



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - UNAPPROVED

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, June 23, 2009

### CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 1:30 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

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

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

### ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

### REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

#### Members:

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)

---

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

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Smith at 3:15 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Thomas Smith, Chair; Cecilia Brown, Vice Chair; Scott Branch; Simon Herrera; Chris Messner, and Bob Wignot.

Board Members absent: Carl Schneider.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Laura Vlk, Associate Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

June 23, 2009

Page 2 of 12

### B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

#### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for June 9, 2009.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Abstain: Wignot; Absent: Schneider), to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for June 9, 2009, as amended.**

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

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the Subcommittee met today and discussed the agenda items that included: discussion regarding adding more tree species to the Recommended Street Tree List; methods to conduct an outreach for community and professional input with regard to the process for updating the Recommended Street Tree List; and the Urban Forest Management Plan Update. Methods being considered to conduct an outreach include posting the Recommended Street Tree List, Nursery Standards and Planting Guidelines on the City's website. All items on the agenda were continued to the next meeting which will be on August 11, 2009, at 2:00 p.m.

Member Wignot stated that the methods for outreach being discussed include placing a scroll on public access Channel 19 that ties in with the information on the City's website to let the public know the current standards and provide an opportunity for input. He noted that representatives from Goleta Valley Beautiful and the Santa Barbara Botanic Garden have attended Street Tree Subcommittee meetings and commented.

Member Brown stated that usually an outreach of this type for community input would include contacting professionals, providing a list of the standards, and advising that there will be a meeting. She does not believe the City's website and the public access Channel 19 are sufficient outreach.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that staff will consider methods for further public noticing.

Subcommittee Chair Messner stated that the next step with regard to the Urban Forest Management Plan is to prepare a report on the state of the City's urban forest. He stated that the results of the satellite imaging assessment by NCDC of the City's canopy coverage was 19 percent which is very good compared with their assessment of other cities that averaged out to 28.9 percent. Chair Messner submitted a copy of a letter from Michaela Parlin, Production Manager, NCDC Imaging, dated January 14, 2009, Subject: "Table of various Cities' Existing UTC (Urban Tree Canopy Tree Assessment) for comparison & Cool Fact Sheet on UTC."

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) Member Wignot was welcomed back. 2) On June 16, 2009, the City Council considered the Telecommunications Facilities Regulations ordinance, and scheduled the second reading for July 7, 2009. 3) On June 22, 2009, the Planning Commission conducted Conceptual Review of the Kenwood Village Project. 4) The DRB recommendation to the City Council for consideration to remove the requirements for review by the Zoning Administrator of all Overall Sign Plans is moving forward. 5) The General Plan Track 1 and Track 3 Amendments will be moving forward this summer. 6) The public hearing date is in the process of being scheduled to consider an appeal filed to the Planning Commission decision to uphold the appeal to the DRB approval of a project a 7837 Langlo Ranch Road. 7) Staff checked the completed signage vs. the approved plans for the Del Valle Grill sign, per the request of a DRB member. 8) The vertical screening of the trash enclosure area at Fresco North, which is a component of DRB Permit No. 09-026-DRB, has not yet been completed. 9) During the summer, only one DRB meeting per month will be held, noting that the meetings for July 28, August 25, and September 22, 2009, will be cancelled. However, there will be an option if a DRB subcommittee believes it will be useful to have a meeting twice per month during the summer.

### **C. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None.

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

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that the applicant for Item J-1, DRB Permit No. 08-169-DRB & 08-170-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue; and Item J-2, DRB Permit No. 09-086-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, requested that Items J-1 and J-2 be taken off calendar.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider), to take off calendar Item J-1, DRB Permit No. 08-169-DRB & 08-170-DRB 6767 Hollister Avenue, and Item J-2, DRB Permit No. 09-086-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, per the applicant's request.**

### **E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he met today with the applicant and reviewed Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-084-DRB, 5266 Hollister Avenue.

### **F. CONSENT CALENDAR**

#### **F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-084-DRB**

5266 Hollister Avenue (APN 065-050-022)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes three commercial buildings totaling 26,422 square feet on a 3.4-acre parcel in the PI zone district. The applicant proposes to install security gates on the west and east entryways to the courtyard for

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

June 23, 2009

Page 4 of 12

the rear building of the complex (Building C). The gates would be constructed of steel and painted to match the beige color of the building, with a botanical motif painted green and welded over the security bars. Security bars are also proposed to be installed in the interior of the security office and would be screened by curtains. No changes to height, floor area, landscaping, or parking are proposed. The project was filed by William Fedderson of Luminare Design Group, agent, on behalf of Stonebrook Square Ltd., property owner. Related cases: 09-084-LUP. (Continued from 6-9-09) (Shine Ling)

### CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that he met with the applicant today and reviewed Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-084-DRB, 5266 Hollister Avenue, and that Final Approval was granted for Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-084-DRB, as submitted. He noted that the Building Department did not require specific egress hardware if there is a sign indicating certain information; for example, open during business hours.

