



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - UNAPPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, August 11, 2009

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 1:00 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 3:00 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; Chris Messner, Carl Schneider, and Bob Wignot.

Board Members absent: Simon Herrera.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Alan Hanson, Senior Planner; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Laura Vlk, Associate Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 2 of 20

Hiefield, Planning Technician; Bill Millar, Parks and Open Space Manager; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for July 14, 2009

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for July 14, 2009, as submitted.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the Subcommittee met today. The next meeting will be on September 8, 2009, at 2:00 p.m.

Bill Millar, Parks and Open Space Manager, stated that he will be working with the Director of Community Services to develop a plan regarding the process for adding more tree species to the Recommended Street Tree Planting List and methods to conduct an outreach for input with regard to the process for updating the Recommended Street Tree Planting List. He stated that these items have been removed from the Continued Items portion of the Street Tree Subcommittee agenda and that staff will provide a staff report in the future with recommendations.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) On July 20, 2009, the Planning Commission reviewed the Track 1 Housing Element General Plan Amendments; 2) On July 21, 2009, the City Council conducted the final reading of the Telecommunications Facilities Regulations ordinance; 3) On July 27, 2009, the Planning Commission reviewed Track 3 General Plan Amendments; 4) The regular DRB meeting for July 28, 2009, was cancelled; 5) On August 18, 2009, the City Council will conduct a public hearing on the Track 1 Housing Element General Plan Amendments; 6) On August 24, 2009, the Planning Commission will continue review of Track 3 General Plan Amendments; 7) The regular DRB meetings on August 25, 2009, and September 22, 2009, have been cancelled. 8) The date has not been set for the City Council to consider the DRB recommendation to remove the requirements for review by the Zoning Administrator of all Overall Sign Plans; and 9) The public hearing date is on hold pending information to be submitted by the applicant and appellant with regard to an appeal filed to the Planning Commission decision to uphold the appeal to the DRB approval of a project a 7837 Langlo Ranch Road.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT

No speakers.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 3 of 20

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

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that no requests for continuance have been received.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Member Branch reported that he reviewed today, with Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz, Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-114-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, and that Revised Final Approval was granted as submitted.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-114-DRB

111 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-025)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a 21,800-square foot commercial building and a 2,568-square foot outdoor mechanical equipment yard on a 3.6-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to modify the design of the enclosure for the outdoor mechanical equipment yard. The revised design would utilize black tennis fiber mesh over black chain link fencing and galvanized metal posts and tube frames. The height of the fencing would vary from 12.5 feet to 16 feet. The project was filed by Mark Armstrong of Cunningham Paris Construction, agent, on behalf of Mark Winnikoff of Frieslander Holdings LLC and Nederlander Holdings, LLC, property owners. Related cases: 08-207-SCD; -LUP. (Shine Ling)

Consent Calendar Action on August 11, 2009.

Consent Calendar Member Branch reported that he reviewed today, with Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz, Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-114-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, and that Revised Final Approval was granted as submitted.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown reported that the Sign Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-055-DRB; Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 09-071-DRB; Item H-3, DRB Permit No. 09-100-DRB; and Item H-4, DRB Permit No. 09-107-DRB RV.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-055-DRB

52 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-110-091)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 5,990-square foot commercial property on a 24,394-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to replace the existing Washington Mutual signage with Chase Bank signage of varying types including a freestanding monument sign, two wall signs, two ATM signs, and ground signs at the entrance and exit to the property. Signage details are as follows:

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 4 of 20

Freestanding Monument Sign:

The proposed Freestanding Monument Sign would measure 17-feet tall by 3.3-feet wide for an aggregate of 56 square feet. As proposed, the vertically aligned sign would have white routed aluminum letters measuring 2-feet wide and a blue Chase Bank logo measuring 2.3-feet wide. The sign would be internally illuminated.

Wall Signs:

Northeast Elevation – The proposed wall sign would measure 1.7-feet tall by 11.7-feet wide for an aggregate of 20 square feet. The sign would have black internally illuminated 7.4-inch deep channel letters measuring 1.7-feet tall and a blue Chase Bank logo measuring 2.2-feet wide.

Southwest Elevation – The proposed wall sign would measure 2-feet tall by 14-feet wide for an aggregate of 28 square feet. The sign would have black internally illuminated 7.8-inch deep channel letters measuring 2-feet tall and a blue Chase bank logo measuring 2.6-feet wide.

ATM Signs:

Two signs are proposed atop the ATMs that would measure 1.2-feet tall by 3.8-feet wide for an aggregate of 5 square feet. The internally illuminated signs would have white letters measuring 6-inches tall and a blue Chase Bank logo.

