



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, January 12, 2010

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

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

January 12, 2010

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 December 8, 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. 09-141-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 12-8-09*, 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Applicant request to continue to February 9, 2010

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

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 3 of 20

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 straightforward, 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 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-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-190-DRB RV

550 Cambridge Drive (APN 069-560-030)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes an existing 2,640-square foot church sanctuary, an existing 1,450-square foot classroom building, and an existing 2,200-square foot office/classroom building on a 2.4-acre lot in the DR-3.3 zone district. Approvals for a 449-square foot office addition to the education/classroom building, which will result in a 1,899-square foot one-story structure. The proposed changes include:

- On the north and south elevations, replace existing jalousie/louvered windows with standard 8040 slider windows, to match those on the approved addition (a small wall area would be filled in);
- Add 5 flat glass skylights to the roof, over the main classroom;
- Remove an existing trellis structure on the north elevation;
- Repair existing rafters over the classroom, and remove rafter beam tails.

No new floor area is proposed. The project was filed by Donald Sharpe, architect, on behalf of Cambridge Drive Community Church, property owner. Related cases: 08-043-SCD; 08-043-LUP. (Shine Ling)

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-165-DRB

22 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-021-044)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes three commercial buildings on a 102,460-square foot lot in the C-3 zone district. The applicant proposes to re-face an existing Cox wall sign on Building A, and re-face the existing monument sign at the entrance to the facility. The non-illuminated wall sign will be flush mounted with 36-inch to 48-inch high, 3-inch deep blue HDU foam letters totaling approximately 36 square feet of sign area. The text of the sign states "COX." The non-illuminated monument sign will be pin mounted with 24-inch to 33-inch high, 3/8-inch deep blue aluminum letters totaling approximately 17 square feet of sign area. The text of the sign states "COX." The project was filed by agent Mark Kuwahara on behalf of Cox Communications, property owner. Related cases: 02-111-LUP, 09-165-SCC, 09-166-SCC. (Brian Hiefield)

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 4 of 20

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-162-DRB

915-1795 Kellogg Avenue (APN 071-090-049)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 17 building, 75-unit apartment complex on a 4.96-acre lot in the DR-16 zone district. The applicant proposes to repaint the existing buildings with one of three color schemes as shown on the project plans. Color Scheme One; Dapper Tan (ICI-479), Palladian Plum (ICI-24), Classic Liberty Red (ICI-159). Color Scheme Two; Yellow Barn (ICI-188), Golden Rice (ICI-88), Classic Liberty Red (ICI-159). Color Scheme Three; Plymouth Rock (ICI-1038), Palladian Plum (ICI-24), Classic Liberty Red (ICI-159). The applicant also proposes to replace the building addresses with 10-inch high silver colored metal numbers mounted on ½ -inch black PVC. The project was filed by agent Mary Chang on behalf of the Goleta Valley Housing Committee, property owner. (Brian Hiefield)

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-169-DRB

75 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-008)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 12,661-square foot commercial property on a 59,975-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to permit an as-built rain canopy in the rear yard setback and to construct a 10-foot tall block wall for a length of approximately 75 feet along the rear yard property line, and construct an 864-square foot rain canopy in the western side yard setback. A portion of the as-built rain canopy encloses an area of 1,153-square feet; thereby creating a 1,153 square-foot addition. Pre-finished metal panels and aluminum windows would replace existing louvers on the rear elevation and continue onto the front elevation, covering (but not enclosing) a truck dock area. The resulting one-story structure would be 12,661-square feet. The project was filed by Rex Ruskauff, architect, on behalf of Castilian LLC, property owner. Related cases: 06-070-DP AM01; 06-070-CUP; 09-169-LUP. (Shine Ling)

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-170-DRB

6865 Silver Fern Court (APN 073-470-078)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,229-square foot two-story residence with an attached three-car garage on a 5,227-square foot lot in the DR-4.6 zone district (Coastal Zone). The applicant

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 5 of 20

proposes to construct a 425-square foot wooden trellis on the rear of the residence with a seat wall and outdoor gas fireplace. A new sliding/folding wall system is also proposed to replace existing doors and windows on the rear elevation. No new floor area is proposed. Materials proposed include wood for the trellis and stone veneer for the seat wall/outdoor gas fireplace. The proposed project was approved by the Storke Ranch Master Owners Association. The project was filed by Ryan Mills, agent, on behalf of Dan Grotenhuis, property owner. Related cases: 09-170-LUP. (Shine Ling)

