



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, October 28, 2008**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.**

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### **SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE**

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

### **STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.**

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

### **ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.**

### **REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.**

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

#### **Members:**

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Scott Branch (Architect)

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

---

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

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Wignot at 3:00 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.

Board Members absent: None.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

## **B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

### **B-1. MEETING MINUTES**

A. Design Review Board Minutes for October 14, 2008

**MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for October 14, 2008, as amended.**

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

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the Subcommittee met today and discussed Nursery Standards. He said that Bill Millar, the City's Arborist, presented a status report regarding the Urban Forest Management Plan, and stated that the satellite imaging assessment of the City's existing urban forest has been completed by the contractor. Chair Messner stated that the agenda for the next meeting, to be held on November 25, 2008, at 2:00 p.m., will include Nursery Standards and consideration with regard to including plant standards and safety standards; a discussion regarding adding more trees to the Recommended Street Tree List; and the Urban Forest Management Plan update.

Street Tree Subcommittee Member Wignot stated that Bill Millar, City Arborist, reported that the contract with Goleta Valley Beautiful is currently on hold with regard to the Urban Forest Management Plan. He said that Bill Millar also reported that staff is in the process of preparing an application for Tree City USA status for another year, for approval by the City Council.

### **B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT**

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) He expressed staff's appreciation for the DRB members' participation throughout the three joint workshops with the Planning Commission on Building Intensity Standards in the General Plan. Staff is in the process of preparing a staff report to the City Council, which is the next step in the process. 2) The City Council approved the Rincon Palms Hotel and Restaurant project, which will return to the DRB for review. 3) The City Council continued the hearing on the Marriott Residence Inn project to November 18, 2008. 4) The hearing on the appeal to the DRB's Preliminary Approval of the project at 7837 Langlo Ranch Road is tentatively scheduled for December, and a DRB representative will need to be designated to attend the hearing. 5) The DRB is invited to attend an open house for staff at the City's Corporation Yard located at the Cabrillo Business Park site. 6) The DRB review of completed projects with regard to approved plans vs. constructed is tentatively scheduled for early 2009.

Vice Chair Smith volunteered to represent the DRB at the hearing regarding the appeal to the DRB Preliminary Approval of the project at 7837 Langlo Ranch Road, tentatively scheduled for December, 2008.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 28, 2008

Page 3 of 11

### C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported that no requests for continuance were received.

### E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Member Branch reported that he reviewed Item F-1, No. 08-159-DRB, 7390 Calle Real, today with Assistant Planner Shine Ling, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted.

### F. CONSENT CALENDAR

#### F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-159-DRB

7390 Calle Real (APN 077-490-041)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property comprises a Community Shopping Center and includes two retail commercial and office buildings (approximately 6,250 square feet and 8,300 square feet) and a gasoline fueling station facility with an approximately 625-square foot canopy on a 1.05-acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to install a new above-ground Healy clean air separator tank for the gasoline fueling station facility. The tank would be placed within a new 42-square foot metal enclosure painted to match the beige color of the building. The enclosure would be 10 feet tall. Air breather piping would extend from the top of the tank to a *minimum* height of 18" above the roof of the building, The air breather piping would match the height of the existing vent risers. No habitable floor area is proposed. The project was filed by Luke Snyder of Quality Project Management, agent, on behalf of Eleni Pertsulakes, property owner. Related cases: 08-159-LUP. (Continued from 10-14-08) (Shine Ling)

*Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on October 28, 2008:*

Consent Calendar Member Branch reviewed Item F-1, No. 08-159-DRB, 7390 Calle Real, today with Assistant Planner Shine Ling, and granted Final Approval as submitted.

### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

### H. SIGN CALENDAR

- NONE

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 28, 2008

Page 4 of 11

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

### 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 09-23-08\*, 08-26-08) (Scott Kolwitz)

Site visits: Made by all members present.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 28, 2008

Page 5 of 11

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by agent Steve Welton of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Service on behalf of the Center for Urban Agriculture at Fairview Gardens, property owner, and the project team including Victor Schumacher, project architect; Daniel Wilson, project landscape architect; and Toby McPartland, Farm Manager.

Steve Welton, agent, stated that the project team responded to the DRB comments that requested more information with regard to landscaping and lighting.

Victor Schumacher, project architect, stated that lights with low energy bulbs will be placed at the door of each yurt and kitchen and bathroom trailers, which will meet safety requirements. He presented picture of the existing yurt, stating that it shows how the landscaping is able to screen effectively.

