



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, January 27, 2009**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.**

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### **SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.**

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

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

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

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

### **REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.**

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

#### **Members:**

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair

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; \*\*Cecilia Brown; Scott Branch; Simon Herrera; Chris Messner; and Carl Schneider. \*Thomas Smith exited the meeting at 7:00 p.m. \*\*Cecilia Brown exited the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Board Members absent: None.

Staff present: Alan Hanson, Senior Planner; Steve Chase, Director of Planning and Environmental Services, Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager; Shine Ling, Assistant

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

January 27, 2009

Page 2 of 15

Planner; April Verbanac, Contract Planner; David Stone, Contract Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

### B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

#### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for January 13, 2009

**MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for January 13, 2009, as amended.**

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

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the Subcommittee met today and discussed adding trees to the Recommended Street Tree List and Nursery Standards. Also, Bill Millar, Parks and Open Space Manager, presented an update on the Urban Forest Management Plan which is on hold. The satellite imaging sets Goleta at 19% for tree canopy which compares well to other cities.

Member Messner requested, on behalf of the Street Tree Subcommittee, an agenda item on the DRB agenda for February 10, 2009, to present recommended additions to the Recommended Street Tree Subcommittee List and recommended Nursery Standards for review by the DRB.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling announced that Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz and Ok Hee, his wife, are the parents of a son, Micah Hahnul Kolwitz, who was born on January 22, 2009.

#### B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Chair Wignot and DRB Members sent regards and best wishes to Mr. and Mrs. Scott Kolwitz.

### C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, commented that he believes it is important to recognize that Fairview Gardens is going to be a viable operating farm it has to be allowed to operate and not have too many constraints, rather than thinking of it as having to fit into the urban environment. He noted that the story poles are in place with regard to the Citrus Village project at 7388 Calle Real. He also commented that there are two big vending machines at the Happy Harry's business on Calle Real and stated that he hopes the City will have an ordinance with regard to vending machine regulations.

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

Senior Planner Alan Hanson reported that no requests for continuance were received.

**E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Consent Calendar Member Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-1, No. 08-207-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, and that he granted Final Approval as submitted. He stated that a note was added to both the landscape plan and the site plan that the electrical transformer shall be screened. Consent Calendar Member Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-2, No. 08-207-DRB, 598 North Fairview Avenue, and granted Final Approval as submitted.

**F. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-207-DRB**

111 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-025)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 21,800-square foot commercial building on a 3.6-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to remodel the façade of the building and construct a new 1,800-square foot outdoor mechanical equipment yard. No changes in building height, building coverage, signage, or floor area are proposed. Features of the remodel include a new aluminum and glass storefront system on the north, south, and west elevations of the building, new roll-up doors on the south and west elevations, and an upgrade of existing aluminum glass and doors on the north, east, and south elevations. A new landscape plan is also proposed, with new plantings consisting of *Prunus cerassifera*, *Miscanthus sinensis*, *Syagrus romanzofflanum*, and other plant species. The project was filed by Dave Jones of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Mark Winnikoff of Frieslander Holdings LLC and Nederlander Holdings, LLC, property owners. Related cases: 08-207-SCD; -LUP. (Continued from 01-13-09) (Shine Ling)

*Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on January 27, 2009:*

Consent Calendar Member Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-1, No. 08-207-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, and that he granted Final Approval as submitted. He stated that a note was added to both the landscape plan and the site plan that the electrical transformer shall be screened.

**F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-145-DRB**

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

This is a request for *Final* 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 01-13-09, 12-9-08, 10-28-08, 09-23-08\*, 08-26-08) (Scott Kolwitz)

*Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on January 27, 2009:*

Consent Calendar Member Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-2, No. 08-207-DRB, 598 North Fairview Avenue, and granted Final Approval as submitted.

