



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - UNAPPROVED

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)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Smith at 3:00 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

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

Board Members absent: None.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Assistant Planner; Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for November 10, 2009

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Abstain: Herrera, Schneider, Wignot) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for November 10, 2009, as submitted.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the Subcommittee met today and reviewed items on the agenda that included updating the Street Tree Subcommittee Recommended Outline Revised 2/11/2009. He stated that by motion, the Subcommittee updated the recommended Outline which will be forwarded to City staff and the Design Review Board.

Member Wignot stated that the purpose of the update of the Outline was to provide clarification regarding some of the items that were vague and needed explanation, which included the industry standards for nursery plants and recommendations regarding contract work.

Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that Randy Baldwin, San Marcos Growers, attended the meeting to comment on the review of the "Diversity of California's Urban Forest" list and the process for adding more tree species to the Recommended Street Tree List. Bill Millar, Parks and Open Space Manager (City Arborist), was absent from the Subcommittee meeting today due to illness. Randy Baldwin made some brief comments regarding the Recommended Street Tree Planting List, and stated that he will contact Bill Millar and that he will plan to attend the next Subcommittee meeting. Bill Millar is in the process of compiling a spreadsheet that will be used in the review process for adding more trees to the Recommended Street Tree Planting List.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that the first public meeting regarding the Urban Forest Management Plan was held on November 18, 2009, and was attended by approximately 25 or 30 interested persons. He stated that staff will work with Bill Millar, Parks and Open Space Manager, to schedule future agenda items before the DRB with regard to the Urban Forest Management process.

Member Wignot reported that the next Street Tree Subcommittee meeting will be held on January 26, 2010, at 2:00 p.m.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported: 1) On November 16, 2009, a dedication was held for the Los Carneros Interchange Landscaping Project. 2) On November 17, 2009, the City Council completed consideration of the Track 3 General Plan

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 3 of 28

Amendment process. 3) On November 18, 2009, a public meeting was held regarding the development of the Urban Forest Management Plan process. Staff will provide status reports regarding the process as it moves forward. 4) The November 24, 2009, DRB meeting was cancelled. 5) On December 1, 2009, the City Council selected Councilmember Onnen as Mayor and Margaret Connell as Mayor Pro Tem for the term beginning December 2, 2009, through December 7, 2010. 6) On December 3, 2009, the Zoning Administrator hearing considered the Overall Sign Plan for Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital and also the proposed project at 266 Spruce Drive; 7) The purpose of Discussion Item O-1 Ad Hoc Committee Formation on today's agenda is to consider the request from the applicant for the Westar project that was made after the review of the project on November 10, 2009, to meet with a few members of the DRB to help facilitate the review process. 8) The DRB terms for Member Herrera and Chair Smith will expire at the end of January 2010. Both Members are requested to consider reapplying, and if they choose not to, then consider providing assistance in finding other qualified applicants. 9) Staff will provide a list of the length of the terms for the current DRB members. 10) On December 14, 2009, the Planning Commission will review the Jordano's Master Plan Project. 11) The DRB meeting for December 22, 2009, has been cancelled. 12) The next DRB meeting will be on January 12, 2010.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, expressed appreciation to the DRB and staff for their talent, time and energy in keeping Goleta a better place. He wished everyone a happy new year.

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

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported that the applicant for Item F-2, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, requested a continuance to January 12, 2010; and the applicant for Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, 6560 Camino Caseta, requested a continuance to January 26, 2010. He stated that staff recommends that Item M-4, 7402 Hollister Avenue, be moved to the beginning of the Conceptual Calendar because Items M-1, M-2 and M-3, may take a longer time for review. Staff also recommends that the DRB recess at approximately 5:00 p.m. before continuing with Items M-1, M-2, and M-3. Scott Kolwitz stated that all interested parties have been notified with regard to the estimated times the items will start based on the staff recommendation.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item F-2, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, to January 12, 2010, per the applicant's request; to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, 6560 Camino Caseta, to January 26, 2010, per the applicant's request; and to approve the staff recommendation regarding agenda management for today's meeting.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 4 of 28

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that today he reviewed Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-131-DRB, 6950 Hollister Avenue; and Item F-3, DRB Permit 09-173-DRB, 420 S. Fairview Avenue.

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)

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on December 8, 2009:

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that today he reviewed Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-131-DRB, 6950 Hollister Avenue, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted.

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)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item F-2, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, to January 12, 2010, per the applicant's request.

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

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 5 of 28

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)

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on December 8, 2009:

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Member Branch reported that today he reviewed Item F-3, DRB Permit 09-173-DRB, 420 S. Fairview Avenue, and that Revised Final Approval was granted as submitted.

Vice Chair Brown asked if there was any replacement landscaping for the landscaping that was removed.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, clarified that the amount of landscaping that was removed was only enough to provide for a ramp from the sidewalk to the loading area, and that the landscaping was not replaced. He noted that landscaping on the proposed project site is 29.5 percent, which exceeds the City's minimum landscaping requirement for 23 percent of the overall site.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown reported that the Sign Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-132-DRB, 351 South Patterson Avenue; and Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 09-163-DRB, 175 Cremona Drive.