## G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown reported that the Sign Subcommittee today reviewed Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue; Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 09-042-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive; and Item H-3, DRB Permit No. 09-071-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue.

## 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 5-26-09\*, 5-12-09\*, 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)

*Sign Subcommittee Action on June 23, 2009:*

Recused: Sign Subcommittee Member Schneider.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

The plans were presented by agent Craig Minus, and Mary Sue Pouliot, of The Towbes Group, property owner. Craig Minus stated that the sign will only be illuminated during the hours of operation. Mary Sue Pouliot stated that the post light will be eliminated from the plans.

Sign Subcommittee Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) Requested that staff add a note on the plans indicating the sign will only be illuminated during the hours of operation.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider), to grant Preliminary Approval and Final Approval of Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, with the following Conditions: 1) The post light shall be eliminated from the plan. 2) The specifications for the light fixture shall be Catalog No. FFL-54-T5HO-30K, 54 Watts, with hood extension, and louver. 3) The sign shall only be illuminated during the hours of operation, which shall be added to the plans. 4) There shall be no light trespass beyond the sign face.**

**H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-042-DRB**

111 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-025)

This is a request for *Preliminary/Final* 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. (Continued from 6-9-09; 5-12-09) (Shine Ling)

*Sign Subcommittee Action on June 23, 2009:*

Assistant Planner Shine Ling stated that Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 09-042-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, was reviewed by the Zoning Administrator, and that there are no changes.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval and Final Approval of Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 09-042-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, as submitted.**

**H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-071-DRB**

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The Cabrillo Business Park is comprised of a 92.25-acre site in the Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. 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

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

June 23, 2009

Page 6 of 12

square feet of the existing retained buildings. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Hollister Business Park. The proposed OSP provides for seven (7) different types of signs: monument signs, directional signs, wall signs, recreation area signs, retail building signs, temporary leasing signs, and miscellaneous 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 Troy White of Dudek, agent, on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-071-OSP; -CUP. (Shine Ling)

### *Sign Subcommittee Action on June 23, 2009:*

The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Shine Ling. He said the purpose today is to review the sign plans and provide direction with regard to the number of signs, the location, and the design of the signage proposed for the Cabrillo Business Park (CBP) site. The proposed signage with regard to the wetlands enhancement areas, public access to recreational facilities on site, and project site trails will be presented in the future. He noted that Projection Description and Background information in the staff report will be updated in the future but it does not materially affect the signage plans for review today.

The plans were presented by Troy White of Dudek, agent, on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC, property owner; Ken Ambrosini, Ambrosini Design, Ltd.; and Steve Fedde, property owner.

Troy White, Dudek, agent, stated that the applicant is in the process of working with the Army Corps of Engineers with regard to the wetlands enhancement areas component, which is expected to take some length of time. The signage plans associated with the wetlands enhancement area treatment will be submitted in approximately one year. He clarified that the landscape plan prepared by Arcadia Studio did not focus on signage locations. He commented that he believes the signage plans are consistent with Condition 17, Item #5, of the Cabrillo Business Park Development Plan that pertains to signage.

Ken Ambrosini, Ambrosini Design, Ltd., presented that plans and document entitled "Cabrillo Business Park Sares-Regis Group/Design Development 05/07/09". He stated that all of the signs have been designed to be consistent with the project architecture and regionalism of the development site. The materials are low maintenance and durable. All lighting has been designed to conform with dark sky principles. The monument signs are designed to be integrated with a landscape component. The signage will comply with Fire Department regulations regarding standards and location of signs. From his experience, he believes the number of signs is few for the scale of this project.

### Sign Subcommittee Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide examples of the illuminated signs showing how the proposed lighting systems will work, including LED upright fixtures; b) Provide the landscape plan at the next review

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

June 23, 2009

Page 7 of 12

which will be helpful. She noted that when the landscape plan was reviewed by the DRB, there was an expectation that monument signs would be placed at certain locations which are not shown on the current signage plan; c) Provide examples of the graphic design for the Temporary Project Marketing Signs. The design shown in the plans does not communicate the same aesthetic feeling of the proposed monument signs; d) It is appreciated that there are no plans for temporary flags or banner signs; e) Provide examples of the signage shown within the scale of the business park environment, and show the relationship of the signage to the site; f) There is concern that there will be too many signs although it is understood that the project site is a big campus; and g) It is appreciated that the signage plan is robust and well thought out.