Ground Signs:

The proposed ground signs marking the entrance, and exit to the property would measure 1.8-feet tall by 1.1-feet wide for an aggregate of 2 square feet. The non-illuminated signs would be mounted on a 3-foot tall pole.

The project was filed by agent Bill Hellmann on behalf of Chase Bank, property owner. Related cases: 92-SCC-011; 99-SCC-010. (Continued from 7-14-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on August 11, 2009:

Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician, commented regarding two items: 1) The Community Services Department will need to review the Freestanding Monument Sign to determine that it conforms to sight distance standards with regard to its location at the intersection; and 2) The ATM Signs will need to be designated as either an Under Canopy Sign or a Wall Sign, both of which have specific issues to be considered. Otherwise, an Overall Sign Plan may be appropriate. He stated that after review by the Zoning Administrator, Preliminary/Final review will be conducted.

The plans were presented by Dustin J. Hansen, Manager, Signage Rebrand Program, on behalf of Chase Bank, property owner. He presented a photograph example of the illumination of the ATM Signs.

Sign Subcommittee Comments:

Freestanding Monument Sign:

General agreement: The freestanding monument sign shall be reduced in height by 2 feet, not to exceed an overall height of approximately 5 feet. Shrink the sign down

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 5 of 20

proportionately so the letters do not exceed 12 inches. The plans need to clarify that the LED channel letters and blue underlining will glow. Compliance with sight distance standards will be reviewed by staff.

1. Member Brown commented: a) The proposed sign is too tall for the corner and out of scale for the site; and b) The gray base is too large, although the blue color is okay.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) From a design standpoint, reducing the height of the letters to 12 inches would shorten the length, and the letters would still be readable.
3. Member Smith commented: a) Suggested lowering the base so the sign can be seen from driver's height.

Wall Signs:

The plans need to clarify that the LED channel letters will glow.

1. Member Brown commented: a) The Wall Sign looks good, and is very neat and tidy.

Ground Signs:

1. Member Brown commented: a) The proposed Ground Signs are fine.

ATM Signs:

General Agreement: An Overall Sign Plan will be the most appropriate solution to accommodate the applicant's request and to comply with the Sign Subcommittee's preferred design which would be to install the new proposed canopy with the proposed LED lighting underneath the canopy, remove the "ATM" lettering on the canopy; and address the Chase branding on the ATM Surrounds.

1. Member Brown commented: a) The proposal to enclose the LED lighting underneath the canopy is fine; b) The preference would be to allow the branding on the two ATM panels and remove the "ATM" on the canopy; and c) The "ATM" lettering does not seem necessary.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) Agreed with Member Brown's comments; and b) The proposed lighting solution with the new canopy is much better than what currently exists.
3. Member Wignot commented from a safety standpoint that retaining both of the existing right turn only signs onto Fairview Avenue will prevent the potential for traffic accidents. He stated that the original proposed plan was to remove these signs.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-055-DRB, 52 North Fairview Avenue, to September 8, 2009, with comments.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-071-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-610-001, -002, -003, -004, -005 & -006)

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 948,782 square feet, including 707,100 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 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. (Continued from 7-14-09, 6-23-09) (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on August 11, 2009:

The plans were presented by Troy White of Dudek, agent on behalf of Santa Barbara Holding Company, LLC, property owner; and Ken Ambrosini, Ambrosini Design, Ltd., project sign design architect. Troy Dudek provided revised plans in response to DRB comments and concerns. Ken Ambrosini pointed out and discussed the revisions.

There being no objections, Member Brown acknowledged that the plans received today from the applicant will be included in the review.

Shine Ling, Assistant Planner, clarified that only the Wall Signs and the Retail Building Signs will return for individual DRB review after Final Approval of the OSP, and that no other signs will require individual review as long as there is consistency with the OSP.

Troy Dudek, agent, stated that the applicant will work with staff to ensure there is a consistent format regarding the verbiage, font size and graphics for the Temporary Marketing Signs.

