with Bank of America, including a new freestanding pole sign (Sign 1), two wall signs (Signs 14, & 15), and two directional signs (Signs 11, & 13). Signage proposed that will not require permits are a sign for disabled parking (Sign 3), glass door signage (Signs 9, & 10), and a Do Not Enter sign to replace the existing sign (Sign 12). The project was filed by agent Steve Stallone on behalf of Bank of America, property owner. Related cases: N/A. (Continued from 11-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-3, No. 08-148-DRB, 5892 Calle Real, to January 13, 2009, per the applicant's request.

H-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-203-DRB

6780 Cortona Drive (APN 073-150-027)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 15,600-square foot commercial property on a 54,014-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to install a 12.8-square foot wall sign with red letters ranging in height from 16.8-inches to 23.3-inches. The registered trademark sign will read "DUPONT" surrounded by an oval seal. The non-illuminated sign will be ¾-inches thick pin mounted ½-inch off the wall. The project was filed by agent Harry Vant-Erve with DuPont Displays, on behalf of Weatherby Enterprises, property owner. Related cases: 08-203-SCC. (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Review on December 9, 2008:

Site visits: Made by Members Schneider and Smith.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 6 of 16

The plans were presented by Harry Vant-Erve with DuPont Displays, on behalf of Weatherby Enterprises, property owner. He clarified that the sign consists of individual letters and that red is the corporate color for DuPont.

Comments:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended that Preliminary Approval be granted as submitted, and that the project be continued to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Review of Item H-4, No. 08-203-DRB, 6780 Cortona Drive, as submitted, and to continue to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-171-DRB

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

This is a request for *Final* 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

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 7 of 16

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 11-25-08, 7-8-08, 6-24-08, 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 Suzanne Elledge on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner; Rick Henderson, project civil engineer, HBE; George Robbin, project electrical engineer, HBE; and Martha Degasis, project landscape architect, Arcadia Studio. Rick Henderson, responded to the DRB conditions for Preliminary Approval. He explained the site drainage, stating that it is basically a sheet flow system that will shed the water off to the sides of the parking lot into ditches designed as bioswales. He noted that an additional stormwater management feature is the addition of pervious pavement in the largest area of the parking lot that will allow the water to transmit through the pavement into a stone bed below which will provide for detention storage and treatment before being filtered into the bioswales. He stated that all of the painted islands will be landscaped. In addition, a small landscaped planter will be provided around each of the lighting poles that are not located in the islands. He clarified that ADA handicapped parking requirements will be covered by the overall plan for the project. George Robbin presented the lighting plans. He stated that the height of the light poles was reduced from 30 feet to 20 feet, and that steel poles will be used instead of wood poles. The landscape plans were presented by Martha Degasis, project landscape architect.

Speakers:

Edward Easton, Goleta, speaking for himself, stated that he believes the front entrance to the hospital should face the parking lot so it can relate and be seen by the people who will be coming to the entrance. He requested the DRB review the location of the main entry to the hospital at the appropriate time. He noted that he was unaware that the hearing today would only review the temporary parking lot portion of the project.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, suggested that the plans for pervious paving would not be a good expenditure of money for a parking lot that is temporary. He noted that the lighting plan has been improved and that there is already good perimeter landscaping that will be provided. He believes there should be more time for the public to review the pervious pavement plans.

Cindy Moore, Senior Planner, clarified that the DRB will conduct Preliminary and Final review of the hospital building during the project review process.

Suzanne Elledge, agent, pointed out that the applicant has provided drawings that have some information that is further developed than what is typically provided during the review process.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 8 of 16

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The improvements to the lighting plan and the addition of landscaped islands to replace the painted islands are appreciated; and b) The temporary parking lot plans are fine.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The lighting plan is appreciated, especially the downward lit features that are fully-shielded; b) The illumination levels and the quality of the lighting source are good; c) The temporary parking lot will be handsome; d) The applicant has set high standards; and e) There will need to be consideration with regard to the location of the plantings to allow for ingress and egress of the cars.
3. Member Branch commented: a) The temporary parking lot plans are fine.
4. Vice Chair Smith agreed with comments made by Member Brown.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) The use of pervious pavement throughout the parking lot, to prevent oils from entering the stream system, is appreciated.
6. Member Messner commented: a) The use of pervious pavement is important.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) The plans to underground the electrical utilities is a good feature from the standpoint of both safety and aesthetic purposes; and b) The temporary parking lot design is fine.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item J-1, No. 07-171-DRB, 351 S. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue, as submitted, for only the temporary parking lot portion that is being reviewed, with appreciation that the applicant has worked with the DRB.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 04-226-DRB

