



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:45 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

Members:

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

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

Notices:

- Requests for review of project plans or change of scheduling should be made to the City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, 93117; Telephone (805)961-7500.
 - In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City of Goleta at (805)961-7500. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City staff to make reasonable arrangements.
 - Preliminary approval or denial of a project by the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Goleta Planning Commission within ten (10) calendar days following the action. Please contact the Planning & Environmental Services Department for more information.
 - Design Review Board approvals do not constitute Land Use Clearances.
 - The square footage figures on this agenda are subject to change during the review process.
 - The length of Agenda items is only an estimate. Applicants are responsible for being available when their item is to be heard. Any item for which the applicant is not immediately available may be continued to the next meeting.
-

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 2 of 18

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for January 12, 2010

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. 09-170-DRB

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

This is a request for *Final* 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 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. (Continued from 1-12-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-12-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Chair Smith commented: a) Regarding shading, he noted that there are existing trees located close to the house.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Regarding shading, if the applicant is interested, there is a variety of methods; for example, installing shades on the inside.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-170-DRB, 6865

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 3 of 18

Silver Fern Court, as submitted; and to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-170-DRB, to January 26, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

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 *Final* 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. (Continued from 1-12-10) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-12-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) The size of the proposed wall sign needs to be reduced; and b) The monument sign is okay, although it is somewhat big.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The existing monument sign appeared acceptable from his observation at the site visit, although it is somewhat big; and b) The proposed wall sign should be reduced to the same size as the proposed lettering on the proposed monument sign, so the sizes of the two signs are in conformance.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-165-DRB, 22 South Fairfield Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) The proposed monument sign is approved as submitted; and 2) The size of the proposed wall sign shall be reduced to the same size as the proposed lettering on the proposed monument sign; and to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-165-DRB to January 26, 2010, for Final review on the Sign Calendar.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-191-DRB

6868 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-003)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a 60,434-square foot two-story commercial property on a 3.1-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct two partially enclosed patios on the north and

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 4 of 18

south elevations of the building and to remodel the façade. No new floor area is proposed. The project was filed by Antonio Villaruel, AIA, architect, on behalf of Cortona Opportunity Ltd., property owner. Related cases: 07-162-DRB; 07-162-LUP; 09-191-LUP RV. (Shine Ling)

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-034-DRB

207 Carlo Drive (APN 077-181-008)

This is a request for *Final* 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 12-8-09, 10-27-09, 9-8-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-8-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

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.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 5 of 18

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.
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.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-118-DRB

7394 Davenport Road (APN 073-222-019)

This is a request for *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

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 6 of 18

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 12-8-09, 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-8-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

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. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. 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. (Continued from 12-8-09*) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-8-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 7 of 18

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.

L-2. 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. (Continued from 1-12-10) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-12-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) From his experience, PVC backing material tends to break down in sunlight, therefore he suggested using another material that is more durable; and b) The proposed Color Scheme One and Color Scheme Two are okay, but it seems that Color Scheme Three becomes too dark with the vegetation and should be somewhat lighter - perhaps the Palladian Plum should be lighter.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed tan colors should be somewhat deeper/richer, and consider colors a bit more brown and less yellow; b) Expressed concern that the Plymouth Rock color appears too gray, therefore, it should be warmer so it does not resemble the color of a battleship; and c) He noted that when he painted his house a very deep brown color, he observed that the deeper color makes the green color of the plants more readable.
3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed colors are appreciated because they are earth tones which blend well when the buildings are placed against the backdrop of the mountains; b) The proposed project will be a nice change and improvement for Old Town; c) The palette is appreciated because this is a very big project and it will be nice to have the mass of color for all of these buildings; and d) Some clean-up on the grounds and attention to the landscaping will help refresh and refurbish the site.
4. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed palette is nice and will wear well over time; b) Suggested the applicant explore changing the shade of the Plymouth Rock color a couple of shades darker in Color Scheme Three, because, in his opinion, when there is painting over wood with stucco next to it, it doesn't seem as though it was intended, and a subtle color change may be worth considering; and c) He noted that the current contrast between the green and the yellow is much too stark.
5. Member Messner commented: a) Agreed with Member Branch's suggestion to consider changing the shade of the color for the wood paneling a couple of shades darker, possibly 20% to 30% darker.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 8 of 18