2. Member Schneider commented: a) There may be redundancy of information on the building signs and directional signs. The elimination of signage redundancy would need to be considered as the signage plans move forward; b) The current design shown on the plans for the Project Marketing Sign is not acceptable; c) Project Marketing Signs should be identified on the plans as Temporary Project Marketing Signs because they will eventually be removed; d) The number of Temporary Project Marketing Signs along Hollister Avenue should be minimized; e) While there is a maximum square footage area for the Anchor Tenant Building Sign, the maximum font size and maximum logo size are more important to consider. It would not seem necessary for the maximum heights to exceed eighteen or twenty-four inches for the signs to be readable; and f) Suggested that language be added to indicate the applicant will submit signage plans in the future that are associated with the wetlands restoration component.
3. Member Smith commented: a) Requested that an example of the Temporary Project Marketing Signs be shown within the context of the proposed architectural renderings of the project site.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION:** By consensus, the Sign Subcommittee continued Item H-3, DRB Permit No. 09-071-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, with comments, to July 14, 2009, at 1:00 p.m., for review on the Sign Subcommittee Calendar.

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

#### J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-169-DRB & 08-170-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 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,

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

June 23, 2009

Page 8 of 12

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 5-12-09\*, 2-10-09\*, 11-12-08, 10-14-08). (Cindy Moore)

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider), to take off calendar Item J-1, DRB Permit No. 08-169-DRB & 08-170-DRB 6767 Hollister Avenue, per the applicant's request.**

### J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-086-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 Building 4 and associated improvements as part of the phased build out of the previously approved Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 4 would be a two-story, 60,000-square foot structure. Associated improvements for the 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 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. Building 4 was referenced on previous agendas under DRB permit number 37-SB-DRB. Related cases: 08-107-DP AM, 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN (Continued from 05-12-09\*, 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)

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider), to take off calendar Item J-2, DRB Permit No. 09-086-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, per the applicant's request.**

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

### L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

#### L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-182-DRB

130 Nectarine Avenue (APN 071-061-020)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary review*. The property includes a 903-square foot, 1-story residence and a detached 462-square foot 2-car garage on a 5,771-square foot lot in the DR-30 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.



## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

June 23, 2009

Page 9 of 12

1,095-square feet in additions, consisting of a 510-square foot first floor addition and the addition of a new 585-square foot second floor. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,460-square feet, consisting of a 1,998-square foot single-family dwelling and a detached, 462-square foot 2-car garage. This proposal exceeds the maximum allowable floor area guideline for this property, which is 1,831.3-square feet plus an allocation of 440-square feet for a 2-car garage, by 188.7-square feet. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Larry Thompson on behalf of Arturo Perez, property owner. Related cases: 07-182-LUP. (Laura Vlk)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The staff report was presented by Laura Vlk, Associate Planner.

The plans were presented by agent Larry Thompson on behalf of Arturo Perez, property owner. He noted that the purpose of the proposed project is to accommodate the applicant's family in terms of their need for additional living space. He stated that the project was designed to have the least impact in terms of the neighbors. He also stated that he believes the property owner talked with the neighbors and have not heard of any problems.

Chair Smith stated for the record that an e-mail dated June 22, 2009, was received today from Steven Holmes, neighbor immediately to the north, which was distributed to DRB Members by staff. The letter indicated no objection to a ground floor addition of any size, asking that the planners take into consideration his desire to reserve solar technology as a viable energy option for his property in the future.

Speaker:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, requested that the project not exceed the recommended floor area ratio, stating that he believes there is no reason that the project needs to be any larger. He suggested if a couple of the walls were stepped back a couple of feet, the square footage that exceeds the recommended floor area ratio could probably be eliminated. He commented that the proposed project is a challenge for the whole neighborhood and a second story does not belong. However, if the addition is an attempt to redevelop and add living space to 700 to 900-square-foot houses, then this sort of project is unavoidable.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed design fits well with the overall appearance of the neighborhood, and keeps the same window treatment; b) He could support the project but there are some concerns with regard to the balconies and neighbors' privacy that need to be restudied, and possibly scaled back; c) Some of the proposed lights seem unnecessary; for example, lights on either side of the exterior doorways on the second floor, on the west elevation; d) The upper floor layout to enter the master bedroom through the bathroom seems