**G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Cecilia Brown reported that the Subcommittee reviewed today Item H-1, 370 Storke Road. She stated that the Sign Committee approved replacing the existing two pole signs with new signs for the drive-thru restaurant and car wash; the Sign Committee made some suggestions for improving the proposed signage which was followed by the applicant; and the Sign Committee granted preliminary approval for both the proposed pole signs and wall sign and gave direction to the applicant for minor changes to the proposed wall sign before granting preliminary approval.

**H. SIGN CALENDAR**

**H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-214-DRB**

370 Storke Road (APN 073-100-008)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,230-square foot restaurant, 1,978-square foot coin-operated, commercial car wash, and a 40-square foot watchman's trailer within a 10,000-square foot contractor's storage yard, on a 1.00-acre parcel zoned C-3 in the Inland Area of the City. The applicant proposes to install four new signs onsite consisting of the following:

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

January 27, 2009

Page 5 of 15

- An 18.3-square foot internally illuminated wall sign stating “Zizzo’s Coffee” mounted above the existing awning on the west (front) elevation of the restaurant. The wall sign would measure 18-inches tall by 146-inches long; and,
- A 72-square foot internally illuminated pole sign stating “Zizzo’s Coffee Drive Thru” mounted on an existing sign pole advertising the restaurant. The pole sign would measure 72-inches tall by 144-inches long; and,
- A second 21-square foot internally illuminated pole sign stating “Self-Serve Car Wash” located below the restaurant pole sign on the existing sign pole at the front of the property bordering Storke Road. The pole sign would measure 36-inches tall by 84-inches long.

All internally illuminated signs would have acrylic faces and internally illuminated channel lettering. The pole signs would have acrylic faces and vinyl graphics. The menu board would consist of three panels with a dark background and light colored lettering. The project was filed by agent Harwood White on behalf of John Price, property owner. Related cases: 79-V-037, 08-035-CUP, 08-214-LUP. (Continued from 01-13-09) (Alan Hanson)

**Sign Subcommittee Motion: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-1, No. 08-214-DRB, 370 Storke Avenue, as submitted, with the following conditions: 1) the pole shall be painted with a “coconut brown” color; and 2) the wall sign shall have black trim around the letters; and to continue the item to February 10, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

#### J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-141-DRB

6325 Lindmar Drive (APN 073-005-021)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 27,927-square foot industrial/manufacturing building, 20,276-square feet of courtyards, loading docks and parking, an as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage/water treatment enclosure/addition, and 23,535-square feet (32%) of landscaping on a 73,616-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a mechanical courtyard in the existing courtyard between buildings A and C, construct two new mechanical roof wells (one on building B and one on building C), permit the aforementioned as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage area on the west side of building A, permit an as-built parking lot on the east side of buildings B and C (which requires the removal of 1,167-square feet of landscaping), alter the loading area on the west side of building A, abandon an existing driveway on the north side of the property, remove equipment from the front yard setback for re-location into the proposed mechanical courtyard, remove an unpermitted parking lot storage area on the southwest side of the property, and re-locate equipment from the side yard (along the south property line) setback. All materials used for this project are to match the

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

January 27, 2009

Page 6 of 15

existing buildings with the exception of new lighting, which will be Lamps Plus bronze, 9" high outdoor dark sky tube lights. The project was filed by agent Bruce Burke on behalf of James L. Bartlett, property owner. Related cases: 07-141-DP AM01; 07-141-LUP. (Continued from 11-25-08\*, 10-14-08\*, 08-26-08) (Laura Vlk)

The plans were presented by Bruce Burke on behalf of James L. Bartlett, property owner.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item J-1, No. 07-141-DRB, 6325 Lindmar Drive, as submitted.**

### **J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-199-DRB**

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

This is a request for *Final* 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. (Continued from 12-9-08) (Shine Ling)

The plans were presented by Ed Lenvik of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Somera Patterson LLC, property owner. Ed Lenvik provided lighting cut sheets in response to the DRB condition of Preliminary Approval. Martha Degasis, project landscape architect, of Arcadia Studio, presented the landscape plan, stating that it has been finalized into a construction document.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Final Approval of Item J-2, No. 08-199-DRB, 454 South Patterson Avenue, as submitted.**

RECESS HELD BETWEEN 3:40 P.M. AND 4:00 P.M.