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

Sign Subcommittee Action on December 8, 2009:

The plans were presented by Maruja Clensay of Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services, agent on behalf of Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner.

Shine Ling, Assistant Planner, stated that since the last DRB review, Community Services staff looked at the site locations of some of the monument signs and requested that the directional monument signs on Patterson Avenue be moved in a couple of feet to satisfy driver safety sight vision requirements, which has been done and is reflected on the site plan. He also reported that the Zoning Administrator has approved the Overall Sign Plan.

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) Based upon review by the Community Services Department, the location of several of the monument signs were changed on the site plan to reflect and comply with safety concerns; and b) There have been no other changes to the plans since the last DRB review.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to grant Preliminary Approval and Final Approval of Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-132-DRB, 351 South Patterson Avenue, as submitted.

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

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 7 of 28

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)

Sign Subcommittee Action on December 8, 2009:

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Dan Morris, Freedom Signs, agent, on behalf of University Business Center Associates, property owner. He stated that he believes the registered business name of the tenant is "Karl Storz - Endoskope", and that "Optronics" may be a division.

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) The proposed height for the lettering on Sign B needs to be reduced; b) The proposed materials and color for Sign B are nice; c) The proposed language in Sign A includes the word "Optronics" which appears to be language that is in addition to the name of the business; d) The language "Optronics" would be acceptable on the sign, although she has a concern that it is an example of an application for a sign that is contrary to the existing Sign Ordinance, which is an issue that may be researched by staff with regard to the registered business name; and e) She noted that the whole monument sign is taken up by the applicant's signage, and it seems like it may complicate things if, at some point in the future, the applicant does not use the whole building and another tenant would need to have space on the sign. (Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that any proposed changes in the future that are not consistent with the Sign Ordinance could be addressed via a voluntary Overall Sign Plan.)
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed height for the lettering on Sign B should be reduced to 15 inches.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to grant Preliminary Approval and Final Approval of Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 09-163-DRB, 175 Cremona Drive, as submitted, with the following conditions: 1) The height of the proposed lettering on the building sign, "KARL STORZ", (Sign B) shall be reduced to 15 inches; 2) The monument sign (Sign A) is acceptable as proposed; and 3) Staff shall work with the applicant to research the issue with regard to the legal registered business name of the tenant, with regard to Sign A.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 8 of 28

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 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)

Brian Hiefield, Assistant Planner, reported that the Zoning Administrator granted the request for a front yard setback modification on December 3, 2009.

The plans were presented by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. Brian Nelson stated that no changes have been made to the plans since the last DRB Conceptual review.

Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) When looking at the front elevation, it seems like some kind of low-lying shrub will do well in front of the light well.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The applicant will need to provide a landscape plan for the front yard, from the public's view of the front yard, to include the area next to the stairwell that goes to the lower level.
3. Member Wignot commented: a) The wrought-iron style safety rail that is shown around the exterior stairwell is a good change from the previous solid stucco concrete detail because it makes the existence of the stairwell more noticeable; and b) The applicant will need to provide for drainage in the stairwell that goes to the lower level. (Brian Nelson stated that a sump pump will be provided for drainage in the stairwell.)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 08-087-DRB, 266 Spruce Drive, with the following Conditions: 1) The applicant shall submit a color and material board; 2) The rail around the exterior stair that goes down to the lower level shall be detailed on the plans; and 3) The applicant shall provide a

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

landscape plan for the front yard; and to continue Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 08-087-DRB, to February 23, 2010, for Final review on the Final Calendar.

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)

Recused: Vice Chair Brown recused herself, stating that she believes it will be appropriate because she was absent from the previous meeting. She exited the Council Chambers.

The plans were presented by Vijay Prajapati, property owner, and Punam Prajapati, project contractor. Vijay Prajapati stated that since the last DRB meeting, he responded to the comments and concerns from the DRB and neighbors, and decided to revise the plans from a two-story project to a single-story project, with four bedrooms and 2.5 baths.

Documents: 1) Letter from Robert W. Kuntz, neighbor, dated December 2, 2009, expressing support for the revised plans for a single-story house; and 2) Letter from James P. Baxter, neighbor, dated December 8, 2009, in support of the latest set of plans which provide for a single-story residence.

