



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REVISED AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, April 28, 2009

### CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:15 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)

---

#### Notices:

- Requests for review of project plans or change of scheduling should be made to the City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, 93117; Telephone (805)961-7500.
  - In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City of Goleta at (805)961-7500. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City staff to make reasonable arrangements.
  - Preliminary approval or denial of a project by the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Goleta Planning Commission within ten (10) calendar days following the action. Please contact the Planning & Environmental Services Department for more information.
  - Design Review Board approvals do not constitute Land Use Clearances.
  - The square footage figures on this agenda are subject to change during the review process.
  - The length of Agenda items is only an estimate. Applicants are responsible for being available when their item is to be heard. Any item for which the applicant is not immediately available may be continued to the next meeting.
-

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 2 of 18

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

### B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

#### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

- A. Design Review Board Minutes for April 14, 2009
- B. Design Review Board Minutes for April 16, 2009

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

#### B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

#### B-4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

#### B-5. SUBCOMMITTEE REORGANIZATION

C. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** General comments regarding topics over which the Design Review Board has discretion will be allowed. Comments from concerned parties regarding specific projects not on today's agenda will be limited to three minutes per person.

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

### E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

### F. CONSENT CALENDAR

#### F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-045-DRB

5484 Overpass Road (APN 071-220-033)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 5,780-square foot shop building, a 1,362-square foot office building, a 18,835-square feet of unenclosed materials storage (a portion of which – in the southwest corner of the property – is as-built), an as-built 640-square foot storage unit, and two unused fuel pumps and associated underground fuel tanks on a 84,070-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 2,961-square foot, two story office addition, and a new trash enclosure. This application also includes a proposal to permit the aforementioned as-built outdoor material storage area and storage unit, and to re-configure the site's parking areas. All materials used for this addition are to match the existing office building with the exception of the proposed lighting, which would be the Capri Mini by The Plaza Family. The project was filed by agent Joseph H. Moticha on behalf of Randy Douglas, Tierra Contracting, Inc., property owner. Related cases: 07-045-DP AM01, 07-045-LUP. (Continued from 4-14-09\*, 3-24-09, 1-13-09\*, 11-12-08\*, 10-14-08\*, 9-23-08\*, 9-09-08) (Laura Vlk)

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 3 of 18

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **3-24-09 Meeting:**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) he is somewhat disappointed that the board and bat materials were removed, but the stucco material is acceptable; and b) flat tile roof material would seem more appropriate than barrel tile, considering that the building is located in an area with buildings that are somewhat agrarian, such as the animal shelter and the new Sumida Gardens building; c) flat tile would probably work better with the solar panels; and d) the beam style is fine and should be retained.
2. Chair Wignot commented: a) the change from board and bat materials to stucco is fine.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) the roof materials shall be changed to a flat concrete tile that is the same color as the proposed color; and continue Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, to April 14, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

## **G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

## **H. SIGN CALENDAR**

### **H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-211-DRB**

120 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-050-030)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The applicant proposes to install a two sided freestanding entry sign for the Patterson Place Apartments measuring a maximum of 4-feet 4-inches tall by 8-feet wide. The sign area is proposed to be approximately 18 ½ -inches by 7-feet 4-inches for an aggregate of approximately 11 square feet on each side of the structure. The non-illuminated sign shall have aluminum pin mounted flat cut out (F.C.O.) "Burnt Crimson" lettering. The portion of the sign reading "Patterson Place" will have 6-inch high letters, the portion of the sign reading "APARTMENTS" will have 4-inch high letters, and the address portion of the sign will have 4 ½ -inch high letters. The sign would be located approximately 9-feet east of the edge of public right-of-way and approximately 36-feet north of the Patterson Place Apartments entrance. No logos are allowed as part of the sign. The application was filed by agent Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, property owner. Related case: 74-CP-39, 07-211-SCC. (Continued from 4-14-09, 5-13-08\*, 4-22-08\*, 4-8-08\*, 3-11-08\*, 2-26-08\*, 2-12-08\*, 1-23-08\*, 1-8-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

**Applicant request to continue to May 12, 2009**

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **4-14-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 4 of 18

1. Member Brown commented: a) The design of the sign is fine. b) Expressed concern regarding light trespass because the proposed lighting is not downward lit. c) Consider possibly inserting LEDs under the letters.
2. Member Smith commented: a) The proposed grid louver shield may not resolve the concern with regard to light trespass.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:** Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to April 28, 2009, with the following comments: 1) The proposed sign is fine. 2) The applicant is directed to explore lighting methods that provide lighting only on the face of the sign to resolve the concern regarding light trespass. 3) The proposed lighting, which is not downward lit, is not acceptable.