7388 Calle Real (APN 077-490-043)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The project has been increased by two units following the Planning Commission hearing on September 8, 2008. The revised project includes a Final Development Plan for 12 condominium units totaling 20,952 square feet, including two affordable units, associated infrastructure, and common open space on approximately .94 acres in the DR-12.3 zone district. Five residential unit types are proposed within three, three-story structures (Buildings A-C) arranged along the eastern portion of the site. The buildings would have a maximum height of 34 feet 3 inches and would each contain four attached units consisting of three, three-bedroom units and one two-bedroom unit. The units in Building A would range from 1,043 square feet to 1,463 square feet. The units in Buildings B and C would range from 869 square feet to 1,512 square feet. Access to the site would be via Calle Real. Parking would include 12 one-car garages at 248 square feet each and 24 parking spaces, for a total of 36 spaces. The project was filed by Detlev Peikert, representing 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner. Related cases 04-226-TM, -DP. (Last heard on 10-14-08, 7-08-08) (Cindy Moore)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue to take off calendar Item K-1, No. 04-226-DRB, 7388 Calle Real, per the request by staff, because the project was continued for Planning Commission review at a Special Meeting on January 26, 2009.

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-145-DRB

598 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-090-052)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The subject property consists of 12.29 net acres and includes agricultural operations, an existing farmhouse, a produce stand, and a bathhouse/restroom in the AG-I-5 zone district. Vehicular ingress/egress is provided by a 16-foot (to be upgraded to 20-foot) wide gravel driveway from Stow Canyon Road, and through the City's adjacent library parking lot. A modification was granted to require a total of 19 designated parking spaces on the property. Minor amounts of grading would be required to facilitate building pads and the installation of utilities.

To be in compliance with 08-111-CUP, the applicant proposes to move the existing farm labor camp from its present location near the avocado orchard to a development envelope along the existing driveway near the farmhouse in Phase 4 as follows:

Phase 4 – (To be completed by July 1, 2009):

- Terminate use of existing farm labor camp site and remove all structures; relocate occupants to temporary or permanent residential units in approved building envelope.
 - Temporary units would consist of up to five (5) yurts meeting code requirements and Design Review Board review for precise location and landscaping, with an option to substitute mobile homes. Cooking and sanitary facilities would consist of a mobile kitchen, restroom, and shower units and/or individual built-in kitchens and bathrooms, all connected to the Goleta Sanitary District system.
 - Permanent housing would consist of up to five (5) modular, stick-built, relocated houses or other City-approved permanent housing as approved by the Design Review Board.
- Construct access improvements as required by the Fire Department.
- Provide additional on-site parking.
- Construct the sewer line.

The project was filed by agent Steve Welton of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services on behalf of Center for Urban Agriculture at Fairview Gardens, property owner. Related cases: 08-111-CUP; 08-145-LUP. (Continued from 10-28-08, 09-23-08*, 08-26-08) (Scott Kolwitz)

The plans were presented by Steve Welton of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services on behalf of the Center for Urban Agriculture at Fairview Gardens, property owner; and Daniel Wilson, project landscape architect. Daniel Wilson provided photographs taken on a visit to the two homes to the east of the site which show the

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 10 of 16

views of the farm building and yurts from the homes. He stated that the 24" x 36" drawing he presented is a sketch of existing vegetation in the area where the two houses are outlined. He provided an overview of the existing vegetation and drainage on the site. He suggested that planting two clusters of *Ironwood* trees next to the drainage ditch would significantly improve the visual screening from the two homes looking up to the temporary yurt village because the species is evergreen and rapid-growing. He stated that he does not believe it is necessary and prudent to completely screen the yurts, considering that Phase 4 is temporary.

