



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, March 10, 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**

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; and Carl Schneider.

Board Members absent: Chris Messner.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Steve Chase, Director of Planning and Environmental Services, Tim Giles, City Attorney; April Winecki, Contract Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 2 of 15

### B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

#### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for February 24, 2009

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for February 24, 2009, as amended.**

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

Street Tree Subcommittee Member Wignot reported that the next Subcommittee meeting will be on April 14, 2009, at 2:00 p.m.

#### B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) The City Council approved the Camino Real Hotel project on March 3, 2009. 2) The regular Planning Commission meeting for March 9, 2009, was cancelled. 3) The deadline for applications to be received for appointment to the DRB was March 5, 2009. 4) A free seminar on Advanced Technologies in Outdoor Lighting will be conducted by Ventura County Partnership on March 25, 2009. 5) He distributed the current City Arborist and Design Review Board Recommended Street Tree Planting List and Recommended Tree Planting Guidelines. 6) The items scheduled for the Planning Commission meeting on March 23, 2009, include the Citrus Village project and the Fairview Gardens compliance hearing. 7) An invitation was received from the Live Oak Unitarian Universalist Congregation to celebrate and sanctify their new Sanctuary on April 12, 2009.

### 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 the applicant for Item H-2, No. 09-002-DRB, 334 South Patterson Avenue, requested a continuance to March 24, 2009. He stated that staff recommends that Item M-2, No. 06-180-DRB, SE Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, be moved ahead of Item M-1, No. 05-034-DRB, 8301 Hollister Avenue, to facilitate the time certain element for Item M-1.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent Messner) to continue Item H-2, No. 09-002-DRB, 334 South Patterson Avenue, to March 24, 2009, per the applicant's request; and to move Item M-2, No. 06-180-DRB, SE Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, ahead of Item M-1, No. 05-034-DRB, to facilitate the time certain element for Item M-1.**

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 3 of 15

### E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-1, No. 08-213-DRB, 425 Caseta Way; and Item F-2, No. 09-011-DRB, 6920 Marketplace Drive.

### F. CONSENT CALENDAR

#### F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-213-DRB

425 Caseta Way (APN 077-412-030)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 1,904-square foot residence and an attached 460-square foot, two-car garage on a 10,041-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 586 square feet in additions, consisting of a 294-square foot addition on the first-floor and a 292-square foot addition on the second-floor. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,950 square feet, consisting of a 2,490-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 460-square foot two-car garage. This proposal is within the maximum allowable floor area for this property, which is 2,835 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a two-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Mary Chang on behalf of Richard and Marylou Eckert, property owners. Related cases: 08-213-LUP. (Continued from 2-24-09) (Brian Hiefield)

*Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on March 10, 2009:*

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-1, No. 08-213-DRB, 425 Caseta Way, and granted Final Approval as submitted.

#### F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-011-DRB

6920 Marketplace Drive; APN 073-440-018

This is a request for *Final* review. The applicant proposes to remodel the exterior of the building, including the refurbishing of an existing storefront on the west elevation and the creation of a new storefront at the southwest corner. An 800-square foot trellis would be installed over the northern outdoor dining patio. A new landscape plan is also proposed. Materials would consist of sandstone, wrought iron, and dark wood trim. No new habitable floor area is proposed. (Shine Ling)

*Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on March 10, 2009:*

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-2, No. 09-011-DRB, 6920 Marketplace Drive, and granted Final Approval as submitted.

### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Schneider reported that the Sign Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-1, No. 09-001-DRB, 820 North Fairview Avenue.