### H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-127-DRB

840 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-070-027)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a total development of 3,884 square feet consisting of a 3,524-square foot Kingdom Hall and a 360-square foot covered entry on a 46,173-square foot lot in the 20-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a concrete block 15-square foot freestanding institutional monument sign with a redwood top piece. The two line sign will read "Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses" on the top line, and "Salon del Reino de los Testigos de Jehova" on the bottom line, both with 5.5 inch individually mounted PVC letters painted black. The site address will be located near the top of the monument sign using the same lettering. The sign will be illuminated from above with down-lights mounted under the fascia. The project was filed by agent Carlos Grano on behalf of Goleta Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, property owner. Related Cases: 08-127-LUP/SCC. (Continued from 3-24-09, 2-10-09) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **3-24-09 Meeting:**

1. The applicant is requested to clarify the size of the lettering and the font style. The proportions are fine.
2. The two pilasters on the side need to have enough width to fit with the design.
3. The color and lighting details are fine.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:** Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-1, No. 08-127-DRB, 840 North Fairview Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall clarify the size of the lettering and font style; 2) the two pilasters on the side need to have enough width to fit with the design; and continue Item H-1, No. 08-127-DRB, to April 28, 2009, for Final review.

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

5892 Calle Real (APN 069-110-061)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes a commercial building occupied by Bank of America. The applicant proposes to install new

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 5 of 18

signage associated with Bank of America, including a new freestanding pole sign (Sign 1), two wall signs (Signs 14, & 15), and two directional signs (Signs 11, & 13). Signage proposed that will not require permits are a sign for disabled parking (Sign 3), glass door signage (Signs 9, & 10), and a Do Not Enter sign to replace the existing sign (Sign 12). The project was filed by agent Steve Stallone on behalf of Bank of America, property owner. Related cases: N/A. (Continued from 3-24-09\*, 2-10-09\*, 1-13-09, 12-9-08\*, 11-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

### Staff recommendation to take off calendar

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **1-13-09 Meeting:**

1. Member Brown commented: a) It seems redundant to have both the wall sign facing Calle Real and the monument sign; and it also seems redundant that both signs are the same size; and b) She does not support the wall sign that faces Calle Real.
1. Member Branch commented: a) The wall sign facing Calle Real is acceptable; and b) The wall sign facing Encina Road should be eliminated.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The wall sign facing Encina Road seems redundant, noting that there is a duplication of signs when coming down Calle Real from Fairview Avenue; b) It is appropriate for a wall sign to be located on the wall that faces Calle Real, but the design would be better if the wall sign is reduced in size or the design is changed to lettering and logo, without the red background; and c) The intent with regard to the wall sign facing Calle Real is to reduce the amount of red in the background.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) He agreed with the comments by Members Branch, Brown and Schneider; and b) The plans that have been changed by the applicant in response to the DRB comments provide a clearer understanding of the proposal, which is useful to continue the Conceptual review.
4. Member Messner commented: a) The wall sign facing Encina Road does not seem to be needed; and b) The monument sign is more visible than the wall sign when driving down the street; c) He supports reducing the size of the wall sign facing Calle Real, noting that it is too big for a one-story building, it is located too close to the street, and the size is the same as the monument sign.
5. Chair Wignot commented: a) The applicant responded to all of the comments that were made at the last meeting; and, from a personal standpoint, it is somewhat troublesome that more changes are now requested.

#### **STRAW VOTE:**

How many members support removing the proposed wall sign facing Encina Road?

Members voting in the affirmative: Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, Smith, and Wignot. (7).

Members not voting in the affirmative: None.

#### **STRAW VOTE:**

How many members support further reducing the wall sign facing Calle Real?

(Note: A vote was not conducted in lieu of discussion).