Sign Subcommittee Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) She is comfortable with the proposed plans that have been submitted; and b) The Temporary Marketing Signs proposed format will need to be reviewed at the Preliminary/Final review.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The language in the OSP need to clarify that each major tenant is limited to one sign per allowed elevation.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to continue Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 09-071-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to September 8, 2009, with comments.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 7 of 20

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-100-DRB

7127 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-440-012)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes a 1,304-square foot commercial tenant space within a shopping center on a 9.3 acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to install a two-line sign for the "Wireless Now Verizon Wireless" store measuring a maximum of 2.08-feet tall by 8.79-feet wide for an aggregate of 19.25 square feet. The non-illuminated sign shall have ¾-inch deep red and black channel letters. The sign shall be centered on Wireless Now's frontage and located on the fascia within the approved sign area per The Plaza Overall Sign Plan. The project was filed by agent Ken Sorgman on behalf of Wireless Now, and Antonio Romasanta, property owner. Related cases: 23-SB-OSP; 23-SB-CUP; 23-SB-DP AM01; 23-SB-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on August 11, 2009:

Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician, stated that the staff report lists the following issues for discussion with regard to the intent of the Overall Sign Plan (OSP) and how they relate to the current proposal: 1) Section 2-A,6 – The tenant identification sign shall display only the registered business name and shall not include identifying objects; 2) Section 2-A,7 – No product signs advertising merchandise or services carried by the tenant shall be permitted; and 3) Minor tenants are allowed two lines of text. He noted that the DRB should determine whether "Authorized Retailer" is a third line.

The plans were presented by Betty Jeppesen, representing Islay Investments, property owner; agent Ken Sorgman, Signs by Ken, sign contractor; and Jonathan, part owner and manager of the location; on behalf of Wireless Now and Antonio Romasanta, property owner. Betty Jeppesen stated that Wireless Now is a Verizon Wireless authorized dealer and she believes the proposed sign identifies the business and is not a service advertisement. She requested that the proposed sign fit under the description in the Minor Tenant 3.b section of the OSP that indicates the tenant will be allowed to display the company logo as it is typically incorporated into the company name within the allocated space. She also stated that the applicant is willing to amend the Overall Sign Plan (OSP), if needed. Ken Sorgman stated that the proposed sign was designed from an outline provided by Verizon Wireless which he believes ties into their trademark with regard to the relationship between the Wireless Now business and Verizon Wireless.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, suggested the applicant may want to consider changing the business name so the sign complies with the registered business name.

Sign Subcommittee Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) Expressed concern that the proposed sign does not comply with the OSP with regard to the issues in the staff report; b) There will be ramifications if allowances are made to the OSP that would affect the whole shopping center; c) For design purposes, the proposed sign does not work because the "verizon wireless" and "Authorized Retailer" lettering are too small to

be readable from the parking lot; d) The “Wireless Now” lettering only would be preferred; or possibly “Wireless Now” and “verizon wireless”; e) It appears the applicant is requesting signage for two businesses; and f) Possibly consider the staff suggestion to change the business name so the sign complies with the registered business name.

2. Member Schneider commented: a) Suggested that the “Authorized Retailer” lettering be moved to the second line after “verizon wireless”, with the same size lettering, and re-centering the sign; b) While the size of the proposed “Authorized Retailer” lettering is small enough not to be a concern, and the proposed design is in proportion, he is concerned that the addition of a third line of text does not comply with the OSP; and c) He noted that the proposed size of the “verizon wireless” text is barely readable.
3. Member Smith commented: a) Expressed concern that the proposed sign does not comply with the OSP with regard to the issues in the staff report.

Sign Subcommittee Motion: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to continue Item H-3, DRB Permit No. 09-100-DRB, 7127 Hollister Avenue, to September 8, 2009, with comments.

H-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-107-DRB RV

420, 430 & 490 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-130-057, -061 & -062)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The project site is located within the Fairview Corporate Center (FCC), which includes 17.31 acres gross (16.67 acres net) addressed as 420, 430, and 490 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-130-057, 071-130-061 & 071-130-062). Three commercial buildings are located on site: 420 South Fairview is a 73,203-square foot 2-story building; 430 South Fairview Avenue is a 60,797-square foot building; and 500 South Fairview Avenue is a 108,000-square foot building. The applicant proposes amendments to the FCC’s Overall Sign Plan (OSP). The proposed changes to the OSP include the relocation and redesign of a monument sign and two additional wall signs for the building at 420 South Fairview Avenue. The project was filed by Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 09-107-OSP; 02-088-OSP, -DRB. (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on August 11, 2009:

Member Schneider recused himself because the applicant is his client.

The plans were presented by Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, property owner. He stated that applicant proposes amendments to the Overall Sign Plan that include the relocation and redesign of a monument sign and two additional wall signs for the building at 420 South Fairview Avenue. He stated that there is a need for more wall signage on the building at 420 South Fairview Avenue because it has become a multi-tenant building since the OSP was approved.

Sign Subcommittee Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) The revised proposal to redesign the monument sign, which steps it back into the project, is a better design and a more elegant

- solution; b) The OSP should state that one wall sign per tenant will be allowed on the building at 420 South Fairview Avenue; and c) Multiple wall signs will tend to add clutter to the building and tends to cheapen the appearance of the building.
2. Member Smith commented: a) The proposed redesign of the monument sign is a better solution; b) The OSP should state that one wall sign per tenant will be allowed on the building at 420 South Fairview Avenue; and c) The address on the building will also be helpful for locating a tenant in the building.