## **H. SIGN CALENDAR**

### **H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-001-DRB**

820 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-070-028)

This is a request for *Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes a 1,512-square foot classroom building, a 1,384-square foot office and education area, a 360-square foot office, a 2,996-square foot sanctuary building with a separate 316-square foot restroom facility, and a 100-square foot play structure, all on a 1.28-acre site in the 20-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to relocate an existing 20-square foot wooden church sign and a 6.5-square foot wooden changeable copy sign to the western face of a trash enclosure located near the northern entrance to the property. Five (5) aluminum ground level signs are also proposed to be located at various entrance and exit driveways on the property. The ground level signs would read "ENTRANCE", "EXIT", "EXIT ONLY NO ENTRY", "RESIDENTS ONLY NO OUTLET", and "NO ENTRY TO Live Oak Unitarian Universalist Congregation." Each sign would have an area of two (2) square feet and be three (3) feet tall. The project was filed by Salvador Melendez, architect, on behalf of Michael Wittman of the Live Oak Unitarian Universalist Congregation, property owner. Related cases: 09-001-SCC; -CUP. (Continued from 2-10-09) (Shine Ling)

*Sign Subcommittee Action on March 10, 2009:*

The plans were presented by Salvador Melendez, architect, on behalf of Michael Wittman of Live Oak Unitarian Universalist Congregation, property owner.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary/Final Approval of Item H-1, No. 09-001-DRB, 820 North Fairview Avenue, as submitted.**

### **H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-002-DRB**

334 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-090-028)

This is a request for *Preliminary/Final* review. The property known as the Hollipat site includes the approved temporary parking lot associated with the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital replacement project. The lot is under construction and will contain 376 parking spaces on approximately four acres in the PI and DR-20 zone districts. The applicant requests new signage for this temporary lot identifying it as the location for hospital parking. All 17 signs would be temporary post and panel with a painted finish on all sides including weather sealed edges secured to painted wood posts. The posts would be installed in the ground with concrete. Three types of temporary signage are proposed: an identification sign, directional and informational signs, and parking signs. The colors of the signs would be Dunn-Edwards "Before the Storm" Green and white reflective vinyl. No lighting is proposed. The project was filed by agent Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services Inc. on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 09-002-CUP, 08-218-LUP, 07-171-OA, 07-171-DP. (Continued from 2-10-09) (Cindy Moore)

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 5 of 15

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent Messner) to continue Item H-2, No. 09-002-DRB, 334 South Patterson Avenue, to March 24, 2009, per the applicant's request.**

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

### L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

**RECESS HELD FROM 4:15 P.M. TO 4:27 P.M.**

### 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, an Ordinance Amendment, Modifications for building setback and building height, a Vesting Tentative Tract Map, and a Final Development Plan as described below.

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

The project proposes amendments to various Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies, figures and tables as initiated by the City Council on May 20, 2008, and to reflect further refinements in the language of amendments that the City is currently processing under what is commonly referred to as "Track 3" General Plan Amendments. In general, the amendments proposed by the applicant focus on: Open

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 6 of 15

Space Element location, protection and management of public lateral and vertical access areas and open space area maps; Conservation Element special status species, environmentally sensitive habitat, protection and maintenance of streams, creeks and drainages.

### Ordinance Amendment (05-034-OA):

The proposal includes a request to amend the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance (GGMO) to exempt the project from its provisions. As proposed, the applicant considers that the proposed project would provide substantial community benefit including: 1) a substantial increase in annual transient occupancy tax revenue to the City; 2) a substantial increase in annual property tax and sales tax revenue to the City, 3) enhancing coastal access opportunities for the public; 4) it would not cause any new impacts on schools, and 5) it would not cause any substantial increase in the number of hotel employees.

### Requested Modifications

The applicant is requesting the following modifications per the provisions of §35-174.8(1), Article II of the City Code (Coastal Zoning Ordinance or CZO):

- Reduction of the Hollister Avenue front yard setback requirement (20 ft. from road right-of-way or 50 ft. from centerline) to accommodate on-site amenities and facilities including the proposed subterranean parking structure to be located on proposed Lot 2 as shown on Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (05-034-TPM). The setback encroachments are shown in Figure 5, page 6, of the DRB Submittal Narrative, March 10, 2009 (attached).
- Modification of the building height requirement (35 ft. from existing grade) to allow for building construction not to exceed 35 ft. from finished grade, with up to an additional 6 feet for chimneys and raised roof extensions.

