



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, December 8, 2009**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.**

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### **SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.**

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

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

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

### **ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.**

### **REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.**

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

#### **Members:**

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

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

---

#### **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

December 8, 2009

Page 2 of 20

## A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

## B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for November 10, 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. 09-131-DRB

6950 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-140-019)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 56,800-square foot industrial research/office building on a 3-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to install a 33-square foot diesel emergency generator with a sound attenuation enclosure in front of the northwest corner of the building. The service area would occupy 151 square feet and would include the generator, sound enclosure, and fuel tank. The enclosure would be painted green to match existing equipment on site and would be screened with landscaping. The project was filed by Craig Minus of the Towbes Group, agent, on behalf of Nassau Land Company LP, property owner. Related cases: 09-131-SCD; -LUP. (Continued from 11-10-09) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **11-10-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

1. Vice-President Brown commented: a) The applicant is requested to consult with the project landscape architect and revise the landscape plan to provide some other plant species that can provide better visual screening; b) A shrub that is taller and much denser is needed because the proposed *Agapanthus* species does not provide much screening; and c) With regard to the original landscape plan for the rear parking lot, she noticed that there appears to be at least one tree missing in the planting strip and one tree that is failing, which should be replaced.
2. Member Messner commented: a) Recommended that the applicant add plants to the landscape palette that are upright, with more of a thick nature, and at least

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

December 8, 2009

Page 3 of 20

five-foot minimum height, for visual screening, which would also help muffle some of the sounds; b) Suggested that the Wax Privet tree species would be a good plant to consider for screening purposes because it is medium-height and thick; c) He noted that there are also many other species that could be considered for better screening; d) The *Agapanthus* species would help fill in the opening at the base area below where some of the plants tend to rise up, and would be appropriate to plant along with other plantings for screening; and e) Planting the right plants means less maintenance.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider; Absent: Herrera, Wignot), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-131-DRB, 6950 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, with the following Conditions: 1) The applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan that provides better visual screening with plants that are denser, like a hedge, that will provide more of a real screen, although the plants do not need to be a hedge; and 2) The applicant shall review the original landscape plan and replace any trees that are missing from the planter strip and any tree that is failing in the rear parking lot; and to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-131-DRB, to December 8, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

### **F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-141-DRB**

5877 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-112-003)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 2,362-square foot commercial property on a 4,100-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to replace the existing bakery store front, and add landscaping and hardscape to the rear of the property to provide an outdoor seating area. This project will not result in any added square footage. The project was filed by agent Jack Shaffer on behalf of the Martin Koobation Family Trust, property owner. Related cases: LUR-47335, LUR-51775. (Continued from 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **10-27-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):**

1. Member Herrera commented: a) The proposed project is a huge improvement on the site.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed project is a great improvement; b) The colors are appreciated; and c) He noticed that there is distinctive stone material on the façade of the buildings on either side of the site which was not incorporated into the design; however, the design works well without it.
3. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with Member Branch's comments; b) The project fits in with the distinctive stone material on both sides of the project site and the warm, earthly palette of the building; and c) The idea of the bi-fold doors is appreciated.
4. Member Schneider commented: a) The design is somewhat simple and straight-forward, and works very well; and b) The intensity of the proposed color will be played down somewhat because the storefront faces north.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, DRB**

## Design Review Board Agenda

December 8, 2009

Page 4 of 20

**Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, as submitted; and to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, to December 8, 2009; for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

### **F-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-173-DRB**

420 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-130-061 & -062)

This is a request for *Revised Final* 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). Two existing buildings are located on site. 430 South Fairview Avenue is a 60,797-square foot structure and 500 South Fairview Avenue is a 108,000-square foot structure (the 11,000 square foot loading dock is to be demolished). A third 73,203-square foot 30-foot tall 2-story shell building located at 420 South Fairview Avenue is under construction. The project site will have associated parking, landscaping, hardscape, and accessory structures such as refuse and recycling areas.

The applicant proposes to revise the approved elevations, site plan and landscape plan for 420 South Fairview Avenue as follows:

- East Elevation Changes:
  - Remove the southernmost storefront window and replace with a roll-up garage door; and
- Site Plan Changes:
  - Remove two parking spaces and replace with a loading zone marking; and
  - Add ADA ramp
- Landscape Plan Changes:
  - Remove landscaping in the ADA ramp location.