Speakers:

Stacey Boles, neighbor to the north, stated that she and her husband acknowledge the applicant's consideration of the concerns of the neighbors, and they appreciate the DRB's comments encouraging the applicant to consider the neighbors' comments and a single-story project. After the last hearing, she and her husband re-read their letters of objection to the two-story project. She believes they were well-founded in their objections and that they made their view and intentions clear about something they felt very strongly about. She wished the property owners the best of luck. She believes that the revised plans look much better and are much more appropriate for the lot, and that it will now be appropriate for the architectural style and landscaping to be reviewed by the DRB. She found the DRB process to be very interesting.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 10 of 28

Jim P. Baxter, neighbor, stated that with the elimination of the second story, he now has no objections to the revised set of plans for a single-store residence, and he supports the revised plans. He appreciates that the comments of the neighbors were taken into consideration within the review process. He submitted a letter dated December 8, 2009, in support of the single-story project.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) He did not attend the previous hearing, but he has read the minutes and reviewed the plans; b) The project is moving in a good direction, particularly with the single-story solution that addresses the neighbors' concerns; c) The applicant is requested to provide details regarding the tile roof materials; and d) Consider landscaping or some other method, to mitigate the effect of headlights in the evening from traffic at the Ravenscroft/Carlo intersection, particularly from traffic turning to the south onto Carlo Drive from Ravenscroft.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The applicant has done a great job with the revised plans which will make the project very livable from within, and the building will be appropriate for the site as well as for the community; b) The applicant's consideration of the neighbors concerns are applauded, noting that the DRB did not require changing the plans to a single-story solution; c) Some landscaping should be added to the project; d) The concern regarding headlights at night can be addressed with landscaping; e) The elevations are okay from a massing standpoint; f) The roof plan does not seem quite right, noting that the little gable form looks like it is sticking up with regard to the ridge, and the location of the California roof may be different than shown on the plans; g) Restudy the front entry form because it seems a little "leggy", noting that possibly the columns are too thin or may need some sort of base; h) Consider changing the round chimney cap to something more square; i) The proposed patio cover in the rear is a nice feature; and j) Considering there is a 9-foot plate, possibly make the windows bigger or add a transom above the windows to enhance the elevation.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The single-story solution will be a win-win for the applicant and the neighbors; b) The applicant will need to provide a landscape plan for the front yard; c) On the elevations, the architecture appears like just windows on a wall plane, and suggested the applicant look at the architecture in the neighborhood and possibly consider adding details such as corbels, trim around the windows, or setting the windows back; d) The columns at the front entry are too thin in relation to their height, and one solution may be to widen the whole form; e) The roof plan showing the roof raised up above the other roof is appreciated; f) The applicant will need to provide details regarding colors, materials and exterior lighting fixtures; g) Staff is requested to ensure that preservation standards are observed with regard to the oak tree to minimize impacts; and h) The drip line for the oak tree is probably significantly larger than what is shown on the plans. (Brian Hiefield, Assistant Planner, stated that there are standards with regard to tree preservation).
4. Member Messner commented: a) The applicant did well with the single-story solution which addresses the "big picture," noting that he had an understanding with regard to the applicant's intent for a two-story proposal.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 11 of 28

5. Member Herrera commented: a) The applicant has responded well to the DRB comments and has addressed neighbors' concerns by changing to a single-story solution; and b) The applicant needs to provide a landscape plan for the front of the house.
6. Chair Smith commented: a) He would have supported a two-story design, but he believes the applicant took the right path, noting it is not easy to redesign a project from two-stories to a single-story; b) Agreed with comments from Members Branch, Schneider and Wignot regarding design; c) Restudy the shape of the fireplace shroud; d) Restudy the front entry and consider possibly widening the columns or widening the whole entry; and e) Overall, the plans look very good.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Brown) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-034-DRB, 207 Carlo Drive, with the following comments: 1) The applicant shall provide details including colors and materials, the landscaping plan; and cut sheets for exterior lighting fixtures, 2) The applicant shall provide details that address the DRB comments regarding the entry form, the fireplace shroud, and the addition of some architectural details such as adding trim around the windows or setting the windows back; and to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-034-DRB, to January 26, 2010.

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)

Recused: Vice Chair Brown recused herself. Member Wignot recused himself because he was not at the meeting when this item was first presented.

Vice Chair Brown and Member Wignot exited the Council Chambers.

Documents: Letter from Irene Chambers, neighbor/property owner, received on November 30, 2009, expressing concerns regarding the proposed project. Her concerns include her comment that a small renovation would be acceptable but to add such a large addition would be out of keeping with the size of the other duplexes and would encourage more occupants, thus more cars.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 12 of 28

The plans were presented by agent Joe Echeverria on behalf of Mark and Chyoung McCann, property owners. Joe Echeverria stated that all of the DRB comments from the previous hearing have been addressed. In response to the letter from Irene Chambers, Chyoung McCann, property owner, stated that her tenant in Unit A is one person who has lived there since 1995, and that her son, his wife and their baby, reside in Unit B; so she does not believe the proposed project will basically increase any traffic. Chyoung McCann also stated that the proposed addition is located pretty much towards the back and is not very visible from the front side.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that when Conceptual review is completed, the project will need to be reviewed by the Director of Planning and Environmental Services before the DRB conducts Preliminary review.

Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed plans are okay in concept; b) The applicant has previously addressed his aesthetic concern regarding the architecture, that included eliminating the cantilever; and c) The only other issue is parking, which has been explained by the applicant and considered.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) When driving through the neighborhood, it appears that there is obviously a parking issue in the entire neighborhood, but he is not sure there would be much of an impact from the addition of the one bedroom; b) The lot at the proposed site is quite large; c) The proposed addition will be in the back and will not be very perceivable from the public view; and d) The changes made by the applicant helped and are appreciated.
3. Member Herrera commented: a) The applicant addressed the DRB comments; and b) The proposed plans are okay.
4. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with comments made by Member Schneider.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Recused: Brown, Wignot) to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-118-DRB, 7394 Davenport Road, with comments, to January 26, 2010, for review on the Preliminary Calendar.

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)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, 6560 Camino Caseta, to January 26, 2010, per the applicant's request.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

AGENDA MANAGEMENT (4:07 P.M.)

Chair Smith stated that the next item for review will be Item M-4, DRB Permit No. 09-154-DRB, 7402 Hollister Avenue.

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 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

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 14 of 28

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)

Cindy Moore, Senior Planner, presented a brief summary of the review process that has been conducted to date with regard to the proposed project. She stated that, most recently, in August, 2009, the City Council reviewed alternatives that were presented by the applicant, and directed staff to move forward with the processing of the 10 Unit Condominium Development project. She noted that there was no staff analysis of the alternatives that were presented by the applicant to the City Council. She also explained the three modification requests with regard to the proposed project.

The plans were presented by agent Detlev Peikert, and Lisa Plowman, Peikert Group Architects, on behalf of 7388 Calle Real, LLC, property owner. Detlev Peikert stated that when the alternatives were reviewed by the City Council, the proposed project for a 10-Unit Condominium Development is the alternative that was preferred. He stated that the affordable component was removed from the plans; in lieu fees will be paid by the applicant. He noted that a little more of the open space has been spread between the buildings which previously were 4-unit buildings and have been changed to duplex buildings. He stated that the height of the highest point in the proposed project is 28 feet, and that the mean height is approximately 24 feet. The applicant presented a PowerPoint entitled, "Citrus Village 7388 Calle Real, Goleta, California 10 Unit Condominium Development", which included an aerial view of the proposed project footprint and a photo-realistic perspective.

Speakers:

Richard Foster, Goleta, stated that when he filed an appeal to the approval of the previous project, the issues were largely size, bulk and scale, and the way that the three buildings seemed to loom over the neighborhood. Some of the neighbors were also concerned about the three-story element being introduced into the neighborhood. Overall, he believes that the proposed project answers most of his issues of concern and that it is a much better project. He appreciates that that the number of buildings has increased to the five duplex buildings which facilitates getting more space between the buildings. Also, the access is better with the entrances on the side, and the rooflines are softer with straight gables. He noted; however, that it appears that the proposed project is "puffed up", and that the spaces between the buildings have

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 15 of 28

changed from 15 feet between buildings to 13 feet since the previous project. When viewing the aerial photograph, he believes the footprint shows that the proposed buildings are now getting more towards the scale of the houses around the area.

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, agreed with the comments from speaker Richard Foster. She believes that the five-building design and layout is far superior to what was presented previously. She expressed concern that it is her understanding that the project preferred by the City Council adds another 300 square feet to the buildings and an additional 50 square feet for each garage, which results in smaller yards and setbacks that will require modifications. She stated that this neighborhood does not need additional square footage on this property. She noted that the proposed FAR is now .42 and that the FAR in the neighborhood ranges from approximately .18 to .25. She requested discussion regarding the status of the six-foot sound wall and the drainage that will now be in the private area. She expressed concern that the access and parking seems tight.

The applicant responded to questions from the DRB Members. Lisa Plowman stated that the sound wall on the eastern side of the property will address noise concerns from Highway 101 with regard to the private outdoor living areas, and that construction techniques will address noise concerns inside the units. Lisa Plowman clarified that when the alternatives were presented to the City Council, the plans were reviewed as a concept for 10 units in a duplex format, and that the square footages were not studied at a specific level of detail. Detlev Peikert stated that the proposed floor plan reflects that the size of the units is pretty modest.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) He supports the proposed building design which is an improvement from what was previously reviewed by the DRB; b) Building out over the garages, rather than having detached garages, is appreciated; c) The single trash enclosure for all of the units is a good solution but it should probably be larger and covered, and have receptacles for recyclables and green waste in addition to trash; d) It is understood that the purpose of the gate along the eastern side of the property, on the sound wall, is to provide access for maintenance purposes only; e) It seems like the private yard could be expanded for Unit 10 by moving the entry gate westward so it is on the same line as Unit 9; f) Unit 1 is the only unit that does not have an exterior gate in the private yard, which should be studied, and consider adding a gate through the sound wall from the detention basin site into the backyard of Unit 1; and g) Re-check to ensure that the calculation is correct for the total common open space on the site, which should not include hardscape walkway areas.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed project is much more appropriate and successful for the site, and better than the project reviewed previously for 12 units which seemed tight, although an effort was made to utilize an affordable housing component; b) The floor plans are modest from a spatial standpoint, and he understands the type of circulation needed that goes from one end to the back; c) It would be preferable if the entries were located a bit closer to the front, instead of having to walk all the way to the back; which would be worth considering to