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-162-DRB, 915 – 1795 Kellogg Avenue, with comments, and to direct the applicant to: 1) Consider comments regarding the color palette and provide the revised colors on a color board; 2) Explore the suggestion to make a subtle change to the proposed Plymouth Rock color for the wood paneling that is one or two shades darker (noting that if the applicant decides to propose the shade change, only one elevation will need to be provided for review); and 3) Change the proposed PVC backing material to another material that is more durable; and to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-162-DRB, to January 26, 2010.

L-3. 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. (Continued from 1-12-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-12-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

There being no objections, the DRB agreed to review the plans presented by the applicant at today's meeting.

1. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) There is a problem with regard to the proposed Blood Red Trumpet Vine species because it will require consistent pruning, otherwise it will overgrow and impact those species on the sidewalk; b) There needs to be more green vegetation in front, but the Sword Fern species is not appropriate because it will not grow very big; c) Suggested replacing the proposed Sword Fern species in front with King Palms, with gravel around them, which will require less maintenance and less water; d) Adding the King Palms in front will be somewhat reflective of the landscaping across the street which includes King Palms; e) The site is actually an industrial yard, therefore, the proposed little planting pockets for landscaping, as well as the proposed planting species for the pockets, are not appropriate and should be removed and replaced with a wheel stop; and f) The proposed board and batting material will not work for the project.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The landscaping is an important component to help facilitate the success of the project; b) Matching the King Palm trees with the project across the street is moving in a good direction; c) The proposed board and batting material will not be appropriate for the design; d) The building

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 9 of 18

- design and materials should keep with the area; and e) Suggested bronze window material rather than white to tie in with the colors.
3. Member Messner commented: a) The proposed Sword Fern species would be fine but he would suggest adding some King Palms with the Sword Fern species around them; b) In his opinion, the proposed landscape plan is fine with regard to line of sight concerns; c) Within the Trumpet Vine species, there are different variations that will grow which are less tenacious and will require less maintenance, but they will still need to be watered and fertilized; and d) Consider using a pre-cast concrete fence material, noting that an example exists at the condominium project on Fairview Avenue across from Berkeley Road.
 4. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed roof drainage system needs to be described on the plans.
 5. Member Herrera commented: a) Suggested the Landscape Plan include planting the Queen Palms, then a couple of King Palms, then a couple of Sword Fern plants to cover the dirt.
 6. Member Branch commented: a) The applicant needs to consider the Landscape Plan with regard to maintenance issues.
 7. Chair Smith commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide a drawing showing the appearance of the proposed wall.

MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item L-4, DRB Permit No. 09-171-DRB, 5750 Dawson Avenue, with comments; and to request that the applicant provide: 1) A proposed solution for the fencing materials; 2) A revised Landscape Plan; and 3) Lighting cut sheets; and to continue Item L-4, DRB Permit No. 09-171-DRB, to January 26, 2010.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. 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.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 10 of 18

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. (Continued from 12-8-09) (Natasha Campbell)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-8-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

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 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-

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 11 of 18

- 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-2. 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

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 12 of 18

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 12-8-09, 11-10-09) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-8-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

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.
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

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 13 of 18

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 26, 2010

Page 14 of 18

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.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 15 of 18

- 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.
- 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.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 16 of 18

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.

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

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 17 of 18

information on drawings that reflect the proposed revisions. If the revisions are not clearly delineated, they cannot be construed as approved.

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

Design Review Board Agenda

January 26, 2010

Page 18 of 18

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 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 aeal hearing.