



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - UNAPPROVED

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, February 9, 2010**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:00 P.M.**

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### **SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.**

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

### **STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE**

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

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

### **REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.**

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

#### **Members:**

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

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

---

#### **A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Smith at 3:07 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Thomas Smith, Chair; Cecilia Brown, Vice Chair; Scott Branch; Simon Herrera; \*Chris Messner; and Bob Wignot. \*Member Messner exited the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Board Members absent: Carl Schneider.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Cindy Moore, Senior Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner; Steve Wagner, Director of Community Services; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

## **B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

### **B-1. MEETING MINUTES**

A. Design Review Board Minutes for January 26, 2010.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Abstain: Herrera; Absent: Schneider) to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for January 26, 2010, as submitted.**

### **B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the next Street Tree Subcommittee meeting will be on February 23, 2010, at 2:00 p.m.

### **B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT**

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported: 1) The City Council has not yet conducted the interviews to fill the scheduled vacancies on the DRB, therefore, Chair Smith and Member Herrera will continue to serve on the DRB until the appointments have been made to fill the vacancies; 2) Staff recommends that Agenda Item B-4 Election of Officers and Item B-5 Appointment to Subcommittees be continued to the next DRB meeting; 3) A presentation regarding the City's Stormwater Management Plan will be made by Steve Wagner, Director of Community Services, today from 3:15 to 4:00 p.m.; 4) A public meeting is scheduled for February 17, 2010, at 6:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, regarding the Stormwater Management Plan; 5) On February 16, 2010, the City Council will consider an agenda item regarding the appeal to the DRB approval of the proposed project at 7837 Langlo Ranch Road; and 6) The City Council is scheduled to review the Jordano's Project on March 2, 2010.

### **B-4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

There being no objections, the Election of Officers was continued to the next DRB meeting on February 23, 2010.

### **B-5. APPOINTMENT TO SUBCOMMITTEES**

There being no objections, the Appointment to Subcommittees was continued to the next DRB meeting on February 23, 2010.

### **B-6. STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN PRESENTATION**

A presentation of the City of Goleta Stormwater Management Plan was made by Steve Wagner, Director of Community Services, along with a PowerPoint entitled, "Storm Water Management Plan Summary Presentation December 2009". He stated that a Stakeholder's kickoff meeting is scheduled for February 17, 2010, at 6:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers. Citizens are invited to attend the meeting and their

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 3 of 20

input is welcome. He introduced Everett King, Environmental Services Coordinator, who will be the primary contact person for the City's Stormwater Management Plan program.

### 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 the applicant for Item F-3, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, requested a continuance to March 23, 2010. He also stated that staff suggests Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-003-DRB, 270 Storke Road, be moved ahead of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 811 Cambridge Drive.

**MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to continue Item F-3, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, to March 23, 2010, per the applicant's request.**

### E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Chair Branch Scott Branch reported that today he reviewed Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-034-DRB; Item F-2, DRB Permit No. 09-118-DRB; Item F-4, DRB Permit No. 09-162-DRB; and Item F-5, DRB Permit No. 09-171-DRB.

### F. CONSENT CALENDAR

#### F-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 1-26-10, 12-8-09, 10-27-09, 9-8-09) (Brian Hiefield)

*Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on February 9, 2010:*

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Chair Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-034-DRB, 207 Carlo Drive, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted, with the condition that the applicant shall work with staff to provide graphic details to meet the DRB requirements for Final review submittal,

including gutters, eave and rake details, and window details. Member Branch reported that the exterior light fixture shall be Forte Light 17048-01-04 with the linen glass lenses.

**F-2. 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 1-26-10, 12-8-09, 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

*Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on February 9, 2010:*

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Chair Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-2, DRB Permit No. 09-118-DRB, 7394 Davenport Road, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted.

**F-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-141-DRB**

5877 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-112-003)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 2,362-square foot commercial property on a 4,100-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to replace the existing bakery store front, and add landscaping and hardscape to the rear of the property to provide an outdoor seating area. This project will not result in any added square footage. The project was filed by agent Jack Shaffer on behalf of the Martin Koobation Family Trust, property owner. Related cases: LUR-47335, LUR-51775. (Continued from 1-12-10\*, 12-8-09\*, 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

**MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to continue Item F-3, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, to March 23, 2010, per the applicant's request.**

**F-4. 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;

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 5 of 20

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 1-26-10, 1-12-10) (Brian Hiefield)

*Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on February 9, 2010:*

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Chair Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-4, DRB Permit No. 09-162-DRB, 915-1795 Kellogg Avenue, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted.