Sign Subcommittee Motion: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider), to continue Item H-4, DRB Permit No. 09-107-DRB RV, 420, 430 & 490 South Fairview Avenue, to October 13, 2009, with comments.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-104-DRB RV

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-610-006)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The subject of this review is exterior building lighting for Building 2 of the Cabrillo Business Park project. No exterior building lighting was included in the Final approval granted for Building 2 by the DRB on April 14, 2009. 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. 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 on July 8, 2009 by agent Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 08-107-DP AM; 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN.

The revised plans were presented by agent Troy White of Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC, property owner; and by David Osborn, JDO Dyer, project architect.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The double-headed lighting fixtures at the entry area should be reduced to single-headed fixtures.
2. Member Branch commented: a) He agreed with Member Schneider's comment.
3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The wall mounted lights should be mounted downward so the light shines downward and there is full cut-off; and b) Suggested eliminating the double-headed lighting fixtures at the entry because the light levels are fairly constant at the entry except from the double-headed fixtures.
4. Chair Smith commented: a) He concurred with the comments.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera), to grant Revised Final Approval of Item I-1, DRB Permit No. 09-104-DRB RV, 6767 Hollister Avenue, as submitted with the following conditions: 1) The double-headed lighting standards shall be changed to

single-headed lighting standards at the entrance area; and 2) The wall lights shall be mounted downward so there will be down light only and full cut-off.

I-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-111-DRB

15 Violet Lane (APN 077-141-067)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a partially constructed 3,130-square foot residence and an attached 570-square foot 3-car garage on a 10,728-square foot lot in the DR-4.6 zone district. The applicant proposes to revise the originally approved exterior elevations including new doors, windows, exterior lighting, and a change to the exterior fire place. The square footage of the originally approved structure would not change. The project was filed by agent Lawrence Thompson on behalf of Jon Rand, property owner. Related cases: 02-014-DRB, 02-014-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

Site visits: Made by Members Messner and Smith; and Members Branch, Brown, Schneider and Wignot when the project was first reviewed.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The revised plans were presented by agent Lawrence Thompson on behalf of Jon Rand, property owner; and by John Rand, property owner.

Document: Brian Hiefield presented a letter received from Robert Larson, dated August 10, 2009, in regards to DRB Meeting of 08-11-09, Item #I-1, 15 Violet Lane, expressing concerns that include the proposed retention wall and also the possibility that there will be drainage problems.

Speaker:

Robert Larson, neighbor directly to the rear of the project, stated that he supports the proposed project but his only concern, along with other neighbors on Baker Lane, is the possibility that a fence would be added on top of the proposed four-foot retention wall, which could result in a 12-foot wall if an 8-foot fence was added. He noted that he planted 240 trees on his property and is concerned that there could be a problem with a wall of this size depriving the trees of sunlight. He also requested that consideration be given to the maintenance of the proposed wall so it does not become an eyesore.

John Rand, property owner, stated that it his understanding that the property owner of each property located above and below his property is responsible for each section of the drainage ditch which ends at each property. He believes that the drainage channel, which is four feet wide, has enough capacity to handle the drainage.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed revisions to the building are fine; b) The drainage system needs to be studied further with regard to possible impacts from the proposed construction of the retaining wall and changes regarding the slope; and c) He requested clarification regarding landscaping and exterior lighting plans. (Agent Larry Thompson stated that a landscaping plan

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 11 of 20

- was not part of the original plans for the tract and that the exterior lighting plans that were originally approved will not be changed).
2. Member Schneider commented: a) There needs to be some documentation, most likely from Penfield & Smith, the original designer of the drainage plans, to ensure that the proposed revisions will not impact the drainage system that was approved for the tract; and b) The proposed revisions to the building are fine.
 3. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed revisions will make the house very handsome; b) He supports the proposed plans for the retaining wall; c) There needs to be assurance from Penfield & Smith that the original design intent of the approved drainage plan will be satisfied; and d) The neighbor's concern regarding drainage is valid although he does not believe there will be a significant impact from his review of the plans.
 4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The improvements proposed by the applicant are appreciated; and b) There needs to be some assurances that the proposed plans are acceptable in terms of the drainage.
 5. Chair Smith commented: a) The proposed revisions to the house are a good improvement; b) He supports the applicant in being able to utilize the rear yard area; c) He believes that building the retaining wall from the interior grade on the applicant's property will be fine and it will not block out too much sun to the neighbor's property on Baker Lane; and d) There needs to be an assurance that the mechanics of the drainage system will function well.
 6. Member Messner commented: a) Comments from Penfield & Smith that address the drainage issue will be useful; and b) Most of the drainage on the property leads towards the backyard area.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote, (Absent: Herrera) to grant Revised Final Review of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-111-DRB, 15 Violet Lane, as submitted, with the following conditions: 1) The proposed drainage plan shall be consistent with the original engineered drainage plans designed by Penfield & Smith for the tract and the applicant shall provide the appropriate documentation that will be required by the Department of Building and Safety; and 2) The height of the wall shall not be built more than four feet high above grade on the applicant's property.