L-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-171-DRB

5750 Dawson Avenue (APN 071-121-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes 7,020 square feet in the C-3 zone district and is currently vacant as a result of a 2007 fire. The applicant proposes to construct a new 1,440-square foot two-story contractor's workshop building and an equipment storage yard. Access would be provided via an existing curb cut on Dawson Avenue and a new curb cut on Rutherford Street. A 6-foot tall wall with rolling gates and landscaping would be installed along the perimeter of the property. Materials proposed include split-face block on the first floor and board and batting on the second floor. No grading is proposed. The project was filed by Mark Sauter of John S. Carter, Inc., agent, for Tom Kennedy, property owner. Related cases: 09-171-LUP. (Shine Ling)

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-037-DRB

5912-5940 & 5960 Olney Street (APN 071-153-008; -009; -010; -011; & -013)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The properties consist of five parcels in the M-1 zone district (Coastal Zone), comprising a total of 28,346 square feet. An existing 3,656-square foot two-story commercial/industrial building is located at 5940 Olney Street; vacant paved lots are located at 5912, 5920, 5930, 5940, and 5960 Olney Street. The applicant proposes an as-built development plan and major conditional use permit for a car rental facility. The first floor of the existing building would be used for a rental office and four car repair bays for light car maintenance and hand car washing. One of the offices on the second floor is used for AVIS administration. The hours of operation would be from 4:30 a.m. to 11:30 p.m. An average of 50 cars per day would be rented from the facility. The total number of employees would be 20, spread over 3 work shifts, with a maximum of 8 during a typical day shift. The existing building is proposed to be used 'as-is' with no physical changes proposed. AVIS customer operations are restricted to the first floor office area. A total of 10 customer parking stalls are proposed (5 on the lot at 5940 Olney Street and 5 on the lots adjacent at 5912-5930 Olney Street). The project was filed by Leland J. Smith of Chester Smith Associates, architect, on behalf of Andrew Jaksich of AVIS Budget Group, tenant, and the Duckett Family Trust and Graziano and Romana Bernardi, property owners. Related cases: 08-037-DP; -CUP. (Shine Ling)

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 6 of 20

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 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

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 7 of 20

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

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-8-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

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;

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 8 of 20

- e) He understands that the economics 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: a) 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. 08-143-DRB

Hollister Avenue Northwest of Glen Annie Road (APN 073-030-020, -021)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes 9,546-square feet of development consisting of a television studio and drive-thru ATM facilities on 23.55 acres located on Hollister Avenue between Glen Annie Road and Santa Felicia Drive within the Inland Area of the City zoned MHS/AHO DR-12.3 and M-RP and partially covered by the F(APR). The applicant proposes to demolish the existing 9,546-square feet of development consisting of a television studio and drive-thru ATM facilities and to construct 89,914 square feet of commercial development and 300 residential rental units and 5 live/work condominiums.

The commercial condominiums would range between 520 to 25,000 square feet totaling 89,914 square feet. Amenities include plazas, pedestrian walkways, 339 parking spaces, drive aisles, operations screening, a 204,800-cubic foot underground stormwater storage area, landscaping, and exterior lighting.

The 300 apartments would be comprised of a mix of one-bedroom (105 units totaling 52,920 square feet), two-bedroom (140 units totaling 136,391 square feet), and three bedroom (60 units totaling 71,551 square feet) units contained within five two-story buildings, and fifteen three-story building with a total of 260,862 square feet. Amenities would include a communal recreation building, pool/spa, pocket parks, pedestrian walkways, carwash and maintenance building, 583 parking spaces (in garages, carports and open areas) and drive aisles, landscaping, and exterior lighting.