The project was filed by Craig Minus of the Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 98-DP-024, 99-OA-024, 02-083-LLA, 02-088-OSP, 02-088-DP AM01, 03-166-PM (TPM 32,016), 02-088-DP AM02, 04-070-LUP, 04-110-LUP, 05-078-SCD, 05-075-MC, 06-122-DRB, 06-122-SCD, 06-122-LUP, 07-123-DRB RV01, 07-123-LUP RV01, 07-148-DRB RV02, 07-148-LUP RV02, 08-019-DRB RV03, 08-019-LUP RV03, & 09-173-LUP RV04. (Scott Kolwitz)

## **G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

## **H. SIGN CALENDAR**

### **H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-132-DRB**

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

This is a request for *Preliminary/Final* 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 (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

## Design Review Board Agenda

December 8, 2009

Page 5 of 20

Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 09-132-OSP; -CUP; -DPAM. (Continued from 10-27-09, 9-8-09) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **10-27-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):**

1. Member Brown commented: a) The plans presented for the landscaping and signs are very nice; and b) The Conceptual review has been completed.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-132-DRB, 351 South Patterson Avenue, to December 8, 2009, with comments, for Preliminary/Final Review.**

### **H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-163-DRB**

175 Cremona Drive (APN 073-330-009)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes a 51,000-square foot industrial research park building on 3.15-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to change the face of an existing monument sign and to install a new wall sign on the building's east elevation. The monument sign structure is 3.3 feet tall by 9.5 feet wide. The sign panel on the monument would be constructed of a dibond aluminum/PVC face that is 8.25 feet long by 1.6 feet tall. The panel would read "KARL STORZ – ENDOSKOPE" and "OPTRONICS" on two lines. The letters would be dark gray and have a maximum height of 4.5 inches, and the overall sign area would be 13.2 square feet. The wall sign would read "KARL STORZ" on one line and be constructed of 3/8"-thick dark blue aluminum pin mounted letters that are a maximum of 18 inches tall. The sign would be 13.4 feet long by 1.5 feet tall and have an overall sign area of 20.2 square feet. The project was filed by Betsy Harris of Freedom Signs, agent, on behalf of University Business Center Associates, property owner. Related cases: 09-163-SCC; 09-164-SCC. (Shine Ling)

### **I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR**

- NONE

### **J. FINAL CALENDAR**

- NONE

### **K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR**

#### **K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-087-DRB**

266 Spruce Drive (APN 079-530-027)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,061-square foot residence and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,968-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 1,081-square foot basement, demolish the existing 450-square foot garage, and construct an attached 472-square foot 2-car garage in the same location as the

## Design Review Board Agenda

December 8, 2009

Page 6 of 20

existing garage. The resulting 1-story structure with basement would be 3,449 square feet, consisting of a 2,977-square foot single-family dwelling with basement and an attached 472-square foot 2-car garage. 684-cubic yards of cut for grading is proposed for construction of the basement. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence aside from new doors, windows, and exterior lighting as shown on plans. The project was filed by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. Related cases: 09-092-MOD. (Continued from 10-27-09, 10-14-08, 09-23-08\*, 9-09-08\*, 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **10-27-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):**

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) that the DRB has conducted Conceptual review of Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 08-087-DRB, 266 Spruce Drive, and the DRB supports the proposed setback modification to construct a basement partially within the front yard setback because the element that is projecting into the front yard setback is below grade and non-visible, and does not add to the mass and bulk of the existing one-story house; and to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 08-087-DRB, 266 Spruce Drive, to December 8, 2009, for Preliminary review, contingent on the Zoning Administrator review.**

## **L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR**

### **L-1. 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. (Continued from 10-27-09, 9-8-09) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **10-27-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed second story can be dealt with and would probably be an acceptable architectural solution by reworking the massing, centering the upstairs mass, and with window placements to address