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-182-DRB

130 Nectarine Avenue (APN 071-061-020)

This is a request for *Final* 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 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

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 12 of 20

Thompson on behalf of Arturo Perez, property owner. Related cases: 07-182-LUP. (Continued from 7-14-09, 6-23-09). (Laura Vlk)

The plans were presented by agent Larry Thompson on behalf of Arturo Perez, property owner.

Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) He is comfortable with the plans as presented.
2. Chair Smith commented: a) He would have preferred that the applicant submitted detailed lighting cut sheets.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) He will abstain from voting on the project because he was not present at the previous DRB review.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Abstain: Schneider; Absent: Herrera) to grant Final Approval of Item J-1, DRB Permit No. 07-182-DRB, 130 Nectarine Avenue, as submitted.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-102-DRB

5650 Calle Real (APN 069-160-042)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a hotel and restaurant totaling 42,694 square feet on a 4.23-acre site in the C-2 zone district. The applicant requests new outdoor lighting fixtures to light the building façade. Four downlights are proposed to be placed on the front faces of the four pillars of the port-cochere; two uplights are proposed to be placed on the south elevation of the hotel building fronting Kingston Avenue. Each fixture would consist of an Insight Masque façade lighting fixture with a ceramic metal halide bulb emitting green light. The fixtures would be positioned so the light would not wash beyond the building façade. No other changes to building floor area, exterior elevations, or land use are proposed. The project was filed by Gary Opdahl of Holiday Inn Santa Barbara-Goleta, agent, on behalf of FCH/JPM Hospitality (SPE) LLC, property owner. (Shine Ling)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Gary Opdahl of Holiday Inn Santa Barbara-Goleta, agent, on behalf of FCH/JPM Hospitality (SPE) LLC, property owner. He presented photographs of examples of finished lighting products that exist at other locations.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 13 of 20

Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed downlights would be acceptable if the wattage is standard and toned down; b) He is not in favor of the two proposed uplights on the south elevation of the hotel, but soft downlights would be acceptable; and c) The proposed color is not the most preferable color, however, he understands the hotel branding standard aspects.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) From viewing the photograph examples, she does not believe the effect of the proposed uplights is appropriate for the neighborhood; and b) Expressed some concern regarding façade lighting that is colored.
3. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed uplighting is objectionable on the south elevation of the hotel because it will light up the whole side of the building and probably be visible from above; b) Downlighting on the south side of the building with two 70 watt downlights would be more acceptable; and c) He could support the proposed downlights on the porte-cochere which are muted and modest by comparison, and will illuminate a small area and not have such a dramatic effect.
4. Member Messner commented: a) From his experience with colored lighting, white light projects a lot more whereas the colored lighting does not project as far.
5. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed uplighting should be eliminated and changed to downlighting that is mounted up higher on the form; b) He has no concerns regarding the proposed downlights on the port-cochere area; and c) White lights are preferred, which would be more elegant, rather than the proposed green colored lighting which is not very attractive, however, he understands there are branding aspects.
6. Chair Smith commented: a) He does not have a concern with the proposed color, stating that he believes the green color will be more muted than if it was white, and that it is kind of an accent light, and he understands the branding aspects; and b) Downward lighting is preferred to the proposed uplighting.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 4 to 2 vote (Noes: Brown, Schneider; Absent: Herrera), to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-102-DRB, 5650 Calle Real, to September 8, 2009, with the following comments: 1) Convert the proposed uplighting on the south elevation of the hotel fronting Kingston Avenue to downlighting and mount the lighting fixtures higher up towards the eave; and 2) The proposed 70 watt lighting is acceptable as the maximum wattage.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-110-DRB

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes three commercial/industrial buildings totaling 50,306 square feet of floor area on a 7.95-acre site in the PI zone district and within the Airport Approach Zone. The applicant proposes to install a diesel-powered emergency power generator and a trash enclosure at the rear of the building fronting Patterson Avenue. Minor changes to the southern elevation of the building to modify door and window openings are also proposed. The generator would be housed within a sound attenuation cabinet and