### **F-5. 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 1-26-10, 1-12-10) (Shine Ling)

*Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on February 9, 2010:*

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Chair Branch reported that he reviewed today Item F-5, DRB Permit No. 09-171-DRB, 5750 Dawson Avenue, and that Final Review was granted as submitted. The applicant added notes to the plans that the window color will be bronze and the stair stringer color will be either black or cortense steel.

### **G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown reported that the Sign Subcommittee today reviewed Item H-1, DRB Permit NO. 10-008-DRB, 6900-7095 Marketplace Drive.

### **H. SIGN CALENDAR**

#### **H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-008-DRB**

6900-7095 Marketplace Drive (APN 073-440-013;-014; -015; -016; -017; -018; -024)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes the Camino Real Marketplace, which contains a total of 483,257 square feet of retail commercial space and an outdoor garden center of 22,484 square feet on 49 acres in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes minor amendments to the Camino Real Marketplace Overall Sign Plan. The project was filed by Kim Schizas of Camino Real LLC, property owner. (Shine Ling)

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 6 of 20

*Sign Subcommittee Action on February 9, 2010:*

Site visits: Made by Members Brown and Smith.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Kim Schizas of Camino Real LLC, property owner; Alastair Cumming, Bill Moore & Associates, project graphic designer; and Joyce Sneed, District Manager, Ross Dress for Less.

Kim Schizas stated that the purposes of the proposed minor amendments to the Overall Sign Plan are to indicate in the language that the sign for a major tenant must be located in the approximate location and meet the size requirements but does not need to fit precisely within the box indicated on the elevations, and also to add specific language to clarify that tenants shall not advertise specific products they are selling underneath the name of the business.

Alastair Cumming, project graphic designer, stated that the height of the letters for "Ross" will be 36-inches and the height of "Dress for Less" will be 18 inches. He clarified that the legal business name of the tenant is "Ross Dress for Less".

Shine Ling, Assistant Planner, stated that the language in the legal notice indicated that the item will be considered for Conceptual/Preliminary/Final review.

Comments:

1. Member Smith commented: a) The proposed language should be revised to clarify that the sign should be visually centered on the façade.
2. Member Brown commented: a) In general, the character of the signs in a development will start to change when businesses start to add descriptors to their legal business name.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to grant Preliminary Approval and Final Approval of Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 10-008-DRB, 6900-7095 Marketplace Drive, as submitted, with the Condition that the following change shall be made to the proposed amended language: 1) The language in the Overall Sign Plan shall be changed to require that the tenant identification sign shall be in the general location, visually centered on the building façade, as shown on the exhibit.**

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

**RECESS HELD FROM 4:00 P.M. TO 4:05 P.M.**

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 7 of 20

### J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-086-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-610-011)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes two screened storage areas and nine buildings totaling 326,490 square feet on a 92.25-acre lot in the Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Building 4 and associated improvements as part of the phased build out of the previously approved Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 4 would be a two-story, 60,000-square foot structure. Associated improvements for the building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, lighting, and parking. New materials consist of concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out, the Cabrillo Business Park would total 948,782 square feet, including 707,100 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. Building 4 was referenced on previous agendas under DRB permit number 37-SB-DRB. The project was filed on June 1, 2009 by agent Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 08-107-DP AM, 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN. (Continued from 6-23-09\*, 5-12-09\*, 2-10-09\*, 11-12-08, 10-14-08) (Cindy Moore)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Cindy Moore, Senior Planner, stated that the purpose of the item today is for Final review for Building 4 and associated improvements as indicated in the Staff Memorandum dated January 21, 2009 [sic], Subject: DRB Meeting of 02-09-10, Item #J-1, 09-086-DRB, Cabrillo Business Park.

The plans were presented by Vince Dyer, JDO/Dyer, project architect; Troy White, agent, of Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC, property owner; Steve Fedde, applicant; and Brian Smith, Smith Engineering, project civil engineer. Troy White, Dudek, provided a brief overview of the previous reviews of the Cabrillo Business Park project. He stated that the review today for Building 4 will include the actual site improvements in terms of the site plan, the landscape plan, and lighting plan. He stated that the plans are similar to the plans that were granted Preliminary Approval, but there are some additional details.

Steve Fedde, applicant, reported that the site drainage plan is working well as designed. He stated that the applicant will be working with the City to make a couple of minor improvements to provide some enhancement features to the drainage plan.

Brian Smith, project civil engineer, stated that the proposed lighting plan for Building 4 is very similar to the plan that was approved for Building 2. One change is that additional lighting fixtures were added to illuminate some dark areas that were found between the building and parking lot, but the previously approved light levels have not been increased or modified. Also, a steplight was added to a stairway to provide adequate lighting and some steplights were added along a patio seat wall. He clarified that full cut-off lighting luminaries will be used throughout the project to direct the light downward.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