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 16 of 28

- potentially restudy; d) The architectural detail with regard to the elevations is relatively successful; and e) Some of the little dormer gables seem small and might need to be somewhat larger.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed project is working quite well, and the plans work relatively well from a site plan standpoint; b) The calculations need to be verified to ensure that the open space requirement is met; c) The architectural details are relatively nice and fully detailed; d) The two different styles, and the different materials going from the shingle to the board and bat, all work pretty well; e) There are some minor architectural details that will need to be refined and made more consistent as the project moves forward, such as the little entry on the Calle Real side which appears to be more classical because it does not have an overhang, f) Also, the architecture style of the building is leaning more towards Craftsman or Ranch, but there is a classical entry form that does not seem to tie in from an architectural consistency standpoint, although it is a fun type of element; and g) The freestanding trellis elements over the garage doors work great.
 4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed plans are good and are much improved and better than the plans previously reviewed by the DRB; b) Expressed concern that Grasscrete areas sometimes do not work very well because it ends up being more concrete than grass and requires more maintenance; therefore, she requested that the applicant explore an alternative that would facilitate making the hammerhead turnaround area feel more like an open space; c) The placement and screening details for the utility boxes need to be shown on the plans; d) She noted that the building at the rear is one of the taller buildings, and more elevated at the rear, although lowering the height by one foot would probably not make any difference; and e) Consider having the entryway a bit closer which would lose the extra concrete walkway.
 5. Member Messner commented: a) There is a groundcover product that would hold up better than grass in the hammerhead area that should be considered as an alternative (an example is located at the Zizzo's Coffee site on Storke Road); b) The hammerhead is a good idea, but consideration should be given to how to address the potential problem that people may use the space for parking; c) Consider how to best facilitate the traffic flow with regard to the trash pick-up vehicles; and d) The applicant should review the drainage plan and consider how to address the flow coming down in the back towards the west end, all the way to up against the fence, preferably with some type of swale.
 6. Member Herrera commented: a) The plans will need to reflect that the backflow preventer, and other utility boxes, will be screened properly.
 7. Chair Smith commented: a) The layout, design and architectural style are appreciated; b) The applicant is requested to carefully examine the drainage in the northwest corner to address his concern that the catch basins provided may not capture the water, because it looks like the water would flow down the slope until it hits the wall, then move eastward along the wall until it hits the grade change, and go to the property to the north; and c) The open space calculations need to be verified.

STRAW VOTE:

How many members would support the modification requests?

Members voting in favor: Members Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, Smith, and Wignot.

Members Not Voting in Favor: None.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to take off calendar, Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 04-226-DRB, 7388 Calle Real, with comments.

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.

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

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 18 of 28

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. 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 Seepel of the Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 08-128-GPA, -SPA, -VTM, -DP, -CUP and Lot Merger. (Natasha Campbell)

Recused: Member Schneider recused himself because the applicant is his client.

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

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 19 of 28

Ex-parte conversations: Vice Chair Brown stated that she has spoken with Kim True, project landscape architect, regarding some of the landscape issues.

The plans were presented by Courtney Seepel, Project Manager, and Michael Towbes, Developer, of the Towbes Group, property owner; and the project team including Ed Lenvik, Lenvik & Minor, project architect; Kim True, Suding Design, project landscape architect; and Dale Weber, MAC Design Associates, project civil engineer.

Ed Lenvik, project architect, presented the architectural and site plans. He stated that the proposed project site will be internally connected to the existing Willow Springs Phase I residential development and the common open space that provides for some beautiful views of the mountains and surrounding area.

Kim True, project landscape architect, presented the proposed landscape plans. She stated that she spoke with Vice Chair Brown with regard to the concern regarding the very high salt content in the soils. She said that careful consideration will be given to refining the plant palette for the second phase of the project and selecting species that can tolerate both the clay soil and the high salt content. In addition, some new fill soil will be brought in which will be a better quality of soil than what exists, and will provide for better drainage and lower salt levels.

Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, stated that the applicant's project team covered most of the items she would have discussed in her staff report presentation. She requested that the DRB comments include addressing the issues regarding neighborhood compatibility, the eastern property line screening, and the planting palette.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, pointed out that the applicant has provided civil engineering plans that are available for review.

Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager, stated that if the DRB requests that the item be continued for an additional review of the applicant's response to comments from today, staff would be supportive because the Conceptual review needs to be completed, and staff believes that the timeline with regard to the environmental review process can still be maintained.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) He believes that the proposed layout for the Phase II project will not be as nice from a density standpoint as the Willow Springs Phase I project, which he likes very much; b) However, he will be supportive of the proposed Phase II project; c) The proposed Phase II development seems to be clustered more densely with the space available on the site and there are no new recreational amenities proposed with the new 100 units; d) Staff should look at whether big trucks associated with the nearby industrial area are likely to use the new Camino Vista Road connection as a short-cut and whether there should be vehicle restrictions for this new roadway; e) He understands that the economics