Primary access is proposed via a new connection to the Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection, which is presently a "T" intersection controlled by traffic signals. The main access driveway is proposed to form the north leg of the intersection, resulting in a conventional four-leg intersection. The new approach would contain a left-turn lane and a left+ thru + right-turn lane for traffic outbound from the site plus two inbound lanes. Hollister Avenue would be widened on the north side to provide an eastbound left-turn lane and a westbound right-turn lane for traffic inbound to the site. Secondary access for the project would be provided via a new driveway connection to Hollister Avenue at the west end of the project site and a new connection to Glen Annie Road at the east end of the project site. The Glen Annie Road/Hollister Avenue intersection would be reconfigured to restrict southbound left-turns from Glen Annie Road to Hollister Avenue. A bus turnout is proposed just west of this intersection.

Estimated project grading would involve 51,000-cubic yards of cut and 33,000-cubic yards of fill (net export of 18,000-cubic yards of cut). Southern California Edison power-lines are proposed to be relocated from the southern property line to the northern and western boundaries of the project. Water and sewer would be provided by the Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District. The project was filed by agent Ken Marshall of Dudek, Inc on behalf of Goleta Hollister,

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 10 of 20

LLC, property owner. Related cases: 08-143-GPA; -RZ; -OA, -TM (TM 32,048); -DP; -CUP. (Continued from 11-10-09) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

11-10-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Sheet C-3 shows that the service road for the commercial area is on the residential area, but he believes the property line should run down the middle of the road, which may affect the densities and other setbacks; b) The applicant needs to work with the Fire Department regarding the site plan to ensure that accessibility requirements are met; c) If a bus stop shelter will be required along Hollister Avenue, the applicant needs to provide details; d) The applicant needs to double-check their open space requirement calculations because he has a concern that the proposed project will be short on open space, noting that hardscape sidewalks are not to be included when calculating the open common landscape area; and e) He has a number of comments regarding the site design, but unfortunately, he must leave the meeting at this time for a previous commitment.
2. Member Branch commented: a) Expressed appreciation to the applicant for the extraordinary amount of work to this point and for meeting with the neighbors; b) He has some concern regarding parking; c) In consideration of the neighbors' comments regarding parking and traffic circulation, at this stage of the process it might be worth considering the concept of not closing Glen Annie Road, or the concept of aligning with the street that accesses Pacific Glen; d) From a site planning standpoint, there is a good flow overall; e) There does not seem to be enough overall open space in the residential area and in the commercial area, particularly near the restaurants, which should be restudied; f) The landscaping and meandering sidewalk along Hollister Avenue is encouraged; g) Consideration will need to be given to appropriate placement and screening of the utility boxes; h) With regard to addressing the grade differential at Glen Annie Road, it would be worth considering changing Buildings 14 and 16 into one-story buildings in terms of neighborhood compatibility and the streetscape view, and it would mitigate some of the parking issues on the street; i) He believes that many residents will park on Glen Annie Road for convenience, and also that they would park there regardless of whether there is access to the proposed project from Glen Annie Road; j) The proposed community car wash area is a good idea; k) The proposed project feels dense, although the zoning permits the density; l) The use of residential courtyards are useful to break up the large-scale buildings in the open space area; m) There are rows and rows of garages that need to be restudied, noting that one solution, aside from breaking up the architecture, would be to add planting fingers for landscaping between the garage doors; n) It is important for a project this size to incorporate photovoltaics and sustainability as much as can be done, along with consideration regarding bioswales and groundwater; o) The proposed commercial architecture is okay and works somewhat with the architecture across the street; p) He has concerns with regard to some of the three-story elements of the residential architecture, and possibly some stepping would help; q) Consider flat tile, as opposed to barrel tile, which can work with some of the elements if not too ornate; r) Overall, the concept is good, and executed relatively well; s) His preference would be to remove one or two of the three-story buildings which would shift the site such

