



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, May 12, 2009

CONSENT CALENDAR

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

Members:

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Chair
Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member), Vice Chair
Scott Branch (Architect)
Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Carl Schneider (Architect)
Bob Wignot (At-Large Member)

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

May 12, 2009

Page 2 of 20

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for April 28, 2009

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

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

- NONE

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-168-DRB

5360 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-101-017)

This is a request for *Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes a 3,600-square foot commercial building on an approximately 12,600-square foot lot in the CN zone district. The applicant requests approval of a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the building. The proposed OSP provides for one wall sign per tenant. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign. The project was filed by Jeffrey and Kimberly Danhauer, property owners. Related cases: 09-030-OSP. (Continued from 4-16-09, 4-14-09*) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-16-09 Meeting:

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 07-168-DRB, 5360 Hollister Avenue, to May 12, 2009, for Preliminary/Final review on the Sign Calendar, with the following comments and changes:

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

The Overall Sign Plan for 5360 Hollister Ave., Santa Barbara, CA 93111, shall be changed as follows:

Item 2. Sign Concept: Add language to indicate that the existing Overall Sign Plan is intended for two tenants only, and that additional tenants will require review by the DRB and/or an Overall Sign Plan amendment.

Item 3. Tenant Signage.

3.b: Change “33 square feet” to “24 square feet”. Revise Exhibit 2 as appropriate.

3.d: Add language to the first sentence to indicate that signs are limited to the lettering of the tenant’s business name. Change “36” in height” to “24” in height” in the second sentence.

3.e: Add language to require that the minimum thickness of the letters shall be ½ inch.

3.f: Add language to clarify how the downward light shall shine downward, i.e., downward facing with no illumination beyond the sign face. Add language to require that any wall-mounted fixtures shall be located on the parapet.

3.g: Add language to require that quality materials shall be used that will not fade with time.

3.h: Remove “not” in the second sentence to indicate that the sign is illuminated with two downward facing lighting fixtures mounted on the parapet.

H-2. 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 4-28-09*, 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)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-14-09 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) The design of the sign is fine. b) Expressed concern regarding light trespass because the proposed

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 12, 2009

Page 4 of 20

- 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-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-042-DRB

111 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-025)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 21,800-square foot commercial building with a 2,570-square foot outdoor mechanical equipment yard on a 3.6-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes an Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the building. The proposed OSP provides for two (2) different types of signs: a monument sign and wall signs. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by Jeff Gorrell of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Mark Winnikoff of Frieslander Holdings LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-042-OSP. (Shine Ling)

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-054-DRB

275 Mathilda Drive (APN 079-554-009)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a 2,080-square foot two-story single-family residence and an attached 106-square foot garage on a 10,139-square foot lot in the DR-30 zone district of the City's Inland Area. The applicant has already obtained development approvals and permits to construct two, three-story attached residential units, one a 1,644 square-foot, two-bedroom unit with a first-floor, 566 square-foot, three-car garage; and the second a 1,130-square foot, one-bedroom unit with a first-floor, 426-square foot, two-car garage. The subject of this review is a request by the property owner/developer to revise the approved landscape plan. Proposed revisions to the approved plan primarily involve changes to the type of trees to be planted onsite. The project was filed by Julio Juan Veyna, agent on behalf of Luis Sanchez, property owner on April 24, 2009. Related cases: 00-DP-030, 01BAR-00000-00191, 06-175-TE, 04-239-LUP. (Alan Hanson)