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 20 of 28

- aspect need to be factored in, but eight buildings on the site would have been nicer than ten, and there would have been less need to place carports next to the open space; f) The applicant should refer to the City's Recommended Street Tree List when selecting trees for the public right-of-way areas; and g) Questioned whether the trash enclosure should be covered.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Requested that the applicant address the concern that it is very unfortunate that carports are looking onto prime views of the open space which is a very special area; b) Possibly consider ways to move some of the carports which would open up some vistas and make the open space area more park-like; c) The existing landscaping has suffered and does not look very robust because of the soil conditions, and hopefully with the next phase there will be some height; d) The applicant's efforts to select plant species that are tolerant of the very salty soil conditions are appreciated; e) The applicant is requested to remove the invasive pampas grass that has unfortunately invaded the wetlands over the past couple of years, and to keep the area regularly maintained; f) The existing wetlands are very beautiful; g) Consideration will need to be given to the lighting standards and the tree conflict in the parking area and public areas; h) The applicant will need to provide a photometrics plan; i) The existing colors have faded; j) The proposed colors look a little washed out, and need to be a little more intense and pigmented, and not match existing; k) She believes that it will be important to plant some nice big trees, noting that ultimately most of the first floor units may not have views; l) The proposed architecture is nice and looks like it belongs in Goleta; and m) The pedestrian sidewalk along Camino Vista Road is located right next to the street, however, she believes it would be better to have a separation with little parkways.
 3. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed plans for the Phase II project are a continuation of the existing Phase I project which he believes is very successful; b) It is appreciated that the details will match existing and the intent of the landscape design is to blend with the existing landscaping; c) He understands that the landscape plan will include mitigation with regard to the existing species that are not thriving; and d) He does not have any concerns with regard to the Conceptual plans.
 4. Member Messner commented: 1) Overall, the proposed plans look pretty good; and b) He recommended that the applicant refer to the City's current Recommended Street Tree Planting List and Recommended Tree Planting Guidelines with regard to the proposed street trees, and contact the City's Arborist.
 5. Member Herrera commented: a) If it is too wet during the rainy season to remove the invasive pampas grass, from his experience, removing the flowers on top and the seeds will prevent spreading until conditions for removal are better; b) He has a list of approximately sixteen plant species that have been very successful in areas with salty soils, which he will provide to the applicant; and c) From his experience, the biggest problem with regard to landscaping in salty soils has been providing irrigation that is adequate and placed appropriately.
 6. Chair Smith commented: a) The proposed project is consistent with the Willow Springs Phase I project which he likes very much.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to continue Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 08-128-DRB, Camino Vista Road, with comments to January 12, 2010.

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.

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)

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

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 22 of 28

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Documents: 1) Letter from Trey Penner, Pacifica Suites Hotel, Goleta, dated December 8, 2009, Re: Case No. 09-075-DP; and 2) Memorandum from Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, dated December 8, 2009, updating the DRB staff report for the Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Business Center for the December 8, 2009, meeting.

Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, presented the staff report and background regarding the proposed project. She stated that the proposed project should be reviewed by the DRB as a new project application, and that the applicant will present minor changes that have been made since the previous project was last reviewed by the DRB. She also stated that Ron Stevens, Interacta, Inc., will present video simulations and drive-by animation of the proposed project that he prepared as part of the Environmental Impact Report process. The specific views chosen by staff for the visual simulations identify a required reasonable worst case assessment to evaluate the project's visual impacts that relate to loss of mountain views from Hollister Avenue.

Ron Stevens, Interacta, Inc., presented photo simulations and video drive-by animations entitled, "Marriott Residence Inn Photo Simulations & Drive-By Animation, Interacta, Inc., Ron Stevens, 22 Oct. 2009". Ron Stevens stated that the intent of the simulations was to look at the potential visual impacts that the proposed project might have on the Santa Ynez Mountains from Hollister Avenue.

The plans were presented by Tony Wrozek, with R. D. Olson Development, applicant, and Gene Fong, project architect. Tony Wrozek summarized the following two revisions that have occurred since the prior presentation to the DRB, stating that there were also a few other more minor changes: 1) The public sidewalk along Hollister Avenue would be moved within the Goleta city limits; and 2) The front lobby will be mirrored so that the major terrace area outside of the meeting rooms would be contiguous with the enclosed front landscaped area.

Patty Miller explained the status of the former and current project proposals.

Speakers:

Gary Earle, Santa Barbara, submitted three cut and paste panoramic photos of the site with the former story poles for a perspective on the size of the building. He believes that the size, bulk and scale of the proposed project should be reduced to better conform to the provisions in the City's General Plan. He stated that the proposed project should be two-stories, rather than three-stories, in order to preserve the scenic corridors and to be in spatial harmony with the other buildings in the surrounding area. He said that there is no other project within a significant radius that matches the proposed project in size, bulk and scale. He commented that higher density and bigger size means more profit for the developer, and expressed concern that citizens who reside in this area will have to live with the consequences of decisions made in conflict with desires expressed in the General Plan. He thinks the

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 23 of 28

DRB made a mistake last time and that the project is not conforming with the General Plan.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, agreed with the comments made by speaker Gary Earle. She stated that the proposed project needs to be reviewed as a new project. She believes that the proposed project appears to be both bigger and taller. She commented that when viewing the simulations from the east, the building appears prison-like with flat walls and a fence, and it also appears prison-like when coming from the west, with the block walls on the block-shaped building. She stated that the trees will cover up some of the building, but when looking at the building from behind the trees, it is still a poorly designed building that is far inferior to what was here before

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, expressed concern that the proposed project with three-stories is out of scale and needs to be reconsidered. He noted that the trees will act like a picket fence that you can see through to the building and that the building should be two stories.

Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager, clarified that during the Track 2.5 General Plan Amendment process, the Floor Area Ratios (FARs) were removed and certain other standards became recommended standards. However, the 0.50 FAR recommended standard for hotel uses is currently within the Hotel Overlay District in the Zoning Ordinance. She stated that the current version of the good cause finding applies to the proposed project. She also stated that staff believes that the results of the photo simulations are highly reliable and cover the visual aspects in combination with the prior story poles.

After the DRB comments were made, Tony Wrozek, representing R.D. Olson Development, stated that the applicant will step back to explore all of the options available, and meet with the Planning staff to discuss aspects with regard to the good cause finding and the DRB comments.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The photo simulations and drive-by animations are very helpful – a picture is worth a thousand words; b) Upon review of the current Conceptual plans and design, there are a number of DRB Findings for approval that he would not be able to make because of concerns regarding neighborhood compatibility; size, bulk and scale; harmonious relationship with adjoining developments; impacts to the viewshed of significant public scenic views; and sufficient parking; c) The parking that is available onsite is not adequate; and d) The size, bulk and scale needs to be reduced.
2. Member Branch commented: a) Agreed with comments from Member Wignot; b) The photo simulations make it clear that the proposed project is too big; c) The current configuration is bigger than he would support; d) There should be a lower frontage at the street elevation; e) The possibility of three-stories at the rear of the project might work; f) The difference between the proposed architectural style and the adjoining styles in the neighborhood is okay; g) The

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 24 of 28

mass, bulk and scale make the project look too big and like it is something that should be located in Los Angeles; and h) He noted that the photo simulations, and the story poles that were viewed previously, provided a clearer understanding.

3. Member Schneider commented: a) The visual simulations help provide a clear understanding; b) It would be difficult to make the good cause finding that the proposed project will provide a significant community benefit, keeping in mind the request for a 20 percent increase in the FAR, the shared parking concept, and the proposed mass, bulk and scale; c) A two-story building would be the easiest solution; d) Although the building is set back far from Hollister Avenue, the third floor is overpowering, particularly because of the flatness of the three-story façade; e) He believes that removing the third floor on the front wing of the hotel needs to be considered in a direction between removing it and doing a two-story solution; f) The photo simulation showed monotone colors on the building, however the color breaks would be an improvement, noting that color breaks were discussed previously; g) When viewing the simulations while moving down the road where there are low-scale buildings, it is apparent that the proposed hotel, which is twice as high or more, feels out of character; and h) In his opinion, the proposed style of the building should be more contemporary to tie in stylistically into the buildings around the proposed project.
4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) This was a struggle before, but the DRB tried to make it better; b) With the visual simulations, the proposed project as presented appears to be out of character with its surroundings with regard to size, bulk and scale; c) There are four or five DRB Findings of approval that she would not be able to make; d) Reducing the proposed project from three-stories to two-stories would help the project fit in with the neighborhood; e) Her biggest concern is making the good cause finding when considering the issues of the impact to community character, the aesthetics, and the preservation of public views; f) The viewshed is very important and defines the character of the community, however, the proposed project detracts from the viewshed; g) Requested staff explore the difference in language between the current good cause finding requirements and the good cause finding in effect when the previous proposed project was reviewed by the DRB; and h) She noted that story poles were not available when the previous project was reviewed by the DRB.
5. Member Messner commented: a) Agreed with comments made by Member Wignot and Member Schneider; b) The proposed project is too big; and c) He noted that he believes a monument sign would be more appropriate at the street level rather than the sample signage shown on the proposed plans that appear as a billboard.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) Agreed with comments made by the DRB members; b) The proposed project looks out of place and too big for the site on Hollister Avenue; and c) If the project were two stories it would be better.
7. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with the DRB comments; b) His biggest concern is that the massing that is closest to the street obliterates the sweep of the mountain range which is something he believes needs to be preserved and which he has said needs to be preserved on other projects; and c) He does not have a concern that the architectural style is different than the styles in the

neighborhood, noting there is a Moorish, Spanish Colonial style in the neighborhood.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to take off calendar with comments Item M-3, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue,

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)

The plans were presented by Scott Dunaway of SureSite Consulting Group, LLC, agent, on behalf of T-Mobile USA, Inc., lessee, and Hollister Business Park LLC, property owner. In response to the DRB comments, Scott Dunaway stated that the elevations were revised to provide a more fuller tree. Also, he presented a landscape plan that provides climbing vines on the CMU wall at the base with an irrigation system included.