### 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 55-unit condominium hotel development and ancillary facilities. The proposed 55-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

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 7 of 15

relocated. An existing beach house and public restrooms located adjacent to the beach on the southern slope of the Valley Floor would remain.

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. (Continued from 2-24-09\*, 1-27-09) (April Winecki, David Stone). This project was conceptually reviewed by the DRB on January 27, 2009. In response to comments received by the DRB, project revisions were submitted on February 18, 2009 by agent Tom Figg on behalf of Bacara Resort and Spa, HT Santa Barbara property owner.

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

Ex-parte conversations: Member Brown reported that she made a site visit yesterday with Tom Figg, agent, and visited some areas of the site that she had not previously visited which was very helpful.

April Winecki, Contract Planner, provided an overview of the staff report. She stated that the applicant's project team submitted additional project materials and revised project elements on February 18, 2009, in response to the first Conceptual review on January 27, 2009. The staff report includes a project description which has been updated to reflect the project revisions and also includes a brief summary of the additional materials that were submitted. She pointed out some of the more significant design changes as follows: a) the color scheme has been revised; b) building heights have been reduced in height from approximately three to thirteen feet; c) additional landscaping has been introduced combined with stormwater management elements; d) one entire building has been eliminated at the southeast corner of the property, and two other buildings were refigured in the area; e) the underground parking and support facility structure has been reduced in size; and f) the resort parking has been reduced from approximately 132 to 113 parking spaces.

The plans were presented by agent Tom Figg, on behalf of Bacara Resort and Spa, HT Santa Barbara property owner; and John Pawson, project architect. Tom Figg, agent, stated that the applicant has provided an informational report attached to the staff report entitled "Bacara Conceptual Design Review Submittal for March 10, 2009". He presented the revisions that were made in response to the DRB Conceptual review.

John Pawson, project architect, presented the revised plans including the document entitled "Bacara Resort & Spa Completion Phase, 03.10.09". He stated that he believes design is a very collaborative process.

Documents: Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that communications were received and distributed as follows: a) Brian Trautwein, Environmental Defense Center; b) Michael Lunsford, Gaviota Coast Conservancy; c) Margaret Fuller; d) Patricia C. Totton; e) Deane Plaister; f) George Relles; and g) Jessie Alstatt.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 8 of 15

### Speakers:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, requested clarification regarding the separation between the public path and the private resort. He believes that the proposed project is not a resort development and should be viewed as a stealth residential development.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, commented that the proposed project is overly large, and the units are bigger than many homes in Goleta and are not appropriate for the location. She believes the project is really a housing development. She requested that the applicant be encouraged to reduce the size and height of the buildings, and present a design that appears less linear. She commented that it appears the project was designed without attempt to meet the General Plan, Zoning Code or environmental constraints. She expressed concern that the proposed public access path is narrower than the existing path.

Michael Lunsford, Goleta, representing Gaviota Coast Conservancy, urged that the analysis and comments be directed at the ways this project is inconsistent with established policies. He referred to his letter dated March 9, 2009, from Michael Lunsford, President, Gaviota Coast Conservancy, regarding Bacara Resort and Spa, Case No. 05-034-DRB.

Karin Kuyper, Goleta, expressed concern with regard to the impact on the area and the community from the proposed project.

John Ruiz, Chumash, stated that he believes that everything possible has been done through the process which started in 1986 to protect the site with regard to archaeology. He commented that the location of the swimming pool can be accommodated with regard to the archaeology on the site. He referred to the book entitled "A Canyon Through Time - Archaeology, History, and Ecology of the Tecolote Canyon Area, Santa Barbara County, California".