Design Review Board Agenda

May 12, 2009

Page 5 of 20

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 37-SB-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Final review*. The property includes two screened storage areas and nine buildings totaling 326,490 square feet on a 92.25-acre lot in the Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Buildings 1, 2, 4 and associated improvements, improvements for the private internal drive, and street and frontage improvements to Hollister Avenue and Los Carneros Road as part of the phased build out of the previously approved Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 1 would be a two-story, 80,000-square foot structure and Buildings 2 and 4 would both be two-story, 60,000-square foot structures. Associated improvements for each building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, and parking. New materials consist of concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out, the Cabrillo Business Park would total 946,282 square feet, including 704,600 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. The project was filed by agent Dudek Engineering & Environmental on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN (Continued from 2-10-09*, 11-12-08*, 9-23-08*, 7-22-08, 6-10-08*, 4-22-08, 4-20-04, 3-16-04, 2-17-04*, 1-6-04, 12-2-03). (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-22-08 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the current proposed location for the Goleta Water District backflow preventer is the preferred location, noting that the equipment would be pushed back as far from the curb as possible, and that the current location shown is in the realm of forty feet; b) the backflow preventer equipment should be landscaped; c) requested that the applicant provide more details regarding the lighting plan, including cut sheets and lighting elements; and d) requested a better understanding with regard to the poles with the lighting standards.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) suggested that the water feature be pulled back and not so far into the parking lot; b) expressed support for the proposed location for the backflow preventer equipment; and c) the changes are fine and the project is looking very nice.
3. Member Branch commented: a) the boldness of the cobalt blue color is appreciated and the muted blue color is not attractive; b) agreed with Member Schneider's recommendation to move the water feature into the center of the landscape element; c) agreed with the DRB members' suggestion to move the water backflow preventer equipment as far off from the street as possible.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) agreed with previous comments from members with regard to the location of the backflow preventer and moving the water feature; b) expressed appreciation for the changes on the Hollister Street frontage on Building 1, stating that the building is very nice and pays some homage to the original Delco Building located up the street by having the building step, and with the glass wrapping the corners.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 12, 2009

Page 6 of 20

5. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with DRB comments recommending moving the backflow preventer from the sidewalk and relocating the water feature; and b) the building design is appreciated.
6. Member Messner commented: a) noted that he believes that the water fountain does not necessarily need to be brought into the center, stating that he would prefer off-center; and b) the bus stop needs to have a pull-out for the bus to facilitate traffic flow.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) the project continues to move in a very good direction; b) the changes respond to the DRB comments from the previous meeting; c) recommended that the applicant refer to the City's current Recommended Street Tree List with regard to planting trees in the right-of-way; d) the suggestion that some of the existing palm trees be re-located to the median on Hollister Avenue would not comply with the City's recommended list; e) expressed support for the public comment suggestion removal of the pampas grass; e) agreed with the DRB comments supporting the location shown for the backflow preventer; and f) the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-1, No. 37-SB-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, with comments; and to continue to September 23, 2008, for Final review on the Final Calendar by the full DRB.

J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-169-DRB & 08-170-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes two screened storage areas and nine buildings totaling 326,490 square feet on a 92.25-acre lot in the M-RP and M-S-GOL zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Buildings 12A and 12B and associated improvements as part of the phased build out of the Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 12A would be a one-story, 10,000-square foot structure and Building 12B would be a one-story, 7,500-square foot structure. Associated improvements for each building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, and parking. New materials consist of metal, concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out the Cabrillo Business Park as proposed to be amended would total 948,782 square feet, including 707,100 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. The project was filed by agent Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 08-107-DP AM, 08-039-LUP, 08-040-LUP, 08-041-LUP, 08-042-LUP, 08-160-LUP, 08-119-LUP, 08-025-LUP, 07-144-MC, 07-236-MC, 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN (Continued from 2-10-09*, 11-12-08, 10-14-08). (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

11-12-08 Meeting:

1. Member Branch commented: a) The plans are a good improvement; b) The project seems pretty balanced; and c) The green screen element is a better solution for the utilitarian side of the buildings.
2. Member Herrera commented: a) The landscape plans are good; and b) The concrete patterns are beautiful.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 12, 2009

Page 7 of 20

3. Member Messner commented: a) The choice of plants is appreciated; b) The Cypress tree planted off to the side balances the site very well; c) Actual plant sizes, quantities and groundcovers on centers will need to be shown on the plans for Final review; and d) It is important that the bus stop has a pull out area.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The response to the DRB comments, particularly with regard to the architecture on the buildings, is appreciated.
5. Member Schneider commented: a) In the future when buildings are reviewed, the applicant is requested to bring information showing the other buildings in the project site for reference; b) Overall, the plans are good; c) The green screen is a better solution than something architectural; and d) The changes on the south elevation help create a sense of entry and draws people into the plaza.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 08-169-DRB, and 08-170-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, and continue to February 10, 2009, for Final review.