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 14 of 20

enclosed by a CMU and plaster wall. An underground diesel storage tank would be located in the drive aisle between the building and the first row of parking spaces. The overall dimensions of the generator are 16 feet long by 6 feet wide; the overall dimensions of the enclosure walls are 25 feet long by 16 feet wide by 8.7 feet tall. The trash enclosure would be constructed of CMU and plaster walls with gates constructed of galvanized metal and would be 25 feet long by 13 feet wide by 6 feet tall. The project would result in a loss of 6 parking spaces, bringing the property's total parking space count to 366. The project was filed by Ed Lenvik of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Somera Patterson LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-110-SCD, -LUP; 08-199-DRB. (Shine Ling)

Site visits: None reported since the last DRB review on January 27, 2009.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Tom Beaudette and Ed Lenvik of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Somera Patterson LLC, property owner.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The applicant will need to comply with the Department of Community Services new Storm Water Management Plan requirements that the trash enclosure shall be covered.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-110-DRB, 454 South Patterson Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) The trash enclosure shall be covered to comply with the Department of Community Services new Storm Water Management Plan; and 2) The applicant shall provide cut sheets for the security monitoring camera; and that Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-110-DRB, be continued to September 8, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

RECESS HELD FROM 4:45 P.M. TO 4:52 P.M.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-039-DRB

Various locations within City Right-of-Way and utility easements across public and private parcels.

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The proposed project involves the installation of 19 radiofrequency transport service system nodes within City rights-of-way (ROWs) and utility easements over various public and private parcels throughout the City of Goleta. Each node would include an omnidirectional antenna and supporting equipment cabinet below the antenna mounted on an existing utility pole, traffic signal, or street light. Each node would be connected by fiber-optic cable installed either on existing utility poles, in joint conduit, or through shallow trenching within City streets. Support equipment for each node would be installed at a minimum

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 15 of 20

height above existing grade of nine (9) feet. Two new City standard street lights would be installed at the Pacific Oaks/Phelps and Los Carneros/Cathedral Oaks intersections to provide mounting structures for proposed nodes that are consistent in height and design with existing street lights in these locations. All antennae and supporting equipment would be non-reflective in color and materials. The electrical power supply for each node would be provided from existing utility lines installed on either existing utility poles or in joint conduit. No new utility poles for the supply of electrical power to any of the nodes are proposed. No removal or trimming of any native or any ornamental trees within any City ROWs, utility easements over either public or private parcels, or other City owned property as a result of project implementation would occur. The project was filed by HP Communications, agent on behalf of NextG Networks, Inc., the applicant. Related cases: 09-039-CP. (Alan Hanson)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The DRB members checked the vicinity map with Senior Planner Alan Hanson and determined that there was not a conflict with regard to any of the DRB members living within 300 feet of the proposed project.

Senior Planner Alan Hanson provided brief background information with regard to the proposed project. He said that the applicant will present a PowerPoint report regarding the proposed project. He stated that staff would appreciate input from the DRB as to possible design modifications such as color of equipment cabinets, location on mounting structures, etc., that could further reduce potential visual impacts without affecting system operations.

The plans were presented by Sharon James, Regional Director, Government Relations; Heidi Payne, Project Manager; Patrick Ryan, Outside Counsel; and Bill Harkness, Construction Manager; on behalf of NextG Networks, Inc., the applicant. Sharon James presented a PowerPoint entitled, "NextG Networks Fiber Based DAS Network Empowering Next Generation Wireless Networks".

Speaker:

Ken Alker, Goleta, stated that he owns a company in town that has been installing antennas along the local area for twenty years. From his experience, he stated that flat panel antennas can typically be painted, which was not possible years ago when there was lead in the paint. Yagi and metallic antennas cannot be painted. Regarding antennas that would be mounted approximately three feet off of the pole, he pointed out that painting those items the color of the mounting pole would not be appropriate because the sky is the background and the presently proposed white color would be better. He commented that when he painted these types of antennas a blue color they seemed to disappear. He will answer questions and advise the DRB members where those antennas can be viewed locally.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 16 of 20