Speakers:

Charlie Hamilton, neighbor to the east, provided photographs taken from his backyard showing the temporary yurt site. He pointed out that the Sycamore/Walnut tree does not provide screening from his backyard of the potential site for the farm labor camp. He also pointed out that a photograph shows a bus parked where the employee parking lot will be located. He expressed concern that there will be no screening from his house with regard to the area where the automobiles will be parked. He pointed out that his concern is with regard to being shielded from automobiles and the farm labor camp, and not being shielded from the farm.

Jim Hurst, neighbor to the east, pointed out that the location of the two rows of trees is not correct on the map provided by the applicant. He stated that he does not believe that planting the *Ironwood* trees will be effective for screening considering the proposed location of the plantings, and he was advised that the species has a slow growth rate. He suggested some minimal screening at the area of concern, stating that it would seem beneficial to maintain the farming area with regard to its purpose.

Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) The yurts would be located approximately 500 feet away from the residents to the east, which does not seem to impact privacy greatly for the property owners to the east; b) The applicant has studied additional plantings to try to accommodate screening; c) Based on the photographs, he tends to agree with the neighbors that planting the *Ironwood* species may or may not be sufficient for screening, and the money could possibly be used by the applicant for other treatments; and d) There does not seem to be much more screening needed than what has been proposed.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The yurts are approximately 600 feet away from the residents, which is a fairly long distance with regard to privacy concerns; b) Agreed with Member Branch that planting the *Ironwood* trees may not be successful for screening purposes, and may be more detrimental than beneficial to the neighbors when the yurts are removed; c) The proposed plans seem fine; d) He pointed out that the neighbors do not particularly mind looking out at the farm but are more concerned with regard to the view of the vehicles in the distance; e) Suggested that it would be beneficial to plant some type of low landscape planting, approximately 3' to 5' in height, in the parking area to screen the vehicles; f) The applicant needs to provide lighting cut sheets.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 11 of 16

3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The photographs portray that the yurts are located quite a distance from the houses to the east; b) The plans proposed by the applicant seem fine; c) If the *Ironwood* trees will be planted to provide screening, it would seem more beneficial to plant the trees closer to the house; d) There needs to be some type of screening around the permanent parking area; and e) Lighting cut sheets need to be provided by the applicant.
4. Member Messner commented: a) Suggested changing the color of the yurts to green, or using camouflage netting, which would help the yurts blend in when viewed from a distance.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) The parking lot, which is permanent, will need to be screened with plantings and/or trellises.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) Agreed with comments from the DRB members; b) He pointed out that the neighbors do not particularly mind looking out at the farm but are more concerned with regard to the view of the vehicles in the distance; c) He believes that planting the *Ironwood* trees should be at the discretion of the applicant, as is it not known whether the trees would be very effective for screening; d) Suggested the applicant might consider some type of temporary screening in front of the yurts, for example, planters that could be relocated when the temporary yurts are removed, for the benefit of the neighbors; and e) The applicant needs to provide the lighting plans and cut sheets.
7. Member Brown commented: a) With regard to temporary screening of the yurts, there is a concern that it will take a long time for plantings to grow enough to screen before the yurts are removed; and b) The neighbors to the east have also expressed concern with regard to viewing the vehicles in the parking lot.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 08-145-DRB, 598 North. Fairview Avenue, to January 13, 2009, with the following comments: a) The applicant shall provide cut sheets for the lighting fixture and a lighting plan with sketches showing the proposed location of the lighting; and b) The applicant shall provide a landscape plan showing landscaping planted along the eastern edge of the parking lot.