J-3. 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 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. (Continued from 4-28-09) (Alan Hanson)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-28-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Vine pockets are more appropriate than installing planter boxes or pots on the ground along the chain-link fence.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The applicant should consult with a local landscape architect and/or nursery to identify none-invasive vine species that are evergreen, and present several proposals to the DRB for its consideration; b) The Red Trumpet vine species is not appropriate because it is very invasive and needs pruning; c) The Morning Glory plant

Design Review Board Agenda

May 12, 2009

Page 8 of 20

- species is not appropriate because it is very invasive; and d) Vine pockets are more appropriate than pots or the proposed planting box on the ground along the chain-link fence.
3. Member Messner commented: a) There are many different types of the Trumpet vine species, but the Red Trumpet is not recommended; b) The *Ficus* (fig) species and the Morning Glory species are not recommended; c) Consider plant species with regard to resistance to disease; d) Plant materials are more successful when planted in the ground rather than in pots or planter boxes; e) The Rosemary species is acceptable for the planter box along the top of the wall; and f) The plants will not survive in the planter box if there is too much overspray from the dust suppression system.
 4. Chair Wignot commented: a) Cautioned that plant species should be avoided which periodically shed leaves and other materials that could mix into the sand and gravel, to minimize interference with the operations of the business.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-037-DRB, 5925 Olney Street, with the following conditions: 1) The applicant shall provide the proposed species for the vine pockets on the chain-link fence and details regarding the spacing of the vine pockets. 2) The details of the proposed planter box to be placed at the top of the CMU wall shall be provided by the applicant; and to continue Item L-1, No. 09-037-DRB, to May 12, 2009, for Final review on the Final Calendar.

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 4-28-09, 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)

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 12, 2009

Page 9 of 20

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-28-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Branch commented: a) The south elevation needs some treatment that is more exciting; b) On the south elevation, possibly consider some changes with heights, which may be a tall order, or some changes with the colors; c) The colors are helpful on the south elevation; d) On the south elevation, possibly consider different textures of plaster, for example, heavily textured vs. smooth; e) If the front elevation design was not this good, the south elevation would be okay. f) The north elevation is great; g) The west elevation is okay, even though it is repetitive, when viewing it along the corridor; and h) The proposed circular design for the turnaround at the front entry is successful from a utilitarian standpoint.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed circular pattern for traffic circulation in the front of the hospital works well; b) The building is very nice from the front; c) Encouraged that a pavement treatment be applied to highlight the pedestrian path as it crosses the traffic circulation area in the front; d) The west elevation is acceptable because of the repetitive feature. It faces a direction that is not typically visible to the public, and the street trees will provide some screening; e) The southeast corner of the building is very visible from the public standpoint; and f) The south elevation needs some enhancement. The color, forms and trellis work well at the wound entry portion of the south elevation. These forms would also work moving to the east and west of the elevation, if feasible. Adding the brown elements and the reveals on the south elevation will tend to tie the south elevation with the west elevation. Possibly adding enough vertical reveals will make it look like a different texture. Consider what treatments can be done on the south elevation to break up the massing, including color breaks, that will not require OSHPD review. He understands that the south elevation is the back of the building and he does not expect it to look like the front.
3. Member Brown commented: a) There may be an opportunity to add a treatment to the south elevation that is visually interesting, and possibly decorative, that will not require the project to return for OSHPD review; and b) Requested Community Services staff research whether the proposed street light is fully shielded, and ensure that the fixture will be fully shielded.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Consider adding surface textures that are richer or different on the south elevation; b) If the color and/or texture are changed on the south elevation, consider adding a vertical element to add interest; and c) The south elevation reads very horizontal; whereas, the east, north and west elevations have horizontal and vertical elements that break up the massing and gives the "jazzy" feel that would be his preference.
5. Member Messner commented: a) He has observed painted stone that looks like stone; b) The circular pattern for traffic circulation in the front is

Design Review Board Agenda

May 12, 2009

Page 10 of 20

appreciated; c) The chapel curve element and the stonework are appreciated; d) Consider adding some berming on the site wall, which will have a softening effect; and e) Suggested a slight tapering out of the stone in the front, which he recalls was shown in previous drawings. (Mark Schutte, HBE, said this kind of change in the proposed plans would need OSHPD review).