### **K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR**

- NONE

### **L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR**

- NONE

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## **M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR**

### **M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-034-DRB**     TIME CERTAIN 4:00-6:00

8301 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-200-012 & 079-200-013)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The proposed project site is within a portion of the 72.73-acre (gross and net) Bacara Resort and Spa located in western Goleta, it is south of the Union Pacific Railroad and US 101, west of the Venoco Oil and Gas Processing Facility, north of Haskell's Beach and the Pacific Ocean, and east of existing Resort and Spa facilities. Proposed development would occur within a 12.66-acre (gross and net) area called Lot 2, and would also include widening of the existing Hollister Avenue roadway site located within a portion of Lot 1 immediately north of Lot 2. The project site has a Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan designation of Visitor-serving Commercial (C-V), and has an Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance designation of C-V, Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial.

The applicant is requesting approval of General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendments, a vesting tentative tract map, and a final development plan as described below.

#### General Plan Amendments (05-034-GP)

The project proposes amendments to ten Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies and tables as initiated by the City Council on May 20, 2008. These amendments address issues including: Open Space Element preservation and management of public lateral and vertical access areas, and open space area maps; Conservation Element special status species and environmentally sensitive habitat; and Safety Element seismic hazards map.

#### Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (05-034-TPM)

The applicant requests a two-lot subdivision of the 72.73-acre Bacara Resort and Spa project area that is comprised of APNs 079-200-012 & -013. Lot 1, totaling 60.07 acres (gross and net), would include the existing Bacara Resort and Spa, existing and proposed Hollister Avenue widening corridor, and an open space eastern terrace area. Lot 2, totaling 12.66 acres, would include all other proposed project site improvements.

#### Final Development Plan (05-DP-034)

The Final Development Plan would provide for construction of a 56-unit condominium hotel development and ancillary facilities. The proposed 56-unit condominium hotel development would be located within the Lot 2 12.66-acre area commonly referred to as the "Valley Floor" of the Bacara property, located directly southeast of the existing Bacara Resort and Spa facilities. Widening of Hollister Avenue would occur from the proposed improvements east to the Bacara Resort and Spa property boundary. Proposed improvements include a pool, cabana pool decks (e.g., shade structures), resort support facilities and guest parking. To accommodate the proposed improvements, the existing tennis club house and maintenance building, four (4) tennis courts, a 50-space public parking lot, and a vertical beach access trail would be relocated. An existing beach house and public restrooms located adjacent to the

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

January 27, 2009

Page 8 of 15

beach on the southern slope of the Valley Floor would remain. Please see the staff report for additional information.

The project was submitted on November 24, 2008 by agent Mary Meaney Reichel, Lucon Inc., on behalf of Bacara Resort and Spa, HT Santa Barbara property owner. Related cases: 05-034-GP, -TM, -DP. (April Verbanac, David Stone)

Site visits: Made by all members.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Documents: 1) E-mails received on January 27, 2009, in opposition to the proposed project, from: a) Janet Koed; b) Tom Modugno; and c) Steven Eggemeyer. 2) Comments from Ingeborg Cox, M.D., dated January 27, 2009, expressing concerns regarding the proposed project. 3) Newspaper articles submitted by Karin Kuyper as follows: a) "Bacara sues builders, engineers, insurers", from the *Santa Barbara News Press*, dated 11/07-08; and b) "Great Gatsby, from the *Santa Barbara Independent*, dated October 12, 2000".