RECESS HELD FROM 4:45 P.M. TO 4:55 P.M.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-194-DRB

5755 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-122-001)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes an approximately 1,000-square foot retail commercial building a 912-square foot gasoline fueling station canopy, three double-sided fueling dispensers, and a car storage lot on a 25,000-square foot commercial property in the C-2 and C-3 zone districts. The applicant proposes new blue and white aluminum fascia panels for the fueling station canopy and the service station façade. No new floor area or other structural development is proposed. The project was filed by Harwood White, agent, on behalf of John Price of Goleta Properties LLC, property owner. Related cases: 08-194-LUP. (Continued from 11-25-08) (Shine Ling)

Recused: Member Schneider recused himself.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 12 of 16

The plans were presented by Harwood White, agent, on behalf of John Price of Goleta Properties, LLC, property owner, and by John Price, property owner. Harwood White presented revised plans with a change of proportions for the blue color on the building from 40 inches in width to 16 inches in width, and an increase in the white color from 8 inches to 32 inches. He presented revised plans for the canopy with a change of the proportions for the blue color from 28 inches to 16 inches, and an increase in the white color from 8 inches to 20 inches.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling clarified that the sign which was placed on the plans by the applicant is shown only for conceptual information but not for review purposes.

Speaker:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, stated that he appreciates the revised plans which he has reviewed. He recanted his complaint made at the last meeting with regard to the brightness of the lighting, stating he now believes the lighting will provide illumination that is needed in the neighborhood which seems to have some problems with mischief and graffiti.

Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) Scaling back the amount of the blue color by the applicant is appreciated and the project looks a lot better.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The reduction of the quantity of the blue color is an improvement.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 08-194-DRB, 5755 Hollister Avenue, as submitted; and continue to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-199-DRB

454 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-090-013)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes three commercial/industrial buildings totaling 49,756 square feet of floor area on a 7.95-acre site in the PI zone district. The applicant proposes a 550-square foot addition to the office building at the front of the property. Covered arcades are also proposed on the north, west, and east elevations, and a new plaster façade treatment is proposed on all elevations. A new trash enclosure would be located near the southeast corner of the building, and a new landscaping plan is proposed. New colors would consist of olive green, rose, and beige. The project was filed by Ed Lenvik of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Somera Patterson LLC, property owner. Related cases: 08-199-SCD; -LUP. (Shine Ling)

Site visits: Made by all members.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 13 of 16

The plans were presented by Ed Lenvik of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Somera Patterson LLC, property owner, Bob Cunningham, project landscape architect, Arcadia Studio; and the project architect. Ed Lenvik stated that a pavilion has been added to the plans to break up the long promenade across the driveway, which is not shown on the plans that were submitted earlier. He presented the lighting plan. He noted that the currently there are lights in the planters in the parking lot and that the plans are to replace the light fixtures in the same location. He also noted that there will be downward lights that will be fully shielded under the canopy for security. He stated that the project is a remodel that the applicant believes will be in character with the neighborhood. The landscape plans were presented by Bob Cunningham. He stated that there are no plans at the present time to make any improvements in the parking lot except possibly resurfacing and restriping.

Shine Ling, Assistant Planner, clarified that the applicant will need to request a separate permit with regard to the plans for a sign.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Overall, the project plans look good; b) The building architecture and the arcade work successfully; c) He would prefer that the colors are deeper and darker than what is shown on the plans; d) Requested that the applicant restudy the use of Wall Packs; e) Requested that up-lights be removed and lighting be provided in another method; f) Expressed concern that some lighting bollards may have too much of a flare that becomes glaring and bright; g) Consider adding permeable paving on the strip at the entry area; and h) The concept of adding a pavilion is workable, but he suggested consideration that the structure might be better if it were lighter and more open rather than having a solid roof.
2. Member Brown commented: a) Her comments are similar to Member Schneider's; b) The proposed plans are appreciated; c) Recommended adding some sort of public space, with benches, in the arcade area, noting that there are great views; d) Lighting fixtures that are truly downlit are preferred to be used for the lighting on the east side of the building and on the trash enclosure and gate; e) Downlighting is preferred on the arcade; f) Requested that the applicant present for consideration other innovative ways to achieve downlighting to prevent glare rather than placing fixtures in the ground with spotlight type of lighting; g) The landscape plan is fine, noting that the refurbishment and retention of trees are appreciated; h) The cross-hatching feature shown on the elevations is appreciated but her concern is that it would not be seen during the day if painted a dark color; and i) Requested the applicant consider stormwater management opportunities on the site.
3. Member Branch commented: a) Overall, the plans are fine and handsome; b) The addition of the pavilion is a good idea to break up the long walkway area; c) Suggested the applicant restudy the pavilion structure which seems somewhat heavy and out of scale; d) Suggested using colors that are bolder than proposed; and e) Suggested placing the sign in front of the check valve may be a solution for the applicant to research.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 14 of 16