6. Chair Wignot commented: a) By consensus, the DRB members accept the proposed entry design with the traffic circulation, the pedestrian access, and the circular vehicular loop; the architectural treatment with regard to the west side of the lobby resolving with the north side at the corner; and the proposed lighting plan; b) The Community Services Department will need to make sure that the street lighting fixtures are fully-shielded and compatible with dark sky principles; c) The proposed colors for the south elevation are not acceptable; and d) Consider adding some berming on the east elevation, and by the site wall, which would add some interest.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera) to continue Item K-1, No. 351 S. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue, to May 12, 2009, with the following comments: 1) The proposed vehicular entry, pedestrian access design and circular vehicle loop is acceptable and works well. 2) The architectural treatment is acceptable with regard to the west side of the lobby resolving with the north side at the corner. 3) The proposed lighting plan is acceptable. 4) The Community Services Department shall make sure that the street lighting fixtures are fully-shielded and compatible with dark sky principles. 5) The applicant should restudy the colors on the south elevation in an attempt to break up the massing of the building.

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-033-DRB

5633 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-073-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,448-square foot single-story residence with an attached two-car garage on a 6,000-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing residence and install a manufactured home on a new foundation system. The existing garage would remain and be remodeled and is proposed to be attached to the manufactured home. The resulting one-story structure would be 1,746 square feet, consisting of a 1,188-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 558-square foot two-car garage with storage area. The proposed project is consistent with the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district. Materials and finishes of the manufactured home are proposed to remain the same and consist of grey-brown plaster and siding; materials of the garage are proposed to match the manufactured home. The project was filed by Amy Taylor, architect, on behalf of Wendy and Eric McFarland, property owners. Related cases: 09-033-LUP. (Continued from 4-14-09) (Shine Ling)

Design Review Board Agenda

May 12, 2009

Page 11 of 20

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-14-09 Meeting:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed plan to remove the roof from the garage is good because the image from the street to the property will be more in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood. b) The manufactured home will be low enough in scale and set far enough back from the street so the difference in architectural styles will not be perceived as much from the street. c) He supports the installation of the manufactured home on the site. d) Requested the applicant designate where the existing trees are located and provide plans for moving the manufactured home onto the property, making sure the existing trees will not need to be removed. e) The front entry porch cover is not integrated into the manufactured home or into the style of the garage. It needs to be restudied to make it more substantial. f) In response to Member Messner's comment regarding whether consideration should be given that the proposed project is located in an area where there are houses with Eichler style architecture, his understanding is that the existing house has been transformed by renovation over time and it does not seem appropriate to try to return to the original architectural style.
2. Member Branch commented: a) He can understand why the applicant chose the low roof design. b) The entry structure needs to be restudied. c) The concept of installing a manufactured home on the site is fully supported.
3. Member Brown commented: a) The entry structure needs to be restudied. There are too many styles. b) Expressed concern that the proposed landscape plan seems too tight to all its perimeters. She suggested adding some plantings rather than just lawn. c) She commented that in the past there has been discussion to try and maintain the Eichler style, however, this project proposes to restore the garage roof to an Eichler style but the manufactured home is a different style.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The concept of moving the manufactured house onto the site is supported. b) The entry structure needs to be restudied. Consider a design similar to the proposed restored garage roof that is flat with a pitch in the same direction, to tie the two elements together. c) The lighting plan needs to comply with dark sky principles.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) The proposed plan will be a big improvement. b) He would like to see a detailed landscape plan.
6. Member Messner commented: a) The addition of street trees would be an improvement. He encouraged the project architect to work with the City's Arborist and to review the City's Recommended Street Tree List and guidelines. b) He would like to see a detailed landscape plan. c) The grading and drainage plans should show drainage away from the structure, towards the street, and away from existing neighbors. d) In the past, when a proposed project was located in an area with Eichler style architecture, there was discussion with regard to the situation, and he

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 12, 2009

Page 12 of 20

would like to know that there has been consideration with regard to this project, although he is not advocating one way or the other.