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

December 8, 2009

Page 7 of 20

- privacy concerns; b) Try to eliminate windows both on the north and south sides of the upper floor so the proposed main window in the master bedroom looks to the street, and the windows from the bathroom and study look towards the creek on the rear elevation; c) Centering the upstairs mass is the best place for the mass in the current footprint and provides for the one-story roof to be soft on all four sides; d) Overall there are some roof massing problems that do not work out very well, for instance, on the upper floor on the south elevation, and in the entry that may prevent the master bedroom window from facing the street; e) Many of the neighbors have requested a one-story project and have raised some valid concerns for consideration by the applicant; f) After additional testimony and driving through the neighborhood again, he believes the neighborhood is predominately one-story designs; g) With the current footprint, removing the second floor would result in a reduction in the roof peak of only approximately three feet; and h) Although Goleta does not have a solar access ordinance, the project would probably meet the City of Santa Barbara solar access guidelines, if applied.
2. Member Branch commented: a) He emphasized that, given the lot size, it is very possible to design the project with a one-story solution and it would also address the neighbors' concerns; b) The revised plans for the two-story solution, with the massing shifted to the center, is moving in the right direction but the plans as submitted are not acceptable; c) If the applicant chooses to move forward with the two-story solution, the privacy issues need to be addressed and the massing needs to be restudied; d) There should be no windows on either the south or north elevations; e) The proportions are inconsistent for all the breaks in the roof and for the massings; f) He strongly suggests the applicant look at the architecture in the neighborhood with regard to roof pitches, proportions and window layouts to get a sense of how the architecture could fit; and g) Often, in some two-story structures in Goleta, a roof that starts at the lower story runs up continuously to the second story, which may be a design concept for consideration.
  3. Member Messner commented: a) He now believes, after further study of the applicant's revised plans, that a one-story solution would be the best direction.
  4. Member Herrera commented: a) The applicant's revisions are appreciated that have addressed all of the DRB concerns; b) The master bedroom is appropriately placed in the center of the project; and c) After listening to the speakers today, he believes the applicant should further consider the possibility of a one-story solution.
  5. Chair Smith commented: a) The applicant's revisions that reworked the floor plan and adjusted the second floor are appreciated; b) However, the massing of the second floor is not acceptable, noting that the front elevation seems to be forcing a symmetry; c) He suggested as a possible consideration that the second floor be shifted southward so the roof slope could be picked up from the first floor, which would also reduce any impact on the property to the north; d) He does not believe there would be much solar impact to the property to the north with the current revised plan; e) He suggested the applicant consider a solution that is one-story which would also address the neighbors' concerns; f) If the roof height is lowered, as suggested by the project contractor, consider a vaulted ceiling in the master bedroom instead of a flat ceiling; and g) He was not present at the first project review but he has reviewed the original plans.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-034-DRB, 207 Carlo Drive, to December 8, 2009, with comments; and that the issues**

## Design Review Board Agenda

December 8, 2009

Page 8 of 20

**need to be better resolved with regard to the massing of the second floor and the window placement for privacy if the applicant moves forward with the two-story project; and that the opportunity for the applicant to study a one-story solution shall not be precluded.**

### **L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-118-DRB**

7394 Davenport Road (APN 073-222-019)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,722-square foot two-story duplex with an attached 198-square foot patio cover, an attached 220-square foot 1-car carport, and an attached 406-square foot 2-car garage on a 11,134-square foot lot in the DR-10 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 1,054-square feet in additions, consisting of a 43-square foot enclosed front porch, a 340-square foot addition on the first-floor and a 671-square foot addition on the second-floor. The resulting two-story structure would be 4,600 square feet, consisting of a 3,776-square foot duplex, a 198-square foot patio cover, an attached 220-square foot 1-car carport, and an attached 406-square foot 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Joe Echeverria on behalf of Mark and Chyoung McCann, property owners. Related cases: 70-M-17; 09-118-LUP. (Continued from 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **10-27-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) He noticed that an addition was made to another unit with a similar floor plan at the corner of Hollister Avenue and Cannon Green which was done without a cantilever; b) There were a large number of cars parked on the street in the neighborhood area which is fairly small, and he expressed some concern from the point of view of adding improvements that have the potential for intensity of use. c) He does not support the proposed cantilever which makes it seem like that portion of the building becomes more overbearing on the adjacent property to the east; d) The mass on the second floor seems very large, and suggested reducing some of the area upstairs; e) The proposed plans for the first floor are fine; and f) The lot in the back is big enough to accommodate the plans and allow for plenty of open space.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed cantilever looks odd and should be eliminated; b) He believes there is ample space to rework the square footage to accommodate the goals of the project without the cantilever; c) He noted that a cantilever adds more expense; d) Suggested the applicant restudy the roofline to address the concern that there is a lot of wall mass above the proposed window that is placed low; and e) The proposed plans for the first floor are fine.
3. Chair Smith commented: a) There are a number of elements on the whole side of the building on the southeast elevation that are not working together; b) The cantilever gives an element of uncertainty, and there seems to be sufficient space to bring in the cantilever; c) Restudy the roof plan to address the large amount of wall space above the proposed window; d) He noted it appears that the big pyramidal chimney structure needs to be firmly rooted into the ground; e) He agrees with the property owner's intent to utilize the second-story floor space; and f) He agreed with comments by Members Branch and Schneider.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.



