



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - UNAPPROVED

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)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

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

Board Members absent: Thomas Smith, Chair; and Simon Herrera.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Assistant Planner; Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

January 26, 2010

Page 2 of 17

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for January 12, 2010.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for January 12, 2010, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the Subcommittee met today and discussed items on the agenda that included Penalties for Shoddy Contract Work, and an update from staff regarding the Urban Forest Management Plan. The next Street Tree Subcommittee meeting will be on February 23, 2010, at 2:00 p.m.

Member Wignot stated that Bill Millar, City Arborist, reported that a meeting of the Urban Forest Master Plan Advisory Group will be held on January 27, 2010, at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers. He stated that Bill Millar invited the Subcommittee members to attend the meeting if available.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported: 1) The DRB positions will expire this month for Chair Smith and Member Herrera. The application date to be considered to fill these vacancies is January 28, 2010. Applicants will be interviewed by the City Council. The tentative date for these vacancies to be filled is by the next DRB meeting on February 9, 2010. 2) The City does not have a mural program and currently there is no anticipated funding. 3) The Urban Forest Master Plan Advisory Group will meet on January 27, 2010, at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers. DRB members as well as members of the public are invited to attend the meeting. 4) The agenda item regarding the appeal to the DRB approval of the proposed project at 7837 Langlo Ranch Road is tentatively scheduled for the City Council meeting on February 16, 2010.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

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

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported that staff recommends that Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 09-154-DRB, 7402 Hollister Avenue, be moved forward ahead of Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, for agenda management purposes, because it is anticipated that the review of Item M-2 will be fairly straight-forward.

MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to move forward Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 09-154-DRB, ahead of Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, on today's agenda.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Chair Branch reported that today he reviewed Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-170-DRB, 6865 Silver Fern Court, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted.

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)

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on January 26, 2010:

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Chair Branch reported that today he reviewed Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-170-DRB, 6865 Silver Fern Court, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown reported that the Sign Subcommittee reviewed today Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-165-DRB, 22 South Fairview Avenue, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted.

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

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

January 26, 2010

Page 4 of 17

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)

Sign Subcommittee Action on January 26, 2010:

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) The applicant has responded to the condition of Preliminary Approval by reducing the size of the proposed wall sign.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to grant Final Approval of Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-165-DRB, 22 South Fairview Avenue, as submitted.

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 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)

The plans were presented by Antonio Villaruel, AIA, architect, representing his client, Occam Networks, tenant. He stated that the revisions are being requested because, based on the dollar value of several cost estimates, his client does not find it feasible to construct the project as it was approved. Mr. Villaruel noted that the request includes minor revisions in the patio and revisions that are somewhat more major to the front of the building. He stated that he is not privy to the revised landscape plan.

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) The revisions are acceptable; b) The proposed greenscreen fences are fine; c) The aluminum awnings will work; and d) The revised plans are much simpler than the previously-approved design, but he understands the cost issues in relationship to projects.
2. Member Wignot commented: a) Agreed with Member Branch's comments; and b) Regarding the landscape plan, in his opinion, it would nice to include new plantings along the Cortona Drive frontage, but under the circumstances, it will have to wait for some future opportunities.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

January 26, 2010

Page 5 of 17

3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The revised landscape plan proposes no changes to the existing plantings along the Cortona Drive frontage; however, she believes it would be nice if the landscape plan could include some additional trees; and b) There needs to be clarity in the language to ensure that the existing plantings along the Cortona Drive frontage are retained, by removing the term "replacement", so the language will be more accurate.
4. Member Schneider commented: a) The previously-approved design was quite nice; however, the budgetary constraints are understood; and b) The revised plans are acceptable architecturally, considering the design is somewhat simplistic.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to grant Revised Final Approval of Item I-1, DRB Permit No. 09-191-DRB, 6868 Cortona Drive, as submitted, with language incorporated into the Revised Final Approval conditions to ensure that the existing plantings along the Cortona Drive frontage shall be retained, instead of the landscape plan that was previously approved for the frontage.