Daniel Wilson, project landscape architect, presented the lighting and landscape plans. He stated that the landscape plan consists of the following three principles: 1) Provide visual screening in offsite directions, in areas where necessary. 2) Enhance the livability for residents and allow for an amenable climate by providing for some afternoon summer shade, and with a balance between evergreen and deciduous trees; and 3) Choose a simple plant palette that would be non-invasive and tolerable to natives and drought as much as possible, and would create food for humans and wildlife. Daniels Wilson stated from his experience he believes that a considerable portion of the trailers would be visually screened by the Passion Fruit species within a year. Also, the Pineapple Guava species would provide privacy for the yurts and effectively screen the yurts from Fairview Avenue. He clarified that upward-lights will not be part of the lighting plan, downward-lights will be mounted at the doorways, and low-watt pathway lights will be installed in fixtures that are approximately 12 to 18 inches in height above the ground.

Speakers:

Jim Hurst, neighbor to the east of the project, expressed concern that the view from his property will be directly at the new farm labor camp and the project plans do not show any screening to the east. He urged that a few more trellises and screening be provided to screen the labor camp from his property. He believes the screening would also provide privacy for the labor camp residents as well as screen the labor camp from people who visit Fairview Gardens. He expressed appreciation and commended Fairview Gardens on their progress with regard to the project and for working with the City.

Charlie Hamilton, neighbor to the east, expressed concern that no plantings are proposed on the landscape plans on the east side of farm labor camp. He commented that a yurt on the site has been located 100 feet behind his fence for the last few years, which is not very aesthetically pleasing. He noted that several

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 28, 2008

Page 6 of 11

members of the Concerned Neighbors of Fairview Gardens have expressed concern that besides the aesthetic problem of having five yurts within vision of homes, there is a financial disadvantage that would impinge on the salability of their homes. He urged that landscape screening be required on the east side of the labor camp to address neighbors' concerns. He noted that the applicant plans to screen the project from the public along Fairview Avenue. He expressed appreciation and commended Fairview Gardens on their progress with regard to the project and for working with the City.

Toby McPartland, Farm Manager, Fairview Gardens, provided details with regard to the existing orchard on the site.

Daniel Wilson, project landscape architect, stated that the screening was not planned for the east side in order to allow for the morning sun and for a view of the mountains, and also to allow the residents to have a view of the farm from the standpoint of managing the operations, safety and security. He stated that given the lay of the land, topography, and change in elevation, it would take approximately six to eight years for any reasonable landscape screening to grow along the entire length of the east property line, which is approximately two hundred feet. After comments were made by the DRB members, Daniel Wilson stated that perhaps some kind of balance could be made by adding some screening in pockets along the east side of the yurt village coupled with some screening towards the lower part of the property, which would address the neighbors' concerns and also allow the farm workers to view the farm so they can tend to safety and operational responsibilities.

### Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) The landscape palette, which is very thoughtful, is appreciated. b) The applicant is requested to research and present plans with regard to providing additional landscaping for screening to address concerns from the neighbors to the east; and c) The flowers from the Pineapple Guava species are edible.
2. Member Branch commented: a) Suggested considering some sort of screening for the neighbors to the east, for example, up to the sill height of the windows, rather than seeing a completely unobstructed yurt.
3. Member Messner commented: a) Suggested planting approximately three or four trees in front of each yurt for screening property to the east, which would hide the yurts somewhat and yet leave some of the area open and provide for morning sunlight, rather than planting trees across the entire length along the east side.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with Member Messner's suggestion to screen a portion of the eastern side, in front of each yurt, rather than the whole length; b) Suggested, for evaluation, whether adding low screening material, such as shrubs, near the kitchen and bathroom trailers, towards the lower part of the property, would screen the view from the neighbors to the east while being low enough not to obstruct the view from the labor camp to the farm.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 28, 2008

Page 7 of 11

5. Chair Wignot commented: a) The applicant is requested to bring photographs showing the view of the labor camp from the neighbors to the east. b) The neighbors to the east may bring in photographs showing their views of the site which will be useful.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 08-145-DRB, 598 North Fairview Avenue, to December 9, 2008, with the following comments: 1) The applicant shall research and consider additional landscaping to address what needs to be done to affect some shielding of the project for the neighbors to the east; and 2) The applicant shall provide cut sheets for the proposed landscape lighting.**

### M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

#### M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-157-DRB

600 Pine Avenue (APN 071-130-040)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 59,535-square foot 28.25-foot tall research and development building, consisting of a 42,875-square foot first-floor and a 16,660-square foot second-floor mezzanine, a 540-square foot detached masonry building, a 2,500-square foot mechanical yard, 165 automobile parking spaces, 3 loading zones, 20 indoor bicycle parking spaces and 161,350 square feet of landscaping on a 6.58-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district with an RDA overlay.

