



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, September 8, 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)

---

#### **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

September 8, 2009

Page 2 of 17

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

### B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

#### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for August 11, 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

#### F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-110-DRB

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

This is a request for *Final* 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 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. (Continued from 8-11-09) (Shine Ling)

# Design Review Board Agenda

September 8, 2009

Page 3 of 17

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

## **8-11-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

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.**

## **G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

## **H. SIGN CALENDAR**

### **H-1. 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 *Preliminary/Final* 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 8-11-09, 7-14-09, 6-23-09) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

## **8-11-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

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 Agenda

September 8, 2009

Page 4 of 17

### H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-055-DRB

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* 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:

#### **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 8-11-09, 7-14-09) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **8-11-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

##### **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 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.

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 8, 2009

Page 5 of 17

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-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.

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 8, 2009

Page 6 of 17

Related cases: 23-SB-OSP; 23-SB-CUP; 23-SB-DP AM01; 23-SB-LUP.  
(Continued from 8-11-09) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **8-11-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

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. 09-108-DRB**

5650 Calle Real (APN 069-160-042)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* 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 proposes to construct a new freestanding monument sign and a new wall sign. The monument sign would be 27 feet tall by 12.2 feet wide and have a sign area of 88 square feet and would display the Holiday Inn logo and "Holiday Inn" in green internally illuminated letters on a white pylon. The wall sign would display the Holiday Inn logo and "Holiday Inn" in white internally illuminated letters that are a maximum of 2.75 feet tall. The wall sign would be 21.3 feet wide by 4.1 feet tall and have a sign area of 76 square feet. The project was filed by Sue Modereger of Contractors Permit Services, agent, on behalf of Felcor Lodging Holding Company LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-108-SCC; 09-109-SCC. (Shine Ling)

### **H-5. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-132-DRB**

351 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-090-022; -023)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The properties include a 93,090-square foot hospital and a 41,224-square foot medical office building located on two parcels totaling 10 acres in area. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 8, 2009

Page 7 of 17

(OSP) for the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital campus. The proposed OSP provides for three (3) different types of signs: monument signs, directional signs, and wall signs. The project was filed by Maruja Clensay of Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services, agent, on behalf of Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 09-132-OSP; -CUP; -DPAM. (Shine Ling)

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### 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. (Continued from 8-11-09) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **8-11-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

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

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 8, 2009

Page 8 of 17

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. 09-034-DRB**

207 Carlo Drive (APN 077-181-008)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property is a 9,150-square foot graded vacant lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. An existing capped and abandoned former Goleta Water District well is located on the property. The applicant proposes to construct a new 2,460-square foot 2-story single family dwelling with an attached 438-square foot 2-car garage, consisting of 1,533 square feet on the first-floor and 927 square feet on the second-floor. The applicant also proposes to construct an attached 130-square foot patio cover. The resulting 2-story structure including the attached 2-car garage would be 2,898 square feet plus the proposed patio cover. This proposal is within the maximum allowable floor area for this property, which is 2,677 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. The project was filed by Vijay Prajapati, property owner. Related cases: 09-034-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

### **L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-099-DRB**

7588 Hempstead Avenue (APN 079-381-016)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,743-square foot residence and an attached 489-square foot 2-car garage on a 6,196-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to permit an as-built 373-square foot front yard trellis over the existing concrete driveway as well as restore the garage conversion constructed without permit back to a compliant 2-car garage, and remove a storage shed in the side yard setback. There are no changes to the existing single family dwelling. The project was filed



## Design Review Board Agenda

September 8, 2009

Page 9 of 17

by agent Paul Zink, AIA on behalf of Taylor Smith and Kim Cole, property owners.  
Related cases: 09-099-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

### **L-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-120-DRB**

7230 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-020-021)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 26,534-square foot commercial/industrial building on a 2.04 acre lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to enclose an existing porch into a 280-square foot lobby with a 60-square foot awning over the door. The applicant also proposes to construct a 156-square foot covered enclosure around the existing trash area. All materials used for this project are to match the existing commercial property. The project was filed by agent JD Augustus on behalf of BEI Industrial Encoders, property owner. Related cases: 09-120-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

### **L-5. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-121-DRB**

6466 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-070-035)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes three commercial/industrial buildings totaling approximately 41,000 square feet of floor area on a 5.45-acre site in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to divide an existing warehouse building at 6466 Hollister Avenue and convert the western half to a retail showroom and service facility for motorcycles (10,773 square feet). Exterior improvements include a new storefront to the southwest corner of the building, storefront glazing to existing door locations, exterior wall lighting, and a new 473-square foot storage area enclosed by a CMU wall with stucco finish. A new 1,660-square foot concrete vehicle display pad is also proposed in front of the building's southwest corner along Hollister Avenue. New colors proposed include Benjamin Moore 'Greenmount Silk HC-3' (beige) for the stucco and Benjamin Moore 'Moroccan Red 1309' for recessed wall areas. The project was filed by Edward de Vicente, AIA, architect, on behalf of Randy Hudspeth of Santa Barbara Motorsports, tenant, and Hollinaros LP, property owner. Related cases: 09-121-LUP. (Shine Ling)

## **M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR**

### **M-1. 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 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;

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 8, 2009

Page 10 of 17

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 4<sup>th</sup>-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. (Continued from 8-11-09) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **8-11-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

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 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

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 8, 2009

Page 11 of 17

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.

**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

#### 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**

September 8, 2009

Page 13 of 17

### **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.
- 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.

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 8, 2009

Page 14 of 17

- 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.

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.

## Design Review Board Agenda

September 8, 2009

Page 15 of 17

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.

### 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.

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

September 8, 2009

Page 16 of 17

### **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 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



## **Design Review Board Agenda**

September 8, 2009

Page 17 of 17

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.