Shine Ling, Assistant Planner, stated that after the DRB completes the Conceptual review, the Planning Commission will consider the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application. If the CUP is approved by the Planning Commission, the proposed project will return to the DRB for Preliminary and Final review.

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The revised monopine design is not much of a change although it has been made fuller at the top, but the DRB request for a more conical shape has not been achieved; b) The top is okay; c) The applicant has placed a lot of branches on the antennas, which looks good, but there is uneven branching throughout the tree; d) There needs to be the same density throughout the entire tree and the tree needs to have a better shape, with the tree broader at the base; e) The branches at the bottom of the monopine are too short and need to be longer, and it may need to be rescaled; f) A discussion at the previous DRB review was that there may be possible co-location in the future, and that the design of the tree needs to look more realistic to hide any future additions underneath the antennas; and g) The applicant is requested to provide the revised monopine plans to the DRB before the Planning Commission reviews the CUP.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 26 of 28

2. Member Herrera commented: a) The branches should be wider and fuller, so the trunk is more hidden and not as visible, which will appear more natural.
3. Member Messner commented: a) The branches in the revised drawing have too much 90-degree symmetry, and recommended that cantilevering would help break up the symmetry and make the monopine look more natural and b) The proposed "Creeping Fig" plant material is a great species for covering, but it will require a lot of maintenance, and if it is not maintained properly, it will overtake and take control.
4. Member Schneider commented: a) Agreed with Member Messner that offsetting the branches of the tree from one side to the other side would be less symmetrical and look more natural.
5. Chair Smith commented: a) The foliage is now a little more dense at the top of the monopine in the revised plans.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item M-4, DRB Permit No. 09-154-DRB, 7402 Hollister Avenue, with comments; to January 12, 2010.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

RECESS HELD FROM 4:20 P.M. TO 4:22 P.M.

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. AD HOC COMMITTEE FORMATION

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that the purpose of the agenda item is for the DRB to discuss whether the formation of an ad hoc committee to facilitate review of certain projects should be made by the DRB or by the Director of Planning and Environmental Services, and if it is acceptable for the formation to be made by either the DRB or the Director. He noted that the applicant for the Westar project requested, after the review at the last DRB meeting on November 10, 2009, an ad hoc committee to facilitate the process. The Director of Planning and Environmental Services considered the request and decided it would be appropriate to set up an ad hoc committee for the applicant to meet with a minority of the DRB members with the understanding that it would help facilitate moving the process forward by testing ideas and direction, with the understanding that the comments would not be binding.

Vice Chair Brown, stated that from her experience, she believes that an ad hoc committee should only be formed by the Design Review Board. If an applicant requests an ad hoc committee, staff should mention it at the DRB meeting. She stated that the DRB follows the Brown Act requirements.

Member Wignot questioned whether it would be appropriate to include a member of the Planning Commission when an ad hoc committee is set up by the DRB to review certain large projects.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 27 of 28

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that it would not be appropriate to include a member of the Planning Commission because the role of the DRB is different than the Planning Commission.

Member Branch stated that if an ad hoc committee is formed, it should be formed by the DRB at the meeting. He commented that a different issue is that an applicant is still getting input outside the DRB meeting whether an applicant participates in an ad hoc committee or the applicant contacts DRB members on an individual basis.

Chair Smith stated that an ac hoc committee should be formed at a public meeting so the public will know there will be an ad hoc committee.

Vice Chair Brown stated that the formation of an ad hoc committee prevents problems that can occur when an applicant asks to meet individually with every member of the board.

Member Schneider stated that the issue regarding the Westar project is that the idea to set up an ad hoc committee came up after the meeting. He noted that the DRB has set up ad hoc committees in the past to facilitate review of some of the larger projects, and that some members of the public have attended ad hoc committee meetings.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, summarized the discussion, stating that the majority of the DRB members agree that that only the DRB shall form future ad hoc committees at the DRB meeting.

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Vice Chair Brown stated that in the past, the DRB has looked back at some of the completed projects from the previous year, which has always been very helpful. She hopes that these reviews will continue to be scheduled on the agenda.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that the first review of some of the completed projects was held at the end of the year, and the review covered two or three years. Since then, the reviews have become more of an annual event and responses from the DRB members have indicated that the reviews are useful. He stated that staff finds these reviews helpful and will continue scheduling the reviews as long as there is support from the DRB.

Member Branch spoke in support of continuing the annual review of completed DRB projects.

AGENDA MANAGEMENT (4:35 P.M.)

Chair Smith stated that a recess will be held, followed by consideration, in order, of Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 04-226-DRB, 7388 Calle Real; Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 08-128-DRB, Camino Vista Road; and Item M-3, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

December 8, 2009

Page 28 of 28

RECESS HELD FROM 4:35 P.M. TO 5:25 P.M. (NEXT ITEM: M-1)

O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

None.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 8:20 P.M.