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 11 of 20

- that it might allow more view corridors from the commercial area and add more open space to the residential area.
3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) For a project this size, It is appreciated that the applicant has been working with the neighbors and hopefully their concerns can be accommodated; b) The issues presented by the neighbors with regard to parking and traffic circulation were valuable and there may need to be some shifting with regard to the site plan; c) This project may be under-parked with regard to the number of residents that will be using vehicles; d) There is the possibility that residents in the adjacent development may be parking in the commercial parking lot; e) Tot lots should not become open spaces that are not used, and perhaps there should be a dual use; f) Consider widening the sidewalk along Glen Annie Road so it is stepped back and pedestrians can move away from the traffic; g) She believes there needs to be some flexibility provided for connectivity between the proposed project and Santa Felicia Drive; for example, consider installing a gate; h) The topography needs to be studied in relationship to the existing residential development and the proposed project site to have a better understanding of the potential impacts; i) The architecture should not be too stylized, but should be more timeless; j) With regard to the commercial area, it will be important to carefully consider the details and to incorporate a human-scale relationship, which will make a difference; k) Incorporate four-sided architecture in the commercial area; l) Refine the pedestrian connectivity within the commercial parking lot, and also consider the connectivity between the commercial and residential areas; m) Consider taking advantage of the mountain views, which are very important to the community; for example, by providing the opportunity for views to the north for people sitting outside; n) The lighting component should be considered early in the process; o) More trees should be added in the drive aisles and near parking spaces in the residential area; p) The applicant is requested to provide street elevation simulations to show a better understanding of the proposed architecture and landscaping; q) Further information regarding stormwater issues is requested; r) The live-work concept is supported, but the applicant is requested to provide the location of a site that can be visited as an example of a similar component that has existed for awhile.
 4. Member Messner commented: a) Consideration needs to be given to the number of parking spaces that will be used by employees who will park in the commercial area; b) It is preferable that all of the utility boxes and check valves are positioned in places where they are not out in front to be seen; c) Irrigation equipment should be located where it will not interfere with landscape maintenance; d) Consider the potential traffic flow with regard to trash pick-ups; e) A pull-out bus stop is appropriate for the site; and f) The car wash facility for residents is a good idea.
 5. Chair Smith commented: a) He likes the concept of the commercial area in front and the higher density residential in the rear on the site; b) The Camino Real Marketplace landscaping bordering Hollister Avenue is appreciated, and he hopes something similar can be achieved on the proposed site; c) He likes the proposed architectural style for the commercial buildings and also for the residential, especially with the use of the courtyards and the breaking of the massing; d) The view of the mountains is very important to the community; therefore, he is concerned with regard to Buildings 1, 4, 5 and 7 (shown on Sheets A-16 and A-17); e) He strongly urged that the topography be restudied to set back to help preserve the mountain views along Hollister Avenue, and to see if it can be achieved by reducing the grade, adding more terracing, or possibly making Buildings 1, 4, 5 and 7 two-story rather than three-story buildings; f) Some benefits of reducing Buildings 1, 4, 5 and 7 to two-story buildings would be

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 12 of 20

the need for less parking spaces and it would possibly allow more open space; g) Regarding the parking and traffic circulation problems expressed by the neighbors on Glen Annie Road, possibly consider whether there is a way to connect the access road to Pacific Glen's entry; h) The two-story buildings on Glen Annie Road are appreciated which are Buildings 14, 16, 18, 19 and 20; i) He expressed concern that the plan feels tight, like trying to fit a size 11 foot into a size 9 shoe; j) He likes the direction this project is going. k) He noted that on the east side of the site there is a slope difference on the opposite sides of the street, and suggested the applicant consider some mitigation for the neighbors.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Schneider, Wignot) to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 08-143-DRB, Hollister Avenue Northwest of Glen Annie Road, to January 12, 2010, with comments.

M-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-106-DRB

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

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The 3.05-acre property is vacant and is located within the PI (Professional/Institutional) zone district with Hotel Overlay. The applicant proposes to revise the Development Plan for the Rincon Palms Hotel and Restaurant Project, approved by the City in October 2008. The proposed revision includes: the addition of approximately 5,340 square feet of roof-top structures to improve the use of the hotel roof deck, some of which exceed the 35-foot height limit for the PI zone district, up to a maximum of 50 feet; expansion of hotel room sizes, resulting in an increase of overall floor area from 59,600 square feet to 75,580 square feet and a reduction in room count from 112 to 102; changes to the port-cochere structure and lobby area; relocation of the ground-floor conference patio, and the elimination of 3 parking spaces (2 surface; 1 underground). The restaurant component of the Development Plan would not be changed.