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 6 of 18

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 1 vote (No: Brown) to continue Item H-1, No. 08-148- DRB, 5892 Calle Real, to February 10, 2009, for Conceptual/Preliminary review on the Sign Calendar, after review by the Zoning Administrator, with the following Conceptual comments: 1) The proposed wall sign that faces Encino Lane shall be omitted; 2) The wall sign that faces Calle Real shall be approved but the wall sign as proposed shall either be reduced in size or changed in design to some type of individual lettering and logo without the red background.**

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

#### K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-023-DRB

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

This is a request for *Preliminary* review of Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital which proposes to improve its existing facilities to comply with State Senate Bill 1953. Existing development consists of a 93,090-square foot hospital. The applicant proposes to replace the hospital with an entirely new facility and demolish the old hospital building, resulting in a total of 152,925 square feet. Parking to serve the hospital will be redeveloped onsite and a temporary construction parking area is under construction across South Patterson Avenue in the northwestern portion of the parcel known as the "Hollipat" site. Phased construction is planned through 2011 in a manner that will continue to provide all existing medical services to the community. The hospital parcel has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Office & Institutional with a Hospital Overlay. The zoning for the hospital is Professional & Institutional (PI) and the southern portion of the hospital parcel has the Approach Zone Overlay. The project was filed by agent Suzanne Elledge on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 07-171-OA, 07-171-DP, 09-002-CUP. (Continued from 3-24-09, 7-8-08, 6-24-08, 5-28-08, 5-13-08\*, 2-12-08, 01-23-08, 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **3-24-09 Meeting:**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) from a circulation standpoint, the proposed design at the entrance is not preferred, noting that vehicles dropping off people will need to drive back onto Patterson Avenue; b) the applicant will need to consider how the pedestrians, particularly those coming from the temporary parking lot across the street, will cross over all the vehicular patterns to get to the hospital; c) the location of the pedestrian entrance to the hospital should be obvious when onsite; d) the architecture on the east elevation is fine and headed in the right direction; e) the colors are fine; f) the part of the building with the

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 7 of 18

sculptural elements is very nice; g) entering the hospital lobby from the front doors with the view of the mountains from the two-story glass element will be a nice experience; h) the applicant is requested to study the architectural treatment with regard to how the west side of the lobby will resolve with the north side at the corner; i) the colors on the south elevation need to be reviewed, particularly with regard to relationship to the corner at the west elevation; j) the west elevation of the building is acceptable, knowing that there will be landscaping; and k) at some point the lighting on the building and in the parking lot will need to be reviewed.

2. Chair Wignot commented: a) from a traffic circulation standpoint, a circular vehicle entrance to drop off people and proceed around the circle into the parking area would be more appropriate than the proposed entrance design; and b) the elevation that can be viewed when entering from Patterson Avenue and the main parking lot is very unique and interesting.
3. Member Branch commented: a) there should be a turnaround option for vehicles so vehicles will not go out into traffic; b) the proposed garden synthesizes very well with the front of the hospital; c) the location of the entrance to the hospital will make itself clear by the way it presents itself, with the pedestrian paths and the signage to be proposed; d) the color palette is harmonious; and e) the balance and proportion of the entrance is great.
4. Member Brown commented: a) the applicant will need to consider how the pedestrians will access the hospital from the temporary parking lot; and b) requested that the *Lophostemon confertus* trees be planted closer together.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Smith) to continue Item K-2, No. 09-023-DRB, 351 South Patterson/Hollister Avenue, to April 28, 2009, with the following comments: 1) the applicant is requested to study the vehicular entry and pedestrian access design, and consider adding a circular vehicular loop; 2) the applicant is requested to study the architectural treatment with regard to how the west side of the lobby will resolve with the north side at the corner; 3) the applicant is requested to provide details with regard to the south elevation including colors; and 4) the applicant is requested lighting cut sheets showing downward lighting, noting that wall packs are not preferred.**

## L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

### L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-037-DRB

5925 Olney Street (APN 071-154-002, -003, -004, & -005)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes an existing 27,540-square foot concrete slab. The applicant proposes to create approximately 8,400 square feet of material storage space for sand & gravel used in the production of ready-mix concrete on four APNs (071-154-002,003,004, & 005) comprising 0.75 acres (in aggregate) located at 5927, 5925, 5917, & 5905 Olney Street, adjacent to the existing ready-mix concrete batch plant at 710 South Fairview Avenue. A 280-linear-foot chain-link fence would be installed along the northerly and easterly property lines to enclose the site. A 5-foot wide planter box for climbing vines would also be provided along the north and east extents of the proposed chain-link fence. A new sprinkler system to keep stockpiled sand and gravel from generating fugitive dust would also be installed within the two storage areas. All drainage onsite would flow south and west to a 258-foot long, 6-foot

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 8 of 18

wide grass drainage swale that would flow into a 6-foot wide by 20-foot long rock lined sediment trap before being discharged onto the adjoining City of Santa Barbara Airport property. The project was filed by Maruja Clensay of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services, agent on behalf of Michael Hunt/Mission Ready Mix, property owner. Related cases: 07-149-DP, 09-037-LUP. (Alan Hanson)

### 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



## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 9 of 18

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 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. (Continued from 4-14-09\*, 3-10-09, 2-24-09\*, 1-27-09) (April Verbanac, David Stone)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **3-10-09 Meeting:**

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.