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Paint the boxes and antennas to match the color of the pole on which they are located, if the paint meets the design criteria from an engineering perspective without affecting system operations; b) She is particularly concerned that the color of the box at the top of the pole matches the pole; and c) It is understood that staff will convey to the Community Services Department the concern from the DRB that when a street light standard is installed for the purpose of a mounting structure, the lighting from the fixtures should be fully cut-off.
2. Member Wignot commented: a) The new proposed system is appreciated particularly with regard to providing service using existing infrastructure rather than having to install new monopoles and disguise them as trees; b) He appreciates the concept that if the City allows attachment to city-owned poles, there is a revenue component the City can realize; and c) He expressed concern that there may be limits to the City's ability to review possible future requests from other providers to co-locate at the sites. (Senior Planner Alan Hanson explained that the City's telecommunications facilities ordinance limits the number of providers to three that could co-locate at any given site).
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The boxes, particularly the boxes that are mounted low on the poles, and the top mounted antennas should be painted to match the pole on which they are located; b) It would not seem necessary to paint items such as the whip antennas and wire strand mounted equipment to match the poles; and c) Agreed with Vice Chair Brown that it would be appropriate for staff to convey to the Community Services Department the DRB concern that when a street light standard is installed to serve as a mounting structure, the lighting from the fixtures should be fully cut-off.
4. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed project is a great benefit for the community; and b) Agreed that the color of the boxes and antennas should match the color of the pole on which they are located.
5. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with the preceding DRB comments.
6. Member Messner commented: a) Agreed with the preceding DRB comments.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera) to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-039-DRB, various locations within City Right-of-Way and utility easements across public and private parcels, to October 13, 2009, with comments.

RECESS HELD FROM 5:40 P.M. TO 5:45 P.M.

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-106-DRB

6878 Hollister Avenue/6868 Cortona Drive: APN 073-140-003; -004:

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The 3.05-acre property is vacant and is located within the PI (Professional/Institutional) zone district with Hotel Overlay. The applicant proposes to revise the Development Plan for the Rincon Palms Hotel and Restaurant Project, approved by the City in October 2008. The proposed revision includes: the addition of approximately 5,340 square feet of roof-top structures to improve the use of the hotel roof deck, some of which exceed the 35-foot height limit

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 17 of 20

for the PI zone district, up to a maximum of 50 feet; expansion of hotel room sizes, resulting in an increase of overall floor area from 59,600 square feet to 75,580 square feet and a reduction in room count from 112 to 102; changes to the port-cochere structure and lobby area; relocation of the ground-floor conference patio, and the elimination of 3 parking spaces (2 surface; 1 underground). The restaurant component of the Development Plan would not be changed.

The revisions would result in a project that consists of the following: A 75,580-square foot hotel, 3 stories with a partial 4th-story and underground parking garage; outdoor pool and patios; a 6,000-square foot restaurant with a 1,000-square foot outdoor dining area; trellises and repeating columns along the southern boundary of the property; sidewalk, curb, and gutter improvements along Hollister Avenue and Cortona Drive. Access is proposed from both Cortona Drive and with the neighboring M-RP building at 6868 Cortona Drive. The project was filed by Laurel Perez of Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services, agent, on behalf of Kip Bradley for Cortona Opportunities LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-106-DP RV. (Shine Ling)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling provided background information regarding the proposed project. He stated that a previous configuration of this project was reviewed by the DRB and thereafter approved by the City Council in October, 2008. The applicant has applied for a Development Plan revision which will be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

The plans were presented by Kip Bradley for Cortona Opportunities LLC, property owner; Richard Six, project architect; and Laurel Perez, of Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services, agent. Kip Bradley, stated that he believes the proposed revised project is a better plan and design than the project that was originally approved. He stated that the applicant is very interested in provided a rooftop deck that would be an exciting and inviting place to hold events.

Richard Six, project architect, presented the details of the revised Development Plan. He stated that in order to meet the Hyatt program, revisions were needed to increase the mass of the building. The proposed revision also includes the addition of a wedge element that defines the hotel as a Hyatt product and a signature porte-cochere architectural feature. He also presented aerial photographs of the site and a computer model simulation of the view from Hollister Avenue.

Kip Bradley, property owner, pointed out that the computer model simulation shows that the visual of the mountainscape is maintained. He requested that the DRB comments focus on the issues regarding height, the increased mass of the building, and the wedge element.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 18 of 20

Assistant Planner Shine Ling requested that the DRB comment with regard to the following topics that are detailed in the staff report: 1) Height and “Good Cause” finding; 2) Size/Bulk/Scale; and 3) Neighborhood Compatibility.

Speakers:

Barbara Massey, Goleta, commented that the problem with the revision is the increased height and its intrusion into the views of the mountains. She does not believe that the revised project meets the “Good Cause” finding because it creates an adverse impact on public views and this area is a scenic corridor. Regarding bulk, she commented that although lot coverage may be under the maximum requirement, building up does not mean it is better. She requested that story poles be provided to show the real view when driving on Hollister Avenue or Storke Road.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, commented that he thought the approved project was good and fit well. He does not believe the proposed roof deck will be usable except in good weather. If the deck doesn't work out because of the weather and cool breezes, he expressed concern that modifications may be needed such as installing glass walls, canvas roofs, and gas heaters, which are used at the Beachside Café for outdoor seating. He does not believe that waivers or special considerations are needed for the hotel project.