7. Chair Wignot commented: a) The use of the manufactured home on this site is a good fit. b) Recommended adding a window or skylight in the storage area to add some natural light in the storeroom. c) The cut sheets on the elevations do not confirm that the lighting fixtures are downward and full-shielded. d) The stoops for the front and backyard entries seem too low. Raising the height of the stoops would make it easier for people entering and exiting. e) Suggested the applicant check to see if there are Building Code requirements to install hand railings for the steps in the front and rear. f) More information is requested with regard to the location of the electric utility meter. g) If the entry canopy was made bigger so it came close to the overhang on the garage, it would be a useful feature. He expressed concern that the proposed plans currently show a gap between the garage overhang and entry canopy.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-033-DRB, 5633 Armitos Avenue, to May 12, 2009, for with the following comments: 1) restudy the front entry structure; 2) restudy the proposed landscape plan with encouragement to accommodate the use of street trees; 3) designate on the plans the location of the existing on-site trees in the rear yard; and 4) re-evaluate and provide additional information regarding the proposed light fixtures.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. 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. (Continued from 4-14-09, 3-10-09) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-14-09 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) This corner is very important to the community because it is located next to the Los Carneros preserve. b) Consider an architectural style that fits with the context of the rural nature of the area, for example, agrarian. c) The architecture should address all

Design Review Board Agenda

May 12, 2009

Page 13 of 20

- four sides of the building. d) Consider colors that are darker. e) Do not design the building around the potential sign. e) The skylights will be nice. f) Recommended native species for the landscape plan.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The massing is appreciated. b) The exterior should not have the same material all the way around and across. c) Adding a different material may add some interest.
 3. Member Branch commented: a) These plans are a better solution. b) He understands the curb-cut issues. c) The style and direction of the project are appropriate. d) The applicant may consider either removing the copula or perhaps only a single dormer. The form is simple and may work as is.
 4. Member Herrera commented: a) He supports the project. b) Good landscaping would make the corner, which is traveled by vehicle every day by many people, look very nice.
 5. Member Messner commented: a) Landscaping if done right will enhance the project. b) Study adding big rolling mounds and big boulders to soften the street corner and the building. There are also many types of high/low shrubs that can be used. c) Some trees would be nice in the appropriate location. d) Eucalyptus trees are not recommended.
 6. Chair Wignot commented: a) Agreed with comments from the DRB members. b) The view corridor from the earthen dam at Lake Los Carneros looking southwest is important because people who are walking see buildings to the south that are not fully screened by street trees. Consider providing some screening from this perspective of the new building with street trees. c) The northeast corner would be a good location for placement of street trees. d) The trees should not interfere with the traffic intersection.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 06-180-DRB, SE Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, to May 12, 2009, with comments.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

N-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-061-DRB

Right-of-way between Calle Real/Highway 101 northbound Patterson Avenue on-ramp
This is a request for *Advisory* review. As approved by City Council, Caltrans is proposing to landscape and screen a proposed Caltrans stockpile/storage yard on excess City owned right-of-way between Calle Real and the northbound Highway 101 on-ramp at Patterson Avenue. See the attached vicinity map. The site will use the portion of the right-of-way that is close to Patterson Avenue behind the commercial buildings to avoid potential impacts to the residences north of Calle Real. Fencing with earth tone slats and abundant landscaping will surround the site to provide the necessary screening. Native landscaping will include California Sycamore, Island Oak and Toyon. The 24 inch box size was chosen for select trees in order to provide as much vegetative screening as possible immediately after the yard is constructed. In addition, any lighting used will be shielded and

Design Review Board Agenda

May 12, 2009

Page 14 of 20

directed away from residences and access will only be permitted from the Patterson Avenue Interchange. (George Amoon)

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-2. 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

May 12, 2009

Page 16 of 20

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

May 12, 2009

Page 17 of 20

- 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

May 12, 2009

Page 18 of 20

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

May 12, 2009

Page 19 of 20

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

May 12, 2009

Page 20 of 20

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.