The revisions would result in a project that consists of the following: A 75,580-square foot hotel, 3 stories with a partial 4th-story and underground parking garage; outdoor pool and patios; a 6,000-square foot restaurant with a 1,000-square foot outdoor dining area; trellises and repeating columns along the southern boundary of the property; sidewalk, curb, and gutter improvements along Hollister Avenue and Cortona Drive. Access is proposed from both Cortona Drive and with the neighboring M-RP building at 6868 Cortona Drive. The project was filed by Laurel Perez of Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services, agent, on behalf of Kip Bradley for Cortona Opportunities LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-106-DP RV. (Continued from 9-8-09*, 8-11-09) (Shine Ling)

Applicant request to take the item off calendar

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

8-11-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Chair Smith commented: a) He appreciates the Streamline Moderne architectural style that was originally approved; b) He cannot make the "Good

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 13 of 20

- Cause” finding because the proposed corporate wedge element is a detriment to the views of the mountains and he does not see a corresponding public benefit; c) The corporate branding wedge element does not seem appropriate for the location as proposed; d) Consider adding more interest to the revised western elevation which is not as interesting as the western elevation in the approved project; and e) The revised overall footprint of the building and related changes including the massing and increase in floors are not problematic.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The approved building design was very nice; b) With the proposed revisions, massing has been added to the bulk of the building and the building appears somewhat “boxier”, particularly at the south elevation (he appreciated in the approved design that the east end and west ends of the building were softened with the forms that stepped.); c) He has concerns with regard to allowing a “Good Cause” finding because the proposed revision adds significant building mass that would exceed the maximum height on the fourth floor; d) While he likes the roof deck idea, and understands the proposed revisions from a usability standpoint, the proposed roof deck element is somewhat problematic; e) Consider removing the third floor from the western wing and dropping the proposed roof deck one level; f) He has some concerns from a neighborhood compatibility standpoint regarding the location of the proposed roof deck on the west elevation; g) He suggested that the proposed roof deck may need to be moved to the east wing of the building farther away from the residential neighborhood; h) Consider lowering the wedge element to address height concerns; i) The wedge is a contemporary element that does not tie into the rest of the architecture; and j) The inverted ‘V’ element was integrated fairly well into the architecture.
 3. Member Branch commented: a) With regard to height, the proposed revision seems to be more than architectural projections and spires, and he has concerns with regard to making the “Good Cause” finding; b) The art deco design previously approved was delicate and appreciated more; c) Expressed concern that the architectural feature that related with the restaurant design is lost with the proposed revision; d) Consider whether the corporate wedge element needs to be located on top of the design because the wedge element will exist if the tenant leaves; e) Wind and temperature concerns are valid regarding the usability of the proposed roof deck; f) The roof deck could be a great place to have events, however it feels too high as a permanent place for events; g) The suggestion from Member Schneider to drop the proposed roof deck one level would address the concern regarding height; h) He agrees somewhat with Member Schneider’s concern regarding the residential neighborhood, however, the site is located near the airport where there is noise from planes; i) From a massing standpoint, the building mass has been kept relatively the same; and j) Agreed with Member Schneider’s concern that the building seems “boxier” with the massing revisions to the end treatments.
 4. Member Wignot commented: a) Agreed with the previous DRB comments.
 5. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The approved project was appreciated because it is unique and fits in well with Goleta, b) Goleta is a very horizontal city and the approved project took advantage of the mountain views; c) The proposed revision intrudes on the view shed and the view of the mountains which are important to many members of the community; d) The proposed revision will draw attention to the project rather than integrate well into the entire neighborhood; e) The residential subdivision at the corner is an anomaly; f) The proposed roof deck does not work; g) The “Good Cause” finding cannot be made when the mountains are a backdrop to the project; h) The wedge element does not work because the architectural connection with the restaurant will be lost; i)

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 14 of 20

The 'V' architectural element is not appropriate; and j) The revised design for the western elevation (Storke Road) does not have the same interest as the approved design which is elegant.

6. Member Messner commented: a) The two buildings need to be considered together so they blend together and apart; b) He appreciates the approved design because the restaurant and building worked well together; and c) Recommended that story poles be installed if the revisions, or the upper floor, will be considered further.

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

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

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

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. MARRIOTT RESIDENCE INN 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

January 12, 2010

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

January 12, 2010

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

January 12, 2010

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

January 12, 2010

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 appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be

Design Review Board Agenda

January 12, 2010

Page 20 of 20

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 appeal hearing.