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)

The plans were presented by Vijay Prajapati, property owner. He stated that the applicant has responded to the DRB comments and that Final approval is requested at this time. He presented color details and the landscape plan.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) From his personal experience, he would recommend adding gutters fully around the roof; b) The exterior light proposed on the yard on the north side of the house would be useful, however the fixture must be shielded and should not shine into the neighbor's yard; and c) Possibly consider motion detectors on the north side of the house.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) With regard to the landscape plan, her personal preference would be a design with less lawn elements; b) The proposed recessed lights under the entryway should be sufficient, therefore, the proposed

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

January 26, 2010

Page 6 of 17

- exterior lights in the front entry are not necessary; c) If the applicant considers adding gutters to the roof, the gutters should empty into the lawn area or somewhere else on the property, and not onto the street; and d) Consider pavers in the driveway, or other methods, to allow water to filter through.
3. Member Messner commented: a) The proposed landscape plan details are fine.
 4. Member Branch commented: a) The applicant's efforts to work with the DRB and the neighbors are appreciated; b) The proposed color scheme is okay; c) A flat tile material might work better as opposed to an s-tile; d) The revised entry design is better than the previous proposal; e) He is not sure about the round column design at the entry, but the proportion is getting better; f) The rafter tails are appreciated and the design seems to be more in character; g) The proposed stucco trims seem too busy, noting that a plain rectangular trim might work better in the neighborhood; h) Consider placing trim around the vents similar to the trim on the windows; i) The trim above the garage adds detail, noting that typically this type of trim goes all the way across or there is exposed wood; j) The proposed two lights at the entry could be eliminated; k) The one light fixture on top of the address sign may be appropriate; and l) The rear porch element on the west elevation has a character that lends itself to the form of the house.
 5. Member Schneider commented: a) Agreed with Member Branch that flat tiles would be more appropriate and would fit better with the proposed stucco color; b) Half round gutters would work fine with the proposed eave details; c) The proposed recessed lighting underneath the entry should provide sufficient lighting, therefore, the two proposed wall-mounted lights at the entry can be eliminated; d) Agreed with Member Branch that simplifying the window trim would be better; e) Encouraged the reduction of the lawn element as much as possible, particularly the element to the north of the driveway where planting materials would be more appropriate.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to continue Item J-1, DRB Permit No. 09-034-DRB, 207 Carlo Drive, to February 9, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar, with the following comments: a) The proposed lights on the front of the house shall be eliminated, with the exception of the recessed lighting; b) The applicant shall provide cut sheets showing fixtures that are shielded for the remainder of the lights that are proposed; c) Flat tiles shall be used on the roof rather than the proposed s-tiles; d) Rectangular trim shall be used for the windows, keeping the sill piece heavier than the sides and the top; e) The vents shall have trim that is similar to the windows; f) The area to the north of the driveway should be planted entirely with all landscaping materials and no grass; g) The roof gutters should be half round, with the water directed onto the applicant's property, away from the house, but not flowing onto the street; and to continue Item J-1, DRB Permit No. 09-034-DRB, to February 9, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

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 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)

Recused: Member Wignot recused himself because he was not at the meeting when this item was first presented. He had also recused himself from the previous meeting. Member Wignot exited the Council Chamber.

The plans were presented by agent Joe Echeverria on behalf of Mark and Chyoung McCann, property owners.

Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) The applicant responded previously to the DRB request to eliminate the proposed cantilever; and b) The site accommodates the parking, although, initially he had some questions regarding the parking.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The applicant responded to the DRB request to help reduce the massing somewhat; and b) The architecture for the proposed project is designed to match existing.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Recused: Wignot; Absent: Herrera, Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 09-118-DRB, 7394 Davenport Road, as submitted; and to continue Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 09-118-DRB, to February 9, 2010, for Final review on the Consent 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,

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

January 26, 2010

Page 8 of 17

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)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by James Zimmerman AIA, architect, on behalf of Francis and Catherine Donohoe, property owners.