April Verbanac, Contract Planner, Dudek, provided an overview of the development review process including the environmental review. She stated that two modification requests have been received for the proposed Development Plan, noting that one request relates to reducing the front yard setback requirement adjacent to Hollister Avenue and the other relates to allowing building heights that exceed the standard of 35 feet from existing grade. She introduced David Stone, Contract Planner, Dudek, project archaeologist.

Mary Meaney Reichel, agent, provided a brief overview regarding the history of this project and also discussed the proposed design.

John Pawson, project architect, provided an overview of the applicant's design philosophy, the proposed architecture and the green building protocol. Michael Leclere, project architect, provided an overview of the grading, site constraints and building heights. He pointed out that the applicant's intent is to achieve the highest LEED rating possible.

Speakers:

Sam Cohen, representing Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, stated that the site is located in a beautiful area and that he looks forward to working with the developer and the project archaeologist on this project. He believes there are significant site constraints and noted three constraints as follows: 1) There are significant cultural resources and some burial issues; 2) There needs to be consistency with existing CEQA regulations and amendments that have occurred past 1985; and 3) If there are General Plan Amendments, procedures required by Senate Bill 18 will need to be followed.



## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

January 27, 2009

Page 9 of 15

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, said he expected that the style of the proposed project would be a continuation of the style of the existing Bacara facilities which resembles a village. He stated that the proposed structures are rigid, stark and formal, with straight lines, and have no association to the bluffs or the ocean. He suggested that this project would be an opportunity for a major employer to provide affordable housing on-site for its low-income workers.

Dr. Ingeborg Cox, Goleta, read comments from her letter dated January 27, 2009, regarding Case No. 07-034-DRB. Her concerns included: 1) With the proposed project, the public's right to beach access will be diminished to a point that it could become extinct; 2) DRB Goal #3 is not met as this project is not the most appropriate use of the land; 3) DRB Goal #4 would not be met because there is no preservation of the open space the residents enjoy now; 4) DRB Goal #8 needs to be considered with regard to grading; and 5) DRB Goal #10 needs to be considered with regard to ensuring that the continued health, safety of the neighborhood is not compromised.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, stated that this site is very special and great care should be taken in the design of this project. She hopes that all issues will be identified in the environmental review process. She expressed a few of her concerns as follows: 1) obstruction of view; 2) destruction of previously required Phase 1 mitigation measures; 3) the large amount of grading on the site and archeological damage 4) the finished grades are too high; 5) the buildings are too high; 6) architecture does not fit the area or blend with the site; 7) the public area has been pushed to the east away from the hotel and as close to Venoco as possible; and 8) the path to the beach seems more like a tunnel.

Karin Kuyper, stated that she has lived in the area and enjoyed the beach for thirty years. She expressed concern with regard to the impact from this project as well as from other potential developments in the area.

Janet Koed, representing Gaviota Coast Conservancy, stated that their mission statement is to preserve the rural character of the Gaviota Coast from Coal Oil Point in Goleta to Point Arguello. She stated that she is attending this hearing to gather information, but she believes it is very unlikely that the Gaviota Coast Conservancy will endorse or support this project.

Vic Cox, Goleta, requested that the proposed project either be extremely limited, especially by giving the eastern portion back to the public, or denied all together. He expressed concern with regard to DRB Goal #11, stating that the entire street design appears to be too narrow for emergency vehicle turnarounds. He requested that consideration be given to the fact that proposed Building 10 is located very close to Goleta Historical Marker #3 regarding the Japanese Attack, which is part of the City's history.

Cary Penniman, Goleta, stated that the number of public parking spaces is insufficient during the summer and that overflow parking, which can be found near the golf course, is on a very busy street which is not good for families. He stated that his main

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

January 27, 2009

Page 10 of 15

concern is public access, and requested that consideration be given now with regard to planning for current parking needs as well as future needs. He noted that it has been over twenty years since the County required fifty parking spaces.