**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-118-DRB, 7394 Davenport Road, with comments, to December 8, 2009.**

**L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-159-DRB**

6560 Camino Caseta (APN 077-412-024)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 3,053-square foot two-story residence with an attached two-car garage on a 9,148-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 380-square foot addition on the first floor and a 122-square foot unenclosed veranda on the front of the residence. The resulting two-story structure would be 3,433 square feet, consisting of a 2,971-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 462-square foot two-car garage. The proposed project exceeds the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district. Materials proposed would match those of the existing residence. The project was filed by James Zimmerman AIA, architect, on behalf of Francis and Catherine Donohoe, property owners. Related cases: 09-159-LUP. (Shine Ling)

**Applicant request to continue to January 26, 2010**

**M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR**

**M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 04-226-DRB**

7388 Calle Real (APN 077-490-043)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is currently vacant. The approximately .94 acre property is located in western Goleta at 7388 Calle Real. The parcel has a zoning designation of Design Residential (DR-12.3).

The applicant proposes to construct 10 residential condominiums within five 2-story duplexes arranged along the east side of the property (Buildings A-E). The maximum height would be 27'10". There are three duplex floor plans proposed as part of the project, identified on Sheet A4 as Plan A1, Plan A2, and Plan B. Plan A1 would occur only in Building A and would be a 3-bedroom, 2.5 bath unit (1,477 gross square feet). Plan A2 would occur in Buildings B-E and include 3-bedrooms and 2.5 baths (1,430 gross square feet). Plan B would occur in Buildings B-E and be a mirror image of Plan A2 as a 3-bedroom, 2.5 bath unit (1,430 gross square feet). All units would have natural gas fireplaces, and private open space areas which range from 272-442 square feet. Each unit would also include an attached 288-gross square foot single car garage. The total structural development including garages would be 17,230 gross square feet.

A single access to and from the condominiums would be provided from Calle Real. The minimum 24-foot wide drive aisle to the west of the garages would include a hammerhead turnaround for emergency vehicles near the tot lot between Buildings C and D. Parking would include 10 single car, attached garage spaces and 21 uncovered parking spaces located along the western property boundary, for a total of 31 parking spaces. A common trash enclosure would be provided

## Design Review Board Agenda

December 8, 2009

Page 10 of 20

adjacent to these spaces across from the hammerhead turnaround. The project would include an offer to dedicate back to the City an approximately 4,016-square foot right of way area along the Calle Real frontage for roadway purposes.

The site would require approximately 1,720-cubic yards of cut and 50-cubic yards of fill, including 1,670-cubic yards of export. A 6-foot tall screen wall would be constructed along the length of the western property boundary and a 5-foot tall retaining wall would be constructed along the western portion of the northern property boundary the length of the parking spaces and drive aisle. A 6-foot tall sound wall would be constructed along the length of the eastern property boundary from Buildings A – E, surrounding the private yards. Storm water runoff would be directed to landscaped areas, bioswales, and the storm drains equipped with cleaning inserts for all catch basins. A detention basin is proposed south of Building A east of the drive aisle.

A landscape plan for the site depicts a mixture of native, drought tolerant trees, shrubs and groundcovers. Common open space would total approximately 43% of the site exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated back to the City for transportation purposes, and includes a tot-lot play area.

The Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District would provide water and sewer service to the site. The project was filed by agent Detlev Peikert, Peikert Group Architects, on behalf of 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-047-APP. (Cindy Moore)

### **M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-128-DRB**

Camino Vista Road (APN 073-060-044; -045; -046; -047; -048)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is currently vacant. The 4.92 acre (214,122 square feet) property is located north of Hollister Avenue, between the Aero Camino Industrial area on the east and Los Carneros Way/Calle Coral on the west. The project site is located immediately north of and would be internally connected to the existing Willow Springs residential development and common open space within the Inland Area of the City zoned Design Residential (DR-20).

The applicant proposes to construct a 100-unit condominium project, to be known as Willow Springs Phase II. The project's 100 units would be incorporated into 10 new, two-story, residential, stacked flats of four to sixteen units per building, with one building containing a single-story element, a 480-square foot common laundry room. There would be a mix of unit types, as follows: 48 – 1 Bed/1 Bath; 12 – 2 Bed/1 Bath; 16 – 2 Bed/2 Bath; 24 – 3 Bed/2 Bath.

Each of the 100 units is proposed to have its own washer and dryer hook-up, in addition to the one common laundry area. Building coverage, including patios, would be 59,780 square feet and the total gross building area of the project would be 97,992 square feet.

## Design Review Board Agenda

December 8, 2009

Page 11 of 20

The proposed architectural style and elevations would match the existing 235-unit Willow Springs development. In addition, the proposed second phase would be incorporated into the existing development and utilize the existing amenities, which include (i) a natural soft-surfaced path around the perimeter of the 2.37-acre open space area on APN 073-060-050, together with a wooden split-rail fence; (ii) a community swimming pool and two spas; (iii) tot lot, group picnic and barbeque area; and (iv) a 3,140-square foot clubhouse with fitness facilities. All active and passive recreational areas and common open space areas are proposed to be for the use of all residents of the proposed project and of the existing Willow Springs project.

Vehicular access to the site will be from Los Carneros Road via Calle Koral and Camino Vista; both are public roadways. Camino Vista will be extended from its current terminus at the boundary of the existing Willow Springs development connecting with the short section of Camino Vista at Aero Camino. The development itself will be served by Willow Springs Court, a private roadway. Camino Vista will include bicycle lanes on both sides of the street. No on-street parking would be provided on either side of Camino Vista. The applicant proposes 184 parking spaces within the project site.

Grading quantities are estimated at 450-cubic yards of cut, 33,100-cubic yards of fill and 32,650-cubic yards of import. All major grading will be completed on the entire site before occupancy phasing would begin. Parking and landscaping for every building in a phase will be completed before occupancy clearance for that phase.

The project provides 61,504 square feet of landscaping around the buildings, parking lot, and along Camino Vista Road. The intent of the landscape design is to blend the new development with the existing by using a similar plant palette and informal landscape style. The proposed landscape palette is comprised of drought-tolerant California native and Mediterranean plants. A bio-swale planted with native moderate-water use carex will cleanse first-flush stormwater and dry season flows from the parking area. Landscape irrigation will be regulated with a climate-based irrigation control system, and supplied by a mix of efficient spray and drip irrigation.

Lot 20 of the Willow Springs property provides 103,368 square feet (2.37 acres) of protected open space (recreational access is limited to decomposed granite path around the perimeter of the open space). Replacement plantings to mitigate project impacts on Coastal Sage Scrub are proposed on Lot 20 by replacing ornamental plantings with Coastal Sage Scrub mitigation plantings. The applicant proposes the same treatment for the eastern project boundary as is in place at the existing Willow Springs development: construction of a concrete block retaining wall, and behind that wall construction of a concrete plank wall to partially shield the residential development from the adjacent industrial uses. The overall wall height will be a maximum of 10 feet above the flow line of the drainage channel on the east side of the wall and 6 feet above finish grade on the west side of the wall.

## Design Review Board Agenda

December 8, 2009

Page 12 of 20

Screening is proposed to be provided for the residential development through vines on the wall, and trees and shrubs.

A drainage channel will be located east of the wall. A 10 foot sewer easement exists on the west side of the proposed perimeter wall. All drainage from the proposed Willow Springs II development is tributary to the previously constructed Willow Springs development. Storm drains, the detention basin and bio-filters in the existing Willow Springs project are sized to accommodate the future phased development of Willow Springs II. All runoff will ultimately drain to the existing vegetated open space (wetland) located along the southern boundary of Willow Springs. This vegetated open space of approximately 7.25 acres serves as an on-site retention basin and bio-filter.