Shine Ling, Assistant Planner, presented the floor area ratios for the immediate neighbors which were provided by the project architect.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) There are a lot of two-story residences in the neighborhood, which is very nice neighborhood; b) The architectural design of the proposed project is appreciated; c) The proposed veranda is a nice aesthetic element to add to the house and it will probably have a lot of use, particularly in good weather; d) One existing bedroom will be eliminated; e) There have been no public comments from neighbors expressing concerns as far as he knows; f) He would support the proposed project, even though the size is ten percent over the recommended floor area ratio; and g) He believes this project shows justification that an exception can be made to the recommended floor area ratio guideline; and h) The applicant will need to provide cut sheets showing that proposed lighting fixtures comply with Dark Sky principles.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed architectural design is nice; and b) With regard to exceeding the recommended floor area ratio guideline, he believes this case is an example of a proposed project adding positively to the aesthetics of the neighborhood;
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed project is a nice aesthetic element that will enhance the neighborhood as well as the existing house; and b) Encouraged the use of board and bat materials to tie into the existing house.
4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed project with the addition of the veranda will be a very nice improvement and benefit for the neighborhood; and b) The appearance of the project does not seem to show that the recommended floor area ratio guideline is exceeded.
5. Member Messner commented: a) The project design works well with the neighborhood even though the project exceeds the recommended floor area ratio guidelines.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, 6560 Camino Caseta, as submitted, with the following Conditions: 1) The applicant shall provide the proposed color details; 2) The

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

applicant shall provide cut sheets showing that the proposed light fixtures comply with Dark Sky principles; and 3) Board and bat material shall be used for the new addition element; and to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, to February 23, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

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)

The plans were presented by Justin Van Mullem, On Design Architects, on behalf of the Goleta Valley Housing Committee, property owner. In response to the DRB comments, he provided the revised proposed colors and the proposed details with regard to the PVC. He stated that the owner requests reconsideration regarding the suggestion by Member Branch to paint the wood paneling a couple of shades darker because there would be a cost implication for the painter to match the colors and with regard to maintenance. He noted that the property owner is a non-profit agency.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed color selection overall is fine; b) He supports the proposed project; and c) He noted that he personally believes that Color Scheme Three appears somewhat dark and could be a little lighter.
2. Member Branch commented: a) His suggestion to paint the wood paneling a couple of shades darker is a subtle aesthetic detail, otherwise it would not look like it was originally intended to be that color; however, he understands the applicant's concern regarding costs.

MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-162-DRB, 915-1795 Kellogg Avenue, including the color scheme, as submitted, and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-162-DRB, to February 9, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

RECESS HELD FROM 4:20 P.M. TO 4:30 P.M.

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)

The plans were presented by Russ Banko, architect, representing Mark Sauter, of John S. Carter, Inc., agent, for Tom Kennedy, property owner. Russ Banko also stated that he has contacted the owner of the building regarding whether a mural would be allowed, and that Mark Sauter has contacted Santa Barbara City College to see if someone would be interested in painting a mural.

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The applicant's proposal to eliminate the proposed King Palm on the east side of the garage is acceptable; b) She had initially expressed concern about planting King Palms on the side of the garage because the planter spaces are typically too small and the species would grow up against the building; c) Planting the King Palm species in front would not be a problem; d) The proposed Boston Ivy species in front is very nice and would be sufficient landscaping, in her opinion, because the site is in an industrial area and also that property owner will need to make an effort to maintain the landscaping; e) The proposed lighting cut sheets look good; f) This is a good example of a project that looks nice and will help spruce up Old Town; and g) If the property owner is willing, the concept of painting a mural on the building would be a novel precedent.
2. Member Wignot commented: a) The size of the planters for the proposed King Palm plantings need to be large enough to accommodate the species.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The revised architectural plans, which fit more with an industrial design, are appreciated; and b) His preference regarding the building material would be split face block rather than plaster.
4. Member Branch commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide architectural details including the parapets and the cable railing at Final review.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-171-DRB, 5750 Dawson Avenue, as submitted, with the following conditions: 1) The proposed King Palm species on the east side of the garage shall be eliminated; 2) The size of the planter on the west side of the garage shall be extended enough to accommodate the proposed King Palm; 3) The material for the windows shall be bronze aluminum to match the material color

board submitted; and to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-171-DRB, to February 9, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

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.