Deane Plaister, Santa Barbara, expressed concern that this project will bring more people, more traffic, more runoff and less nature to the Gaviota Coast, no matter how sensitively it is designed. In his opinion, he believes that the existing Bacara development has affected the shoreline enough and that further expansion should be denied or severely curtailed.

Mary Meaney Reichel, agent, clarified that there is no public access gate in the area from the public parking lot to the beach, and stated that the public access gate notation should be removed from the plans.

Jeremy Salts, project civil engineer, Penfield & Smith, responded to general questions from the DRB with regard to stormwater runoff and drainage. He also stated that there will be water quality features on the site.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase stated that many of the questions from the DRB at this point relate to issues that will be identified in the Initial Study and will be addressed during the environmental review process.

### DRB Comments:

The majority of members agreed that the applicant's presentation was excellent, and expressed appreciation for the amount of work and effort to provide the information.

Additional information requested by the DRB members, in general, included: a) a copy of the Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (05-034-TPM); b) copies of the various cross sections and photographs of the elevations; c) stormwater runoff, drainage, and water quality details; d) the total number of proposed bedrooms; e) details with regard to the retaining wall adjacent to the public access, including the height and its appearance along the path, f) a chart detailing building heights, and g) additional planting details for the landscape plan and information on how green roofs would be maintained.

Member Schneider commented:

- a. The work process was good but he has concerns regarding the result.
- b. The proposed design appears to be competing with the cliffs, which he believes will be unsuccessful.
- c. The proposed design is kind of an international style and he is not sure that this is the right site for the style. There needs to be some kind of way to break up the strong horizontality of the design. The proposed design may work if it was more softened.
- d. Expressed concern that there is no vertical movement in the proposed design. More stepping features might work although it may not fit with the style.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

January 27, 2009

Page 11 of 15

- e. The proposed grading has created two flat areas where the horizontal buildings are placed.
  - f. The lighter color makes the architecture stand out too much. Suggest using the proposed darker color as the color for the upper portion of the buildings, then moving downward with deeper colors.
  - g. When viewing the image from the ocean, the proposed project appears to "jump out" and does not appear soft. In comparison, the existing Bacara facilities appear to blend in as a village, and are softened by trees. (The proposed architecture does not need to match the existing Bacara facilities.)
  - h. The proposed vegetation on the roof would be good, but it may not be a realistic solution when considering the limited rainfall in the area and finding appropriate low-maintenance plantings. This feature would seem more relevant if there were more people who would be looking down on the vegetation. Photovoltaic cells would seem to be more successful on the roofs.
  - i. He would probably support the front yard setback modification along Hollister Avenue at a distance to be determined, as long as it is below grade and does not become a visual issue.
  - j. His concern with regard to the building height modification is that there is sloping, particularly on the ocean side of the upper row, that would add to the apparent height of the building. He noted that he would prefer more architectural variation with regard to heights.
  - k. The image at the entry drive works particularly well, with the view of the ocean and the architectural layers. It would be nice if there was room to spread the buildings more for a wider view of the ocean. He encouraged more similar designs.
  - l. The architecture when viewed from the south, on Page 21 of the plan, appears to be a cubic structure and creates a kind of wall that does not provide the sense that the ocean is on the other side of the units.
2. Member Brown commented:
- a. The proposed buildings appear too formal and rigid for the informality of the beach and need to be more fluid and playful.
  - b. The square footage of the individual condominium units seems large.
  - c. The landscaping needs to be considered along with the buildings on the site.
  - d. There may be issues that come forward with regard to the amount of parking.
  - e. The crescent design is an interesting connotation for the site.
  - f. The concept of vegetation on the roofs will not be successful considering the amount of rainfall in the area unless there are plans for watering in the summer. Photovoltaic cells or some other feature would be more appropriate.
  - g. Suggested consideration that the proposed location for the pool is in an area open to the ocean that can be very cold, which does not seem very practical.
  - h. There needs to be a better understanding provided by the applicant with regard to stormwater runoff and landscaping.
  - i. Consideration of Dark Sky principles with regard to exterior lighting will be an important consideration for the site.
3. Member Branch commented:

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

January 27, 2009

Page 12 of 15

- a. It appears that great length was taken by the applicant to make the site work and to accommodate views. The grading is well thought-out, particularly for a project this size.
  - b. The proposed architectural style is somewhat too rigid and the effect is too polished, although he is not against the style. The architecture needs different articulation and possibly more breaks in planes.
  - c. Expressed concern regarding the view of the long horizontal planes of glass.
  - d. Suggested that the architecture may need to undulate vertically along the horizontal path. Suggested the buildings may need to step within themselves down the site.
  - e. From his standpoint, overall the concept is good and is moving towards where it needs to be.
  - f. The proposed development should be the most logical design and as appropriate to the site as possible.
  - g. The current beach access is great. Conceptually his preference would be that Buildings 6, 9 and 10 do not exist which would provide the same open feeling currently from the path to the beach at its existing location.
  - h. Encouraged more parking for the public, if possible.
  - i. Regarding vegetation on the roofs, the change of colors with the seasons would be organic to the site, if the landscaping could be maintained.
  - j. Potentially he could support the modification with regard to the front yard setbacks.
  - k. The modification for the 35' height limit needed for the proposed design to exceed 35 feet would not be appropriate.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented:
- a. The proposed architectural design does not seem appropriate for this site and the overall concept needs more work. (He is not suggesting that the existing Bacara facilities be imitated.)
  - b. The horizontal lines are too strong and the design needs to be broken up.
  - c. More consideration should be given to maintaining the building height at 35 feet. The effect when people are looking at the architecture from the beach will be much higher than the view from the ocean.
  - d. The quality of the proposed materials is appreciated.
  - e. The concept of public access to the beach needs to be respected.
  - f. He would support the modification for the front yard setback.
5. Member Messner commented:
- a. Expressed concern regarding the drainage concept, stating that he would like something done to address the runoff.
  - b. Expressed concern that there will be issues that will need to be addressed with regard to maintenance of the DG pathway.
  - c. Suggested widening Hollister Avenue, on the beach access side, to provide for more public overflow parking, instead of people having to park towards the golf course and walk.
6. Member Herrera commented:
- a. Agreed with Member Messner's concerns regarding the drainage concept, and requested further details with regard to the bioswale plans.
  - b. The proposed vegetated rooftops with grass plantings do not seem attractive.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

January 27, 2009

Page 13 of 15

- c. He appreciates the appearance of the existing Bacara facilities and noted that if the proposed design was somewhat similar the project would look better.
7. Chair Wignot commented:
  - a. Encouraged the applicant to consider an architectural design that is less horizontal and less of a visual impact, and that would be unique to Goleta.
  - b. He does not believe that the proposed project meets the applicant's approach identified on Page 8 of the plans to address the challenge to marry the need rigorously to control the visual and ecological impact of the development with the desire to enhance the environment of great natural beauty with architecture of real aesthetic quality.
  - c. The proposed square footage for the individual condominium units is too large and makes the whole project overly large.
  - d. The orientation and layout of the architecture is appreciated because it allows for some views for ground floor units, but he is concerned that the terraced effect increases the height of the buildings over 35 feet, which is higher than he believes is necessary.
  - e. The concept of vegetated roofs is appreciated and also the fact that units in the rear would look out over this organic feature. Periodic use of reclaimed water during the dry season would probably be needed to maintain the plantings.
  - f. Suggested planting another row of trees along the line between the western part of the public access parking lot and the entrance motorcourt. The proposed landscaping between the public access parking and the entrance motorcourt area seems to be somewhat sparse.
  - g. Adding more public parking spaces along the Lot 1 portion of Hollister Avenue would be useful (within the Bacara development), noting that the parking spaces will fill up very quickly in the summer.
  - h. He requested that the applicant review and provide information with regard to the Can and Will Serve letter from the Goleta Water District, noting that water is becoming more of an issue in the community.
  - i. In his opinion, the concept of this kind of condominium use does not fit in Goleta, stating that he believes a general hotel use would be more appropriate.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 05-034-DRB, 8301 Hollister Avenue, to February 24, 2009, with comments.**