The project was filed by Courtney Seeples of the Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 08-128-GPA, -SPA, -VTM, -DP, -CUP and Lot Merger. (Natasha Campbell)

### **M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-075-DRB**

6300 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-050-020)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. This is a request for *Conceptual* review of a 140-room extended stay hotel on a vacant portion of a parcel located at 6300 Hollister Avenue, between La Patera Lane and Robin Hill Road. The project site occupies the westerly 3.81 acres of a larger 10.95-acre parcel that contains an existing research-manufacturing facility, known as the Hollister Center. The 3.81 acres would be split to create the separate parcel for the hotel development. Reciprocal access and parking with the Hollister Center would be provided. The property is presently zoned M-RP (Industrial Research Park).

The proposed hotel is approximately 99,634 square feet and is designed in a U-shape configuration around a pool, framed by three building wings, each three-stories in height. The main entrance is oriented toward Hollister Avenue with access served from both Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. A new landscaped island in Hollister Avenue and a new left turn lane for eastbound vehicles approaching the hotel would be provided. Vehicles exiting the hotel's Hollister Avenue driveway would be limited to right turns only.

A total of 132 surface parking spaces are provided around the building perimeter, with 27 additional spaces that would be provided through a reciprocal parking agreement with the Hollister Center.

The proposed architecture is characterized as contemporary Mediterranean with emphasis on smooth stucco finish, accent awnings, wood trellis, cornice mouldings and concrete roof tile. Proposed uses include a pool, fitness center, library, guest laundry, and approximately 1,875 square feet of meeting space. The proposed hotel is intended to accommodate extended stay guests and would have full kitchens in each room. The project does not include a restaurant, but it is proposed to have a small ground floor kitchen to provide complimentary breakfast and a manager's reception in the evening.

## Design Review Board Agenda

December 8, 2009

Page 13 of 20

Trees would be placed along frontages, entry ways, parking areas, and elsewhere throughout the property. The plan also includes shrubs, groundcovers, vines, and biofiltration plants.

Utilities along the property's Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road frontage would be placed underground. An existing lift station located along Hollister Avenue is planned to be relocated eastward on Hollister Avenue by the GSD prior to construction of the hotel. Water service would be provided by the Goleta Water District. (Natasha Campbell)

### **M-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-154-DRB**

7402 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-064)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. On the eastern parcel of the HBP the applicant proposes to construct a wireless communications facility 12 feet from the eastern property line. A 50-foot tall monopine would be constructed to support 12 antennae. The service area would occupy 623 square feet and would include the monopine structure and associated equipment cabinets. Up to 2 parking spaces would be displaced by the facility. The project was filed by Scott Dunaway of SureSite Consulting Group, LLC, agent, on behalf of T-Mobile USA, Inc., lessee, and Hollister Business Park LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-154-CUP. (Continued from 11-10-09) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **11-10-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

1. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) There needs to be a better shape for the monopine so it will appear fuller, with more of a conical form rather than a form that is more rectangular; and b) Since the proposed monopine will be located near a landscaped area, it would seem appropriate to add some landscaping.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) He noted that he voted in favor of a previous monopine application, and although he did not like the completed project, it is only seen close up by very few people; and b) If a monopole cannot be designed without antennas hanging off it, a monopine design would be okay.
3. Chair Smith commented: a) The Eucalyptus tree design would be more in keeping with the surrounding area.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot), to continue Item M-3, DRB Permit No. 09-154-DRB, 7402 Hollister Avenue, to December 8, 2009, with the following comments: 1) The applicant is requested to provide a photograph of a shape for the proposed monopine that is more conical and fuller so there is an understanding regarding the details such as the number of branches and the dimensions of the shape; and 2) The applicant is requested to provide a proposed landscape plan .**

## **N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

December 8, 2009

Page 14 of 20

- **NONE**

### **O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**O-1. AD HOC COMMITTEE FORMATION**

**O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

**O-3. 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**

December 8, 2009

Page 16 of 20

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

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

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

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

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

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

December 8, 2009

Page 17 of 20

- 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

December 8, 2009

Page 18 of 20

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**

December 8, 2009

Page 19 of 20

### **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**

December 8, 2009

Page 20 of 20

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.