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.
2. Member Schneider commented:

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 10 of 18

- a. The color change will help make the buildings seem to recede rather than stand out.
  - b. Expressed concern regarding the repetitiveness feature of the style.
  - c. 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.
  - d. 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.
  - e. Locating the intermediate trees between the two arcs is a good feature.
  - f. He would support the modification request for the setback encroachments, stating that the proposed parking structure is basically underground.
  - g. He has concerns regarding the building height modification request, probably because of the repetitive nature of the proposed architectural style. Height 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.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 11 of 18

- 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.  
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.

**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.

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

April 28, 2009

Page 12 of 18

- 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.

### **N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- NONE

### **O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **O-1. APPROVED VS BUILT SLIDESHOW**

#### **O-2. ZONING ADMINISTRATOR/SIGNAGE PROGRAMS PROCESS PATH DISCUSSION**

#### **O-3. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

#### **O-4. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

### **P. ADJOURNMENT**

## **Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines**

### **Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)**

The purpose of the City Design Review Board (DRB) is to encourage development that exemplifies the best professional design practices so as to enhance the visual quality of the environment, benefit surrounding property values, and prevent poor quality of design.

### **Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)**

The Goleta City Council established the DRB and DRB Bylaws in March of 2002 (Ordinance No. 02-14 as amended by Ordinance No. 02-26). DRB Bylaws have subsequently been amended through Resolutions 02-69, 04-03, 05-27, 07-22 & 09-04. The DRB currently operates under Bylaws from Resolution 09-04

## **Design Review Board Procedures**

### **Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)**

The DRB is guided by a set of general goals that define the major concerns and objectives of its review process. These goals are to:

- 1) ensure that development and building design is consistent with adopted community design standards (e.g. General Plan, Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architectural and Design Guidelines, Design Standards for Commercial Projects);
- 2) promote high standards in architectural design and the construction of aesthetically pleasing, architecturally correct, structures so that new development does not detract from existing neighborhood characteristics;
- 3) encourage the most appropriate use of land;
- 4) promote visual interest throughout the City through the preservation of public scenic, ocean and mountain vistas, creation of open space areas, and providing for a variety of architectural styles;
- 5) preserve creek areas through restoration and enhancement, discourage the removal of significant trees and foliage;
- 6) ensure neighborhood compatibility of all projects;
- 7) ensure that architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access;
- 8) ensure that grading and development are appropriate to the site and that long term visible scarring of the landscape is avoided where possible;
- 9) preserve and protect native and biologically and aesthetically valuable nonnative vegetation or to ensure adequate and appropriate replacement for vegetation loss;
- 10) ensure that the continued health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood are not compromised;
- 11) provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way;
- 12) ensure that construction is in appropriate proportion to lot size;
- 13) encourage energy efficiency; and
- 14) ensure that air circulation between structures is not impaired and shading is minimized on adjacent properties.

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

April 28, 2009

Page 14 of 18

### **Aspects Considered in Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.1)**

The DRB shall review each project for conformity with the purpose of this Chapter, the applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects, and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations. The DRB's review shall include:

- 1) Height, bulk, scale and area coverage of buildings and structures and other site improvements.
- 2) Colors and types of building materials and application.
- 3) Physical and design relation with existing and proposed structures on the same site and in the immediately affected surrounding area.
- 4) Site layout, orientation, and location of buildings, and relationship with open areas and topography.
- 5) Height, materials, colors, and variations in boundary walls, fences, or screen planting.
- 6) Location and type of existing and proposed landscaping.
- 7) Sign design and exterior lighting.