Kip Bradley, property owner, responded regarding speaker Gary Vandeman's comments that the applicant proposes adding the roof deck to provide an exciting place for people to meet, greet, and be together.

Comments:

1. Chair Smith commented: a) He appreciates the Streamline Moderne architectural style that was originally approved; b) He cannot make the “Good Cause” finding because the proposed corporate wedge element is a detriment to the views of the mountains and he does not see a corresponding public benefit; c) The corporate branding wedge element does not seem appropriate for the location as proposed; d) Consider adding more interest to the revised western elevation which is not as interesting as the western elevation in the approved project; and e) The revised overall footprint of the building and related changes including the massing and increase in floors are not problematic.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The approved building design was very nice; b) With the proposed revisions, massing has been added to the bulk of the building and the building appears somewhat “boxier”, particularly at the south elevation (he appreciated in the approved design that the east end and west ends of the building were softened with the forms that stepped.); c) He has concerns with regard to allowing a “Good Cause” finding because the proposed revision adds significant building mass that would exceed the maximum height on the fourth floor; d) While he likes the roof deck idea, and understands the proposed revisions from a usability standpoint, the proposed roof deck element is somewhat problematic; e) Consider removing the third floor from the western wing and dropping the proposed roof deck one level; f) He has some concerns from a

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 19 of 20

neighborhood compatibility standpoint regarding the location of the proposed roof deck on the west elevation; g) He suggested that the proposed roof deck may need to be moved to the east wing of the building farther away from the residential neighborhood; h) Consider lowering the wedge element to address height concerns; i) The wedge is a contemporary element that does not tie into the rest of the architecture; and j) The inverted 'V' element was integrated fairly well into the architecture.

3. Member Branch commented: a) With regard to height, the proposed revision seems to be more than architectural projections and spires, and he has concerns with regard to making the "Good Cause" finding; b) The art deco design previously approved was delicate and appreciated more; c) Expressed concern that the architectural feature that related with the restaurant design is lost with the proposed revision; d) Consider whether the corporate wedge element needs to be located on top of the design because the wedge element will exist if the tenant leaves; e) Wind and temperature concerns are valid regarding the usability of the proposed roof deck; f) The roof deck could be a great place to have events, however it feels too high as a permanent place for events; g) The suggestion from Member Schneider to drop the proposed roof deck one level would address the concern regarding height; h) He agrees somewhat with Member Schneider's concern regarding the residential neighborhood, however, the site is located near the airport where there is noise from planes; i) From a massing standpoint, the building mass has been kept relatively the same; and j) Agreed with Member Schneider's concern that the building seems "boxier" with the massing revisions to the end treatments.
4. Member Wignot commented: a) Agreed with the previous DRB comments.
5. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The approved project was appreciated because it is unique and fits in well with Goleta, b) Goleta is a very horizontal city and the approved project took advantage of the mountain views; c) The proposed revision intrudes on the view shed and the view of the mountains which are important to many members of the community; d) The proposed revision will draw attention to the project rather than integrate well into the entire neighborhood; e) The residential subdivision at the corner is an anomaly; f) The proposed roof deck does not work; g) The "Good Cause" finding cannot be made when the mountains are a backdrop to the project; h) The wedge element does not work because the architectural connection with the restaurant will be lost; i) The 'V' architectural element is not appropriate; and j) The revised design for the western elevation (Storke Road) does not have the same interest as the approved design which is elegant.
6. Member Messner commented: a) The two buildings need to be considered together so they blend; b) He appreciates the approved design because the restaurant and building worked well together; and c) Recommended that story poles be installed if the revisions, or the upper floor, will be considered further.

RECESS HELD FROM 6:55 P.M. TO 7:00 P.M.

Kip Bradley expressed appreciation for the comments from the DRB. Laurel Perez, agent, requested a continuance for one month to allow the applicant to address the DRB comments, work with Hyatt, and continue to work with staff as well.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

August 11, 2009

Page 20 of 20

MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera) to continue Item M-2, No. 09-106-DRB, 6878 Hollister Avenue, with comments, to September 8, 2009.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- **NONE**

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

None.

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Member Schneider announced that he may be absent from the DRB meeting on September 8, 2009, and will keep staff informed regarding the status.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 7:07 P.M.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 21 of 21