**RECESS HELD FROM 6:55 P.M. TO 7:03 P.M.**

### **M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-168-DRB**

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

This is a request for *Conceptual* 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

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

January 27, 2009

Page 14 of 15

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 5 as follows:

### **Phase 5 – (To be completed by July 1, 2013):**

- Final permitting and construction of permanent housing. Permanent housing would consist of modular, stick-built, relocated homes or other permanent housing, as approved by the Design Board Review, for up to five (5) units of farm worker housing.
- The farm labor camp would include restroom and kitchen facilities within each of the housing units fully connected to public water and sewer line systems.
- Remove and replace all interim housing units with permanent housing. Use of kitchen and restroom/shower trailers (if any) is discontinued.
- Retain the bathhouse/restroom as a demonstration facility.

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-DRB. (Continued from 12-23-08\*, 09-23-08\*, 08-26-08 - see case 08-145-DRB) (Scott Kolwitz)

Documents: 1) Two letters from Sharon Gill as follows: a) dated September 12, 2008, in summary, stating that it is her desire to continue to support the farm with the scheduled improvements as long as the structures in the planned Phase 5 are built as single story units; and b) dated September 22, 2008, stating that she will not support any two story structures for Phase 5 and will oppose this plan in its current conceptual location.

Chair Wignot stated for the record that he did not attend the hearing on August 26, 2008, regarding Phase 4, but he read the minutes from the meeting.

The plans were presented by Dennis Thompson, project architect, and Tiffany Cooper, Acting Executive Director, Fairview Gardens.

### **Speaker:**

Adrienne Davis, President of the Board, Fairview Gardens, expressed support for the proposed plans and requested approval so the Board can move ahead with fundraising plans.

### **Comments:**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The concept to narrow the houses to Fairview Avenue is good and it also works well for solar orientation; b) The concept of the courtyard and the courtyard porches is good; c) Consider adding some porch elements with braces to enhance the character; d) The straw bale concept is good

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

January 27, 2009

Page 15 of 15

- consider using plaster or possibly wood siding; e) He supports the proposed solar panels on the roofs; f) Maintenance of the vegetated roofs may not be realistic in this climate; g) Consideration will need to be given to Dark Sky principles; and h) Suggest the applicant consider whether to soften the two-story forms that face Fairview Avenue; although the simplicity of the forms might be better than making a change.
2. Member Branch commented: a) Overall, the concept is fine; b) The site plan is good; c) The concept of stepping the roofs is good; and d) He noted that a neighbor to the north had expressed concern with regard to the temporary housing, and suggested that the applicant may want to possibly consider some sort of plantings or placement of the eave for screening.
  3. Member Messner commented: a) He supports the plans; b) His only concern is that the new employee housing design should not take away from the historical aspects of the original farm house design, so visitors in the future will continue to appreciate the farm house's history.
  4. Member Herrera commented: a) The project is great; and b) He appreciates the houses facing south.
  5. Chair Wignot commented: a) The project is very worthy; and b) He fully supports the project.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Smith) to take off calendar Item M-2, 08-168-DRB, 598 North Fairview Avenue, Phase 5.**

### N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

### O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

#### O-1. BUILDING INTENSITY STANDARDS

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller stated that staff will report to the DRB with regard to the specific dates that the Building Intensity Standards will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council when the dates are scheduled.

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

No requests.

#### O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

No announcements.

### P. ADJOURNMENT: 7:40 P.M.

Minutes approved on February 10, 2009.

**Design Review Board Agenda**

January 27, 2009

Page 16 of 16