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)

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

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

January 26, 2010

Page 12 of 17

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Ad Hoc Committee Attendance: Members Branch, Schneider and Wignot participated in the two Ad Hoc Committee meetings with members of the applicant's project team.

Document: Memorandum from Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, dated January 26, 2010, Subject: 09-075-DRB, Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Business Center, 6300 Hollister Avenue, APN 073-050-020.

Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, stated that she attended the two Ad Hoc Committee meetings and that a summary is provided in her Memorandum dated January 26, 2010. She noted that no additional correspondence has been received regarding the proposed project since the DRB review on December 8, 2009.

Member Schneider reported that the Ad Hoc Committee met twice since the last DRB review on December 8, 2009. He stated that the Ad Hoc Committee requested that the applicant present a couple of different options in response to the reviews.

The plans were presented by Tony Wrzosek, with R. D. Olson Development, applicant; Gene Fong, project architect; and Steve Fedde, property owner.

Gene Fong, project architect, presented the revised architectural plans and document entitled, "Residence Inn by Marriott Goleta, California". The plan sheets included the plan presented at the January 22nd Ad Hoc Committee meeting for a 135-room hotel and three new options in response to comments made at the Ad Hoc Committee meetings. He summarized the three options as follows: a) Option A removes two additional guest rooms, reducing the room count to 133 rooms; b) Option B is identical in plan to Option A, with the exception that the roof pitch turns the corner; and c) Option C adds one room back.

The applicant prepared their own visual simulations for the revised project that were included in their plan sheets. These visual simulations were not reviewed by the City's consultant, Ron Stevens of Interacta, who prepared the visual simulations presented at the December 8, 2009, DRB meeting. Tony Wrzosek, R.D. Olson Development, pointed out that the design shown on Sheet A-4.6 is in response to the request from the Ad Hoc Committee to change the third floor massing, the roof pitches and setback distances, which he believes has improved the visibility of the mountains. He stated that this improvement is shown when comparing Sheet A-4.6 with Sheet A-4.3 which shows the previous plan. He noted with regard to Sheet A-4.10, that the massing of the proposed building seems to be consistent with the adjacent Sares-Regis 21-foot tall building. He stated that the proposed project, which is within the 35' height limit, as well as the architectural projections, are in compliance with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance for height.

Speakers:

Ana Citrin, attorney, Law Offices of Marc Chytilo, representing Friends of Saspili, urged more dramatic revisions that would help to alleviate some of the visual impact concerns, particularly regarding neighborhood compatibility and view obstruction.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

January 26, 2010

Page 13 of 17

She expressed disappointment that the plans that were reviewed a few years ago had cultural and aesthetic impacts which she does not believe are addressed in the revised plan. She noted there were some improvements as a result of the Ad Hoc Committee, including minor improvements to ridgeline visibility, but the concerns regarding mass bulk and scale, and neighborhood compatibility still remain. It is still larger than other buildings in the area. She expressed concern that drawings A-4.5 and A-4.7 show public view obstruction, for example in the southwest corner and cited the potential for a significant aesthetic impact based on the City's CEQA Guidelines. She also cited visual resources policies VH 1.4, VH 2.2 and VH 2.3. It is her understanding that Hollister Avenue is a scenic corridor. She spoke in support of the importance of revised visual simulations. She expressed concern that the architectural style is not similar in style with regard to the other buildings in the area that are shown in Sheet A-3.2, although she noted there is some diversity in the area. Another concern is that the proposed stacked stone accents are potentially a Southwestern style which is not in character with the neighborhood, and some other options may need to be considered to address cultural sensitivity. She stated that it would be helpful to know the actual square footage of the individual rooms excluding public areas. She suggested scaling back the number of rooms, or reconfiguring some of the rooms to accommodate the proposed project. She does not believe that DRB Findings of Approval #1, #2, #3, #13 and #17 can be made, which relate to size, bulk and scale; the relationship of buildings to other buildings in the area; public scenic views, and neighborhood appearance. She urged more dramatic alternatives to address visual concerns, view obstruction, and neighborhood compatibility.