Ingeborg Cox, M.D., Goleta, referred to a report from the Coastal Commission with regard to two archaeological sites, SBA 72 and SB 73. She commented that perhaps the proposed project should be reviewed first by the Planning Commission with regard to the location of the buildings on the site plan prior to the DRB design review. She also commented that she does not believe Goleta should allow for the privatization of the beach. She noted that this area is classified by the County of Santa Barbara as a high seismic problem zone.

Jeremy Salts, project civil engineer, Penfield & Smith, responded to questions from Chair Wignot on behalf of Member Messner who was unable to attend the meeting.

### DRB Comments:

The majority of members agreed that the revisions to the project in response to Conceptual comments are appreciated and that the plans and model are very useful.



## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 9 of 15

1. Member Brown commented:
  - a. The revised landscape plan is appreciated.
  - b. The revisions which eliminate one building and relocate another building improve the view corridors and visual aesthetics.
  - c. The color change is appreciated. Rich colors are recommended.
  - d. Dark sky features are important to consider at the Conceptual stage.
  - e. Consider whether the jitney path could be broadened and also provide for pedestrian access, moving the bioswale to the east side of the public path.
  - f. Requested more undulation of the buildings in front that appear too rigid to reduce some of the mass of the built environment. Currently there are no buildings seen when walking down the path. The buildings in the back have greater articulation and undulation.
  - g. The reduction in the building heights is appreciated. The overall height of the three-story buildings is still a concern.
  - h. Regarding the view from the jitney path, requested the applicant check the structure that appears to be protruding into the path.
  - i. Regarding the view through the motor court, suggested that the tree in the center be removed because it does not seem to fit and appears too formal for the beach. Widening the view corridor to the ocean would be appreciated.
  - j. Concerns remain about the sustainability and suitability of the vegetated roofs.
  - k. The plants chosen for the bioswales are fairly large and probably do not belong in bioswales. Grasses would be more appropriate. Some of the proposed species may not be available locally. The proposed species, particularly trees, should be grown from native seeds to this area.
  - l. Member Schneider commented:
    - m. The color change will help make the buildings seem to recede rather than stand out.
    - n. Expressed concern regarding the repetitiveness feature of the style.
    - o. Suggested breaking up the massing of the buildings on the site plan by conceptually eliminating some of the units as follows: Building 1: Eliminate the top floor unit to the west (there would be a two-story unit on the west side and a three-story building on the east portion, stepping up). Building 2: Remain as proposed. Building 3: Change Building 3 opposite to the recommendation for Building 1. Regarding the view from the motor court: Suggested dropping the two third-story buildings on either side of the corridor which would allow the view to open up. Building 6: Eliminate the unit farthest to the east on the top floor which would help soften the building and open up the area near the public access path and jitney path.
    - p. Vegetated roofs will be a good feature but will require long-term irrigation (preferably with reclaimed water) and appropriate plant species to be successful. Suggested that the applicant consult with a local landscape architect regarding the selection of appropriate plant materials for the vegetated roofs and bioswale.
    - q. Locating the intermediate trees between the two arcs is a good feature.
    - r. He would support the modification request for the setback encroachments, stating that the proposed parking structure is basically underground.
    - s. He has concerns regarding the building height modification request, probably because of the repetitive nature of the proposed architectural style. Height

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 10 of 15

modifications may be appropriate toward the interior of the development where not visible. He noted that some of the heights are significantly over the requirement.