The applicant proposes to construct a 23,376-square foot manufacturing/office addition (18,694-square foot first-floor & 4,682-square foot second-floor mezzanine) on the east end of the building and an 1,650-square foot "airlock" addition on the north side of the building, to expand parking from 165 to 239 (188 standard, 44 compact, & 7 ADA compliant) parking spaces, and to retain 3 loading zones and the 20 indoor bicycle parking spaces. The resulting 2-story structure would be 84,561 square feet with a maximum height of 35 feet, consisting of a 63,219-square foot first-floor & a 21,342-square foot second floor mezzanine. Landscaping would be reduced to 119,755 square feet and would require the removal of 13 trees (2 Jacaranda, 1 Liquidambar, 2 Lophostemon, 3 Brazilian Pepper & 5 Tipuana); however 78 new trees (25 Jacaranda/Purple-Leaf Plum, 45 Australian Willow/Brisbane Box, 8 Queen Palm) and additional shrubs and ground cover are proposed. Grading would consist of 3,500-cubic yards of cut and 300-cubic yards of fill. Stormwater would be directed to two detention basins prior to reaching Old San Jose Creek. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence/commercial property. The project was filed by agent Laurel Perez & Heidi Jones of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services on behalf of Pine Avenue Associates, property owner. Related cases: 75-DP-11, 75-DP-34, 79-DP-9, 79-ND-3, 79-DP-9 SC01, 79-DP-9 SC02, 79-DP-9 SC03, 79-ND-43 Addendum, 75-DP-34 AM01, 06-091-DRB, 06-091-SCD, 07-190-SCD, & 08-157-DP RV. (Continued from 09-23-08) (Scott Kolwitz & Laura Vlk)

Site visits: Made by all members.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 28, 2008

Page 8 of 11

Ex-parte conversations: Member Brown reported that she had a conversation with the project landscape architect.

Recused: Member Schneider recused himself and exited the Council Chambers.

The plans were presented by agent Heidi Jones and Laurel Perez of Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services on behalf of Pine Avenue Associates, property owner; and the project team including Brian Poliquin and Inaki Villarin, project architects, Poliquin Kellogg Design Group; Kimberly True, project landscape architect, Suding Design; and Wayne Fitch of Penfield & Smith Engineers.

Brian Poliquin, project architect, responded to DRB comments regarding architecture from the last meeting. He stated that the mansard roof was eliminated and the roof element was returned to a straight parapet. He also stated that the HVAC equipment is fully screened by the parapet element; the existing equipment on the north elevation facing Ekwil Street will be screened by landscaping; and the trash structure will be fully enclosed. He noted that that the building is a utility building and that the design relates to the function of the building. He believes that making the building essentially a background to the landscaping is the right approach for the project. He stated that the landscaping creates a series of layers of screening from Ekwil Street.

Kimberly True, project landscape architect, presented the landscape plan. She stated that a *Cotoneaster* drought tolerant groundcover was added in the parking lot areas, and that the King Palm species has been added to the palette that will be used as some of the taller palm trees against the building. Vines were added onto the green screens and a vine was added at the trash enclosure. She clarified that mitigation for removal of the mature coast live oak, *Quercus agrifolia*, will be on a ten-to-one basis. (note: Mitigation is not required for all landscape trees being removed). She said that the landscape plan shows the future Ekwil Street alignment as well as the various creek buffers.

Wayne Fitch, Penfield & Smith, discussed the drainage plans. He stated that the applicant is working with the City's Community Services staff with regard to the Ekwil Street alignment plans and that the output point for the drainage will be adjusted accordingly. He clarified that the drainage design was updated to handle a 100-year storm event, per County flood control requirements.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the updated drainage plan that was recently submitted by the applicant is currently being reviewed by the Community Services staff.

### Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) The architecture on the north elevation, that will face Ekwil Street, appears top-heavy, and suggested that the applicant study the window application on the façade and provide solutions to address this concern, perhaps consider adding some windows to create a better rhythm; and b) The high glass element design on the south elevation works fine.



## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 28, 2008

Page 9 of 11

2. Member Brown commented: a) The landscape plan is very good with a nice mix and selection of species; b) The applicant's concept that the building will be a backdrop to the landscaping is appreciated; c) The building architecture, which has a variety of elements, seems appropriate for its Old Town location; d) Recommended planting trees that are larger than one gallon size, for example, plant five gallon size, with regard to the coast live oak mitigation trees, *Quercus agrifolia* species; d) Recommended lighting that incorporates dark sky lighting principles; and e) The applicant will need to provide cut sheets showing full cut-off lighting fixtures and height of the fixtures.
3. Vice-Chair Smith commented: a) He agreed with Member Brown's comments.
4. Member Messner commented: a) The landscape plan is good; b) The existing riparian cottonwood trees (*Populus* species) located within the creek bank are not preferred because of the potential to clog creeks (note: no additional cottonwood trees are proposed); and c) More information is needed with regard to the drainage plan.
5. Chair Wignot commented: a) The applicant has responded to previous comments; b) The applicant is encouraged to continue to work with the City regarding how the project will fit with the Ekwill Street extension project; c) The output point for the drainage is shown in the middle of the Ekwill Street alignment area which will need to be addressed; and d) The buffer zone between the new Ekwill Street extension and the line of trees that will be planted is appreciated.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to continue Item M-1, No. 08-157-DRB, 600 Pine Avenue, to November 12, 2008, with the following comments: a) The applicant shall study the window application on the north elevation and present solutions that address the concern that the façade appears top-heavy, perhaps consider adding some windows to create a better rhythm; b) The applicant shall provide cut-sheets showing fully shielded lighting fixtures and heights; and c) The applicant is encouraged to work with Community Services with regard to the review of the drainage plans and shall provide updated drainage plan information.**

### N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

RECESS HELD FROM 4:37 P.M. TO 4:45 P.M.

### O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

#### O-1. DENSITY DISCUSSION

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that this agenda item was originally requested to discuss a situation that may occur when a project has constraints with regard to building on a portion of the site however the applicant would be allowed to build on a percentage of the site's acreage, which would allow for a very dense project. This

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

October 28, 2008

Page 10 of 11

agenda item was continued until the joint Planning Commission/DRB workshops on Building Intensity Standards were completed, which was on October 20, 2008.

Member Brown stated that this situation is somewhat an example of a new concept known as conservation planning whereby homes are clustered together to conserve open space.

Member Branch commented: a) It would seem appropriate to subtract the amount of the site that is designated as open space and to base the density on the size of the site that is available for development; and b) The number of units may be reduced, but it would be less difficult to create a good design, which would be of benefit to the community.

Vice Chair Smith commented: a) One consideration may be the possibility of some type of compensation for the property owner in this type of situation which lowers the amount of units per acre; b) With regard to story poles, he reported that in Malibu, full-size wire frames are being built for projects to provide an understanding of ridge heights and rooflines.

Chair Wignot commented: a) Suggested the possibility of a situation where a developer realizes some consideration for not being able to build on an area of a site due to constraints and at the same time the remainder of the property is not overly densified; b) An early conceptual review process may address issues including the developer's economic impacts, opportunities for open space, and neighborhood compatibility; c) Prior to the City's incorporation, some projects may have been considered "fast track" by the County because there was an affordable housing component; d) Site visits, as well as story poles for certain types of units and design, are very helpful; and e) The current cumulative project list may be useful for the DRB members.

Member Brown commented: a) Conceptual review early in the process would provide more of an opportunity for site planning; and b) More details are needed with regard to establishing an early conceptual review process, including the role of the DRB.

Member Branch commented: a) Early conceptual review would be useful before the applicant has spent a lot of money and time to develop plans that may seem too far along, or too big, when the project is seen for the first time.

Member Schneider commented: a) Some site planning issues are beyond the purview of the DRB even though the ramifications may become apparent from a design review standpoint.

Member Herrera commented: a) Story poles are beneficial to provide an idea of the context of a project with regard to adjacent properties as well as the neighborhood.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz clarified that staff is preparing an outline of an early conceptual review process to use as a draft for further consideration and modification, in response to one of the proposals made at the joint Planning Commission/DRB

## **Design Review Board Minutes - Approved**

October 28, 2008

Page 11 of 11

workshops on Building Intensity Standards. He stated that staff will provide the DRB members with the current cumulative projects list.

There being no objections, Chair Wignot stated that the Density Discussion agenda item was concluded.

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

No requests.

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

Member Brown announced that she will not be present at the next DRB meeting on November 12, 2008.

Chair Wignot announced that he will not be present at the next DRB meeting on November 12, 2008.

### **P. ADJOURNMENT: 5:15 P.M.**

Minutes approved on November 12, 2008.

**Design Review Board Agenda**

October 14, 2008

Page 12 of 12