### **Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)**

In approving, approving with conditions, or denying an application, the DRB shall examine the materials submitted with the application and any other material provided to Planning and Environmental Services to determine whether the buildings, structures, or signs are appropriate and of good design in relation to other buildings, structures, or signs on the site and in the immediately affected surrounding area. Such determination shall be based upon the following findings, as well as any additional findings required pursuant to any applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations:

- 1) The development will be compatible with the neighborhood, and its size, bulk and scale will be appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.
- 2) Site layout, orientation, and location of structures, buildings, and signs are in an appropriate and well-designated relationship to one another, and to the environmental qualities, open spaces and topography of the property.
- 3) The project demonstrates a harmonious relationship with existing and proposed adjoining developments, avoiding excessive variety and monotonous repetition, but allowing similarity of style, if warranted.
- 4) There is harmony of material, color, and composition of all sides of a structure or buildings.
- 5) A limited number of materials will be on the exterior face of the building or structure.
- 6) There is consistency and unity of composition and treatment of exterior elevation.
- 7) Mechanical and electrical equipment is well integrated in the total design concept and screened from public view to the maximum extent practicable.
- 8) All visible onsite utility services are appropriate in size and location.
- 9) The grading will be appropriate to the site.
- 10) Adequate landscaping is provided in proportion to the project and the site with due regard to the preservation of specimen and landmark trees, and existing native vegetation.
- 11) The selection of plant materials is appropriate to the project and its environment, and adequate provision will be made for the long-term maintenance of such plant materials.
- 12) The project will preserve and protect, to the maximum extent practicable, any mature, specimen or skyline tree, or appropriately mitigate the loss.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 15 of 18

- 13) The development will not adversely affect significant public scenic views.
- 14) Signs, including their lighting, are well designed and are appropriate in size and location.
- 15) All exterior site, structure and building lighting is well-designed and appropriate in size and location.
- 16) The proposed development is consistent with any additional design standards as expressly adopted by the City Council.
- 17) The development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.
- 18) The public health, safety and welfare will be protected.
- 19) The project architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access.
- 20) The project will provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way.

### Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

#### Conceptual Review

Conceptual review is a required step that allows the applicant and the DRB to participate in an informal discussion about the proposed project. Applicants are encouraged to initiate this review as early in the design process as possible. This level of review is intended to provide the applicant with good direction early in the process to avoid spending unnecessary time and money by developing a design concept that may be inconsistent with the City's architectural guidelines and development standards. When a project is scheduled for conceptual review, the DRB may grant preliminary approval if the required information is provided, the design and details are acceptable and the project is properly noticed for such dual approval.

Information required for conceptual review includes:

- a. Photographs which show the site from 3 to 5 vantage points or a panorama from the site and of the site as seen from the street, and photographs of the surrounding neighborhood showing the relationship of the site to such adjacent properties. Aerial photographs are helpful if available and may be required at later stages.
- b. Site plan showing vicinity map, topography, location of existing and proposed structures and driveways, and locations of all structures adjacent to the proposed structure. The site plan shall also indicate any proposed grading, an estimate of the amount of such grading, and any existing vegetation to be removed or retained.
- c. Site statistics including all proposed structures, square footage by use, and the number of covered and uncovered parking spaces.
- d. Schematics of the proposed project shall include rough floor plans and at least two elevations indicating the height of proposed structures. Perspective sketches of the project may also be required. Proposed materials and colors shall be indicated. (Schematics and sketches may be rough as long as they are to scale and describe the proposed development accurately and sufficiently well to allow review and discussion.)

#### Preliminary Review

Preliminary review involves the substantive analysis of a project's compliance with all applicable City architectural guidelines and development standards. Fundamental design issues such as precise size of all built elements, site plan, elevations and landscaping are resolved at this stage of review. The DRB will identify to the applicant those aspects of the project that are not in compliance with applicable architectural guidelines and development standards and the findings that the DRB is required to make.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 16 of 18

Preliminary approval of the project's design is the point in the process at which an appeal of DRB's decision can be made. Preliminary approval of the project's design is deemed a basis to proceed with working drawings, following the close of the appeal period and absent the filing of an appeal.

Information required for preliminary review, in addition to the information required for conceptual review, includes:

- a. Complete site plan showing all existing structures, proposed improvements, proposed grading, including cut and fill calculations, lot coverage statistics (i.e., building, paving, usable open space and landscape areas), vicinity map, and topography.
- b. Floor plans and roof plans (1/8" scale minimum).
- c. All elevations (1/8" scale minimum) with heights, materials and colors specified.
- d. Preliminary landscape plan, when required, showing existing and proposed trees and shrubs, including any existing vegetation to be removed. This landscape plan shall also include all retaining and freestanding walls, fences, gates and gateposts and proposed paving and should specify proposed materials and colors of all these items.
- e. Site section for projects on slopes of 20 percent or greater, and when required by the DRB.