3. Member Branch commented:
  - a. The effect of the location of the tree in the motor court is appreciated. He does not agree with Member Brown that the tree should be removed.
  - b. After viewing the model, it seems that privacy needs to be considered with regard to the residential aspect (the units will be privately owned), noting that some of the decks are close.
  - c. He would support the modification request for the setback.
  - d. The modification request for the height limit would be difficult to support because the modification is not in conjunction with a hardship.
  - e. The proposed vegetated roofs, if successful, will be a good feature.
  - f. The separation of the public path and the jitney path seems appropriate. He expressed concern that the public path becomes too narrow.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented:
  - a. The revisions are a big improvement and the direction is appreciated.
  - b. The plans for the public access path area appreciated.
  - c. The pedestrian path and jitney path should be separate and not merged.
  - d. The proposed vegetated roofs will be a good feature and beneficial with regard to the view from the units in back.
  - e. The changes that add architectural undulation and modifications of the building heights are appreciated.
  - f. Suggested providing some more openness between Buildings 3 and 4. Possibly consider removing a third-story unit on each side as recommended by Member Schneider.
  - g. The modification request regarding the height limit is not presented as a hardship.
5. Member Herrera commented:
  - a. The reclaimed water aspect is good for the project.
  - b. The revisions made to reduce building heights are appreciated.
  - c. The tree in the motor court is fine; however, if the tree is removed, suggest replacing it with a small water feature that would allow for a view to the ocean.
  - d. Non-invasive grasses should not be selected for the property.
  - e. Use permeable pavers in the parking lot as much as possible.
6. Chair Wignot commented:
  - a. Requested the applicant respond to the following questions: a) Is the plant species proposed for the pathway appropriate and how will it be maintained? b) Will storage be provided for condominium owners for items and/or vehicles?
  - b. He expressed concern that he would not be able to make findings for approval of the conceptual project as follows:

Finding #1: He cannot find that there is a compatibility with the existing neighborhood, particularly the existing Bacara style and other structures on the site. The project would be more appropriate as an infill project where there are similar structures. With regard to the size, bulk, and scale of the project, the size of the units seems too large.

Finding #3: The project does not demonstrate a harmonious relationship with adjoining developments.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 11 of 15

Finding #13: The public scenic views from the access road, the public parking area, the beach access way, and the beach will be substantially blocked off by this project.

Finding #17: The appearance of the neighborhood is impacted by the proposed project.

Finding #18: Relocating the existing public vertical access way to a narrow corridor between the condominium buildings and the bluff diminishes public health and safety. He believes that the public walking along the proposed access area would be at risk in the event of bluff erosion or an earthquake. The proposed changes would narrow the emergency vehicle access road that would pass through a public parking lot and require two gates rather than one gate to be unlocked for emergency access.

- c. The proposed relocation of the public access way to the east will end in an area of the beach where there are still remnants of oil field operations. These are a hazard and should be removed in accordance with original conditions of approval.
- d. Expressed concern that public beach access will be marginalized.
- e. For purposes of Conceptual review by the DRB, he believes that the applicant has adequately explained the nature of the design of the project.
- f. The proposed General Plan Amendments will be reviewed by the decision-makers. He expressed concern that the applicant has requested so many amendments to the General Plan.

Member Brown requested discussion regarding whether or not the DRB believes it would be appropriate for the applicant to further respond to the conceptual review comments and issues at another DRB meeting.

Tom Figg, agent, stated that several individual comments were made by the DRB, some with common denominators, and that it may be useful for the DRB to further agree on the issues that the applicant needs to study. He provided a general overview of his understanding regarding the comments and issues as follows:

- a) Interest was expressed regarding how the jitney path, public access, and emergency access can better fit together and interplay to possibly provide a better experience.
- b) The applicant understands the concern regarding the vegetated roofs and appropriateness of plant materials, stating that it will be acknowledged at the Preliminary and Final review, and that the applicant's intent is not to obstruct the line of sight and views of the ocean as the public enters on the other side of the crest.
- c) Interest was expressed to further study the interplay of the buildings, address the massing and scale, and how to accomplish more interest, and also provide a better transition from the public space to the private space.
- d) He did not hear that the style in itself was a concern, but further examination of the features of the design was requested, for example, to address the concern regarding the monotone in the back row of the buildings.
- e) There are concerns regarding the building height. There were comments regarding the hardship issue. He suggested that the applicant may need to

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 12 of 15

provide more details with regard to the orientation of the buildings and the public impact.