Gary Earle, Santa Barbara, concurred with comments by speaker Ana Citrin. He believes there needs to be quite a reduction in the size of the proposed building to make it compatible with the neighborhood and the policies in the General Plan with regard to size, bulk and scale; and ridgeline view corridors. He thought that at the last meeting, the overwhelming comments by the public and the DRB were to have a two-story building. He expressed concern that the revisions presented today merely nibble away at the corners of the building which is still a three-story building. Another concern is the impact to the ridgeline shown on Sheet A-4.7. He questions considering the developer's concerns regarding economic viability vs. the community's desire for planning within its General Plan.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, stated that the real issue is not being addressed which is that the proposed project is too big. He also concurred with the previous speakers.

Vice Chair Brown closed the public comment period at 6:13 p.m.

Tony Wrzosek, R.D. Olson Development, requested that the DRB provide comments regarding a general theme and suggested architectural style for the proposed building design.

Steve Fedde, property owner, stated that he understands the concerns regarding community standards and he noted also that there are economic considerations and that the community needs a certain type of hotel product. He stated that the applicant believes the three-story product would make more sense from a land use perspective

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

January 26, 2010

Page 14 of 17

because even if a two-story product was feasible, the footprint would be greater which would be challenging with regard to meeting landscape and parking requirements.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Of the options presented today, Option A is preferred; b) The Option A version on Sheet A-3.1 makes the building seem like mostly a two-story building with a three-story portion that builds up over the lobby along Hollister Avenue; c) It will be important to view updated visual simulations and video drive-by simulation by Ron Stevens that show the view with regard to the mountain ridgeline when driving eastbound and westbound on Hollister Avenue; d) It would be helpful to know the actual sizes of the rooms; e) When considering the architectural style, he noted that Goleta is a very eclectic community, with a variety of architecture including traditional, contemporary and Spanish; and f) The proposed architecture appears to have an universal character, however, he would prefer something that keeps more with a specific style.
2. Member Branch commented: a) Option A is the better option presented today, and the revisions made by the applicant help significantly with regard to the hip roof and stepping back some of the mass; b) He is not opposed overall to a three-story building, but he believes the mass facing Hollister Avenue needs to be different; c) When viewing Drawing A-4.7, he believes that the centralized three-story element that relates to the porte-cochere works okay, but as the mass moves to the southwest, it seems to bump up at the stair element. d) Consider moving the guest room at the rear to behind the front center mass and manipulating the stair into the mass to reduce the mass on the southwest corner; e) The three-story centralized mass of the building to the back is acceptable when considering the context of where the site is located and what the use of the building would bring to the community; f) The roof over the third floor is successful; g) Changing some of the eave details might help the architectural style fit more in Goleta as a whole; for example, the continuous flat roof with a cornice around it would work better if it were an actual pitched roof; h) He questioned whether the applicant considered a Marriott Residence Inn/Courtyard combination, which would lower the average room size and possibly reduce the overall size of the hotel so the project can meet the floor area ratio guidelines; and i) Following Vice Chair Brown's comments, Member Branch noted that her comments echoed what he was talking about. He remains concerned about how the building will look from Hollister Avenue and thinks the southwest corner needs adjustment.
3. Member Wignot commented: a) He expressed concern that the building will still appear as a three-story building from the view when driving by on Hollister Avenue, although it may be within the 35' height limit; and further stated that even if a two-story building were the same height as a three-story building, a building with three stories of windows would read as a taller building at three stories; (he noted that the Citrix building along Hollister Avenue is a two-story building with two stories of windows and appears as a two-story building, although he does not know the height of the Citrix building); b) Option A is the preferred option presented today; c) He noted that the applicant has made a good attempt to try