4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Overall, the design is fine; b) The darker color should be somewhat more darker which would provide some enhancement; c) The landscape plan is appreciated; d) Expressed concern regarding the lighting; e) The wall packs along the north side need to be fully shielded; f) Encouraged the applicant to find another way to accomplish the lighting plans without up-lighting; g) The concept of adding a pavilion is appreciated and the proposed pavilion structure design appears fine; and h) Recommended that some benches be included near the pavilion.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) The landscape plan is fine and the plant selections are appreciated; b) He agreed with other members that downlighting is preferred; and c) He has mixed feeling with regard to the entry lighting because it can be possible to beautify the entrance with the use of lighting and plantings.
6. Member Messner commented: a) Overall, the plans are fine; b) The landscape plan is appreciated; c) Recommended using flowers that are white for the *Agapanthus* species; d) If the *Clivia* species is planted, recommended mixing the colors, using yellow, red, and salmon, which would provide for variation because the species has a short flowering time and each color variety blooms a little off from the others; e) Expressed concern regarding drainage into the creek and requested consideration regarding some solution such as a filter; and f) Recommended that the applicant consider solar panels on the roof, as there are big rebates for solar panels.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) The project is moving in a good direction; b) The existing arched windows are attractive but he understands they will not remain when the modifications take place; c) The plans need to indicate that the south roadway will remain as exit-only, which he believes is a good feature; d) The use of green and energy efficient features would be appreciated, including items such as solar water heating, solar panels, and low-voltage lights; e) Agreed with other DRB members that up-lighting is not desired and requested that the applicant find some other method for lighting the exterior; f) The project is a good example of adaptive use of the building; and g) The applicant is requested to consider stormwater management opportunities on the site.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-199-DRB, 454 South Patterson Avenue, with comments, with the condition that the applicant shall provide the lighting cut sheets; and continue to January 27, 2009, for Final review.

L-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-202-DRB

6991 Scripps Crescent (APN 073-181-008)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,230-square foot single-story residence, a 471-square foot 2-car garage, and a pool on an approximately 9,100-square foot lot in the DR-10 zone district. The applicant proposes a 90-square foot addition to the residence. An approximately 120-square foot as-built trellis would also be part of the scope of this permit. The resulting one-story structure would be 1,791 square feet, consisting of a 1,320-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 471-square foot two-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by David Varesio, property owner. Related cases: 08-202-LUP. (Shine Ling)

Site visits: Made by Members Herrera, Schneider and Wignot.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by David Varesio, property owner. He stated that the site plan will be amended to show the as-built trellis that would also be part of the scope of this permit.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-4, No. 08-202-DRB, 6991 Scripps Crescent, as submitted, including the as-built trellis; and continue to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

- NONE

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

There being no objections, Member Schneider requested that a Discussion Item regarding Building Intensity Standards be added to the next agenda, and possibly future agendas, to provide an opportunity for the members to discuss the recommendations from the joint DRB/Planning Commission workshops on Building Intensity Standards that will be made by the Planning Commission to the City Council.

Chair Wignot requested that staff advise the DRB members regarding when the staff report to the Planning Commission regarding Building Intensity Standards will be available for review.

The DRB members indicated that they responded to an announcement from the City Clerk regarding AB 1234 Ethics Training for Local Officials. Chair Wignot suggested that it would be appropriate for the DRB members to be compensated at the meeting rate for attending the training meeting.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that he will keep the DRB informed regarding the status of the letter from DRB Member Schneider requesting changes in the appeal point for sign approvals.

Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

December 9, 2008

Page 16 of 16

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Member Branch announced that a new band of mostly architects will debut at the annual AIA Santa Barbara Chapter holiday party to be held tomorrow.

The DRB members extended holiday greetings.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 6:20 P.M.

Minutes approved on January 13, 2009.

Design Review Board Agenda

December 9, 2008

Page 17 of 17