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

June 23, 2009

Page 10 of 12

- somewhat awkward; and e) Requested the applicant provide a solar study to address the concern presented by neighbor Steven Holmes that the second floor addition would negatively impact his ability to install solar panel technology as a viable energy option on his property in the future.
2. Member Branch commented: a) From a site planning standpoint, the footprint of the addition seems appropriate to the site; b) The street elevation is innocuous, not a big impact on the neighborhood, but the proposed building feels huge when looking at the north and south elevations. c) He noted that the lot is very narrow, and also a nine-foot plate is proposed for the rear; d) Overall, the proposed project seems somewhat oversized and larger than it needs to be to achieve the applicant's solution, and does not meet the floor area ratio guidelines; e) The proposed family room seems undersized, suggesting the area could be massaged, taking more advantage of space on the ground floor, and noting that the 10-foot setback would be in constant shadow year round; f) He wondered whether a single-story solution is possible if the project went to the 5-foot setback; g) Agreed with privacy concerns, particularly on the south side; h) Obscure glass and other treatments to address privacy concerns on the north side would suffice; and i) Joining the two styles is successful, as well as keeping the front elevation simple.
  3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed project is too large and aggressive for the size of the lot and not appropriate for the site; b) Agreed with Member Branch that there is room on the ground floor that can be used for the project that would help eliminate the massing, particularly on the north side; c) Restudy the project to make the size smaller and way under the floor area ratio guidelines; and d) Eliminate the balconies which she would not support overlooking neighbors' yards, although she would probably support the balcony in front facing the street.
  4. Member Messner commented: a) He agreed with comments made by Member Branch and Vice Chair Brown.
  5. Member Herrera commented: a) He agreed with most of the comments made by Member Branch; however, the addition is proposed in order to accommodate a large family; b) Perhaps eliminate one of the proposed balconies, which would be the one that has more of an impact on the neighbors' privacy; c) Possibly downsize by eliminating one room on the second floor; and d) Possibly consider a single-floor design.
  6. Chair Smith commented: a) He does not have a problem with the second floor because it is pulled away from the front setback and the streetscape; b) In his estimation, the front elevation hides somewhat the apparent size of the project, when looking north or south; c) In concept, he likes the project, but supports trimming some of the square footage to try and meet the FAR guidelines; d) Perhaps the proposed study could serve as the family room, which would pull the building in somewhat closer; e) Consider trimming some square footage on the second floor; f) He understands the privacy concerns from the DRB members regarding the proposed balconies, and he would like to hear from the neighbors on the south side; g) He prefers the balcony that faces the street; and h) He would agree with comments to perhaps reduce the prominence of the balconies.

**MOTION:** Branch moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to continue Item L-1, Permit No. 07-182-DRB, 130 Nectarine Avenue, to July 14, 2009, with comments; and that the applicant restudy the size of the project as a whole, noting there were several comments expressing concern with regard to the proposed second story, and restudy scaling back the project.

**L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-087-DRB**

44 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-003)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 46,750-square foot commercial building, a 208-square foot water filtration equipment yard, and a 3,623-square foot rear equipment yard on a 3.25-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to expand the water filtration equipment yard to 650 square feet and install additional equipment for wastewater treatment and discharge. The yard would be enclosed by a 9.5-foot tall chain-link fence and roofed with a metal canopy. No changes in building height, building coverage, signage, or floor area for the main building are proposed. The project was filed by Brian Beebe of Anderson Systems, agent, on behalf of Peter Goodell for Castilian Associates, property owner. Related cases: 09-087-SCD; -LUP. (Shine Ling)

Site visits: Made by Members Herrera and Wignot.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Brian Beebe of Anderson Systems, agent, on behalf of Peter Goodell for Castilian Associates, property owner.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) He noticed that there was some pump noise when he made a site visit, and suggested that an effort be made to purchase new equipment units that have quieter motors to address this concern; b) The project will be very similar to what exists presently but a little larger; c) The proposed color would probably blend in better than what is existing; and d) He would support the project as submitted.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The slats should be the dark brown color; and b) Agreed with Member Wignot's comments.

**MOTION:** Branch moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-087-DRB, 44 Castilian Drive, as submitted, with the following Condition: 1) The slats shall be the dark brown color; and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-087-DRB, to July 14, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

**M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR**

- NONE

## **Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved**

June 23, 2009

Page 12 of 12

### **N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- **NONE**

### **O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

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

Member Wignot requested an opportunity to schedule an appointment with staff to view the Approved Vs. Built Slideshow, which he heard was very interesting.

#### **O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

None.

### **P. ADJOURNMENT: 4:17 P.M.**

**Design Review Board Agenda**

June 23, 2009

Page 13 of 13