- f) Interesting comments were made with regard to the entry motor court area.
- g) More permeability was requested for surfaces, stating that some clarity may be provided; however, details will be provided at the Preliminary and Final review process.

Member Brown stated that Tom Figg, applicant, provided a good compendium. She noted that suggestions were also made by the DRB with regard to studying the possibility of broadening the view shed through the motor court. She noted that in addition to comments regarding the building massing, comments were made with regard to addressing the building edges. She also stated that an issue to consider is whether it would be appropriate for pedestrians to walk on the jitney path.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item M-1, No. 05-034-DRB, 8301 Hollister Avenue, to April 14, 2009, at a time certain of 4:00 p.m., with comments including:**

- a) **Restudy the interplay of the jitney path, pedestrian path and emergency access and consider whether it would be appropriate for pedestrians to walk on the jitney path.**
- b) **Vegetated roofs will need appropriate plant materials and on-going irrigation to be successful.**
- c) **Further study the interplay of buildings and address the concerns regarding massing and scale, address the building edges, how to accomplish more interest and how to provide a better transition from the public space to the private space.**
- d) **Further examine the design to address the concern regarding the repetitive feature in the buildings in the back.**
- e) **The building height modification will be difficult to support.**
- f) **Permeable surface materials are recommended as much as possible.**
- g) **Restudy the entry motor court area with regard to modifications suggested to broaden the view shed.**

Tom Figg, agent, suggested that a working session with the applicant's project team and a DRB subcommittee may be useful.

Member Brown stated that working sessions that were held with applicants in the past have been helpful.

Member Schneider stated that he believes this project is important and should be reviewed by all DRB members. Vice Chair Smith agreed with Member Schneider. Member Branch noted that this project has more complexity than previous projects that have been reviewed by a DRB subcommittee.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase stated that staff will provide notice to all interested parties with regard to the next public hearing date.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 13 of 15

### **M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 06-180-DRB**

SE Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real (APN 077-160-040)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is a vacant 23,020-square foot commercial property in the CN (Neighborhood Commercial) zone district. The applicant proposes to construct an 8,753-square foot commercial building, consisting of a 5,032-square foot retail first-floor retail space and a 3,721-square foot general office space on the second-floor. The resulting 2-story structure would be 8,753-square feet with 24 proposed parking spaces, and associated landscaping. New materials are not defined for this conceptual review, other than a non-color specific stucco covering. The project was filed by Doug Reeves of D. W. Reeves & Associates A.I.A., Architects, on behalf of Dr. James Sturgeon, property owner. Related cases: 06-180-DP. (Scott Kolwitz)

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz provided an overview of the staff report and background.

The plans were presented by Doug Reeves of D. W. Reeves & Associates A.I.A., Architects, on behalf of Dr. James Sturgeon, property owner.

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Speakers:

Ronald Nye, historian, and former president of the Goleta Valley Historical Society, stated that the Goleta historical architectural tradition is basically a ranch model, noting that the simplistic gable form is the context. He commented that the neighborhood is a very sensitive cultural and historical area, with the adjacent Stow House, train depot and park, as well as a sensitive view corridor coming north on Los Carneros. He expressed concern that the proposed project would be a stark and jarring vision. He also stated that the building is too large and set too close to the street. He pointed out that the commercial buildings that are directly adjacent to the site, which are made of brick with a ranch style, located back from the street with trees, should be the model. He pointed out that there is historical importance of the property to the neighborhood.

Robin Cederlof, president, Goleta Valley Historical Society, stated that the Historical Society does not have an official position regarding the proposed project at this time. She pointed out that there was some concern regarding the size, bulk and scale of the project at this particular corner. She stated that there is an interest in bringing more architecture into the Goleta Valley that represents the historic nature of this community and is unique as well as a complement to the surrounding communities. She expressed concern that traffic which is already a problem, stating that there will be a need in the future to consider installing a signal. She noted that there are many streets in Goleta that do not have sufficient capacity. She requested clarification regarding the types of office use and retail that could be considered for this location.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

March 10, 2009

Page 14 of 15

Fermina Murray, Goleta, local historian, agreed with comments from speakers Ronald Nye and Robin Cederlof. She stated that this particular corner of Los Carneros and Calle Real is the gateway to the semi-rural part of the city. She expressed concern that the proposed building is too big for the site. She believes that the design would be improved if it were modified to reduce the total size of the building, integrate the tower to make it less visible, and break up the domineering mass of the structure. She presented her comments in a letter dated March 10, 2009, regarding Agenda Item 06-180-DRB-DF.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, commented that the proposed building is too big and an enormous mass on the corner. He noted that the adjoining development has more of an open feel.

### Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) This area is a very unique corridor and it is important that buildings blend and do not stand out. b) The proposed project stands out and does not fit into the corridor. c) The aesthetic view when coming over Los Carneros toward the mountains needs to be considered. d) Consider locating the parking lot in the front to open the view.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The Los Carneros/Calle Real corner is an important corridor. b) The best location for the driveway access is on Calle Real. c) The architectural style needs to be more agrarian; for example, gables and shed roofs; and possibly board and bat or flat concrete tile. d) The existing Towbes project form is typical agrarian but not necessarily the materials. d) The tower needs to integrate more. e) Suggest removing the trellis on the north side which is on the section of the building that needs to be softened. f) The trellis on the south side is okay. g) It would be worthwhile to install a sidewalk along Los Carneros.
3. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed project feels like one large mass. b) Consider breaking the project into two smaller masses. c) The design should be considered as part of the entry to this portion of Goleta and with regard to the orchard views. d) The Stow House and train depot styles would be most appropriate to consider. e) The Towbes project is simpler but he does not recommend that it be emulated. f) Suggested bigger break-ups and deeper recesses, possibly with some porch elements. g) Consider subterranean parking.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a)
5. Member Herrera commented: a) The placement of the building as proposed seems to create visual barriers to the intersection. b) Requested the applicant provide details regarding the landscape, hardscape and footprint percentages. c) Chair Wignot commented: a) Suggest the applicant look at the commercial building on the corner of Calle Real and Carlo Drive that previously was a barn, and the dentist office east of the Spectrum Health Club which is a single-story building. b) The size and bulk of the proposed project is not compatible with the neighborhood.

**STRAW VOTE:**

**How many members believe that the size, bulk and scale of the building is suitable?**

Members who believe the proposed size, bulk and scale of the building is suitable. (3)

Vice Chair Smith suggested that changes in the style would reduce the size, bulk, and scale.

Member Schneider stated that softening the corner of the building and also shifting the second story mass to the south would be helpful.

Member Branch believes there are architectural changes that can be worked out.

Members who do not believe the proposed size, bulk and scale of the building is suitable: (3)

Member Brown stated that she does not know if changes in the architectural style will make a difference

Member Herrera stated that the size needs to be reduced.

Chair Wignot believes that the size and bulk is not compatible with the neighborhood.

Member Absent: Messner. (1).

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item M-2, No. 06-180-DRB, SE Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, with comments to April 14, 2009.**

**RECESS HELD FROM 7:00 P.M. TO 7:12 P.M.**

**N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- NONE

**O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

Member Brown requested that an item regarding the Zoning Administrator and signage programs process path be placed on future agendas as an item to be discussed.

**O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

Chair Wignot announced that the Goleta Water District will conduct a public meeting on the new Groundwater Management Plan on March 11, 2009, at 7:00 p.m. at the Goleta Union School District.

**P. ADJOURNMENT: 7:17 P.M.**

**Design Review Board Minutes - Approved**

March 10, 2009

Page 16 of 15

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.



**Design Review Board Agenda**

March 10, 2009

Page 17 of 17