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

January 26, 2010

Page 15 of 17

and reduce the size, bulk and scale of the building by moving it back from Hollister Avenue by 23 feet and reducing some of the third-story elements on the front of the building; d) At the Ad Hoc Committee meeting, the property owners explained that they would be landscaping the frontage along Hollister Avenue from La Patera Lane to Robin Hill Road, which would include adding sidewalks and a bus stop; e) A concern expressed at the Ad Hoc Committee meeting was that the large swaths of parking area in the front and back of the building on the adjacent property do not have very much landscaping, and a suggestion was made to provide additional tree wells; f) An updated visual simulation and a video drive-by simulation regarding the revised proposed option will be needed; and g) The current plans exceed the recommended floor area ratio (FAR) by approximately 12 percent. The Ad Hoc Committee previously asked the applicant to provide an example of a hotel plan that would comply with the [General Plan Hotel Overlay and Zoning Ordinance Hotel Overlay] FAR of 0.50; and h) Expressed concern that there needs to be an assurance that the shared parking component and inclusion of compact parking spaces will provide for sufficient parking.

4. Member Messner commented: a) He spoke in support of the pull-out style bus stop because it will help facilitate traffic flow on Hollister Avenue; and b) Regarding the architectural style, some recent projects at Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital and the airport will be using Santa Barbara sandstone as part of their design.
5. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The applicant's revisions have helped to free up some of the views, but some additional progress needs to be made; b) The public viewshed along Hollister Avenue is exceptionally important to the community's character and Goleta's General Plan standards require protection of the mountain views. She understands that Marriott has their own standards for development, but the project needs to comply with Goleta's standards, that include maintaining public views of the mountains. There are areas that can change and should be revised. c) Member Branch's suggestion to remove the mass on the southwest corner of the building may be a good solution; d) Possibly consider a three-story massing on the central core of the building, then stepping down to two stories; e) There may be some other additional changes that might make some difference; f) The floor area ratio guideline issue needs to be honored; g) Consider the use of materials that would be more reflective of the cultural resources of the area; h) It would be nice if the architecture style looks something like the community's character; i) Her preference would be a style that is somewhat simple and not overdone; j) A three-story façade that appears very monolithic is not very inviting; k) If the applicant considers a Spanish or Monterey style of architecture, there are some examples in Santa Barbara; and l) The architectural style should not be Southwestern; m) The proposed project is still impacting archaeological resources; n) The eastern view is really important; and o) The visual simulations should not be revised until the DRB has seen the newest project revisions.

Following the DRB members' comments, Tony Wrzosek, R.D. Olson Development, applicant, stated that they were not trying to force this project without concern for the City's standards. Gene Fong, project architect, and Tony Wrzosek stated that their understanding of the DRB comments was that the three-story element was okay for

the entrance and that they would look at modifying the stairs and the southwest corner to the middle of the south elevation on the third floor.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, to February 9, 2010, with the following direction: 1) The applicant is requested to study the third-story element on the southwest corner of the proposed building with regard to the stair tower to reduce the mass based on the DRB comments and direction, and to present an Option D scheme.

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 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)

The plans were presented by Scott Dunaway of SureSite Consulting Group, LLC, agent, on behalf of T-Mobile USA, Inc., lessee, and Hollister Business Park LLC, property owner.

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The branches should to be staggered so they are not opposite one another.
2. Member Messner commented: a) The design would be fine if the branches are staggered off the trunk.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith) to take off calendar Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 09-154-DRB, 7402 Hollister Avenue, with the following Conceptual comments: 1) The branches shall be offset and staggered as they project from the trunk; and 2) The revised design showing the branches offset and staggered as they project from the trunk shall be included in the plans that move forward in the review process for the proposed project.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

January 26, 2010

Page 17 of 17

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

No requests.

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

No announcements.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 7:00 P.M.