### Final Review

Final review confirms that the working drawings are in conformance with the project that received preliminary approval. In addition to reviewing site plan and elevations for conformance, building details and the landscape plan will be reviewed for acceptability.

Final review is conducted by the Planning and Environmental Services staff, in consultation with the DRB Chair or the Chair's designees. In the event that final plans are not in substantial conformance with the approved preliminary plans, the DRB Chair and Planning staff shall refer the matter to the full DRB for a final determination.

Information required for final review, in addition to the previous review requirements, includes:

- a. Complete set of architectural details, which must include window, eave & rake, chimney, railing and other pertinent architectural details, including building sections with finished floor, plate, and ridge heights indicated.
- b. 8 1/2" X 11" materials sample board of materials and colors to be used, as well as an indication of the materials and colors on the drawings. Sheet metal colors (for vents, exposed chimneys, flashing, etc.) shall also be indicated. All this information shall be included on the working drawings.
- c. Final site grading and drainage plan when required, including exact cut and fill calculations.
- d. Final landscape drawings, when required, showing the dripline of all trees and shrubs, and all wall, fence, and gate details. The drawings must show the size, name and location of plantings that will be visible from the street frontage, landscape screening which will integrate with the surrounding neighborhood, and irrigation for landscaping. Landscape drawings shall include a planting plan specifying layout of all plant materials, sizes, quantities and botanical and common names; and a final irrigation plan depicting layout and sizes of all equipment and components of a complete irrigation system (automated system required on commercial and multiple-residential developments). Planting and irrigation plans shall depict all site utilities, both above and below grade.



## **Design Review Board Agenda**

April 28, 2009

Page 17 of 18

### **Revised Final**

Revised final review occurs when a substantial revision (e.g., grading, orientation, materials, height) to a project is proposed after final DRB approval has been granted. Plans submitted shall include all information on drawings that reflect the proposed revisions. If the revisions are not clearly delineated, they cannot be construed as approved.

### **Multiple Levels of Approval at a Single Meeting**

Planning staff may accept and process signs for two or more levels of DRB review (e.g., conceptual and preliminary) at a single meeting provided all required information is submitted and the project is properly noticed and agendized for such multiple levels of approval.

### **Presentation of Projects (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.3)**

All levels of review with the exception of the consent agenda require the presentation of the project by the applicant or the applicant's representative. Items on the regular agenda that do not have a representative will be continued to a later hearing or removed from the agenda. The applicant or representative will be responsible for rescheduling the project if the project is removed from the agenda.

### **Public Testimony (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.4)**

Members of the public attending a DRB meeting are encouraged to present testimony on agenda items. At the appropriate time, the DRB Chair will ask for public testimony, and will recognize those persons desiring to speak. A copy of any written statements read by a member of the public shall be given to the DRB Secretary. All speakers should provide all pertinent facts within their knowledge, including the reasons for their position. Testimony should relate to the design issues of the project and the findings upon which the DRB must base its decision. An interested party who cannot appear at a hearing may write a letter to the DRB indicating their support of or opposition to the project, including their reasoning and concerns. The letter will be included as a part of the public record.

### **Continuances, Postponements, and Absences (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.5)**

A continuance is the carrying forward of an item to a future meeting. The applicant may request continuance of a project to a specified date if additional time is required to respond to comments or if they will be unable to attend the meeting. This is done either during the DRB meeting or by calling the DRB Secretary prior to the scheduled meeting so that the request may be discussed as part of the agenda status report at the beginning of the meeting.

### **Appeals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.8)**

#### **Sign Appeal Periods**

The **Final** or **Revised Final** approval or **denial** of a sign project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person withstanding may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. An appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within the ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed or closed early (such as on Fridays which close at 1:00 p.m.), the appeal period is extended until 5:30 p.m. on the following

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 28, 2009

Page 18 of 18

business day. Planning and Environmental Services will notify the DRB as to the scheduled date of the appeal hearing. The DRB will designate a member to attend an appeal hearing.

### All Other Appeal Periods

The **Preliminary** or **Revised Final** approval or **denial** of a non-sign project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person withstanding may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. An appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within the ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed or closed early (such as on Fridays which close at 1:00 p.m.), the appeal period is extended until 5:30 p.m. on the following business day. Planning and Environmental Services will notify the DRB as to the scheduled date of the appeal hearing. The DRB will designate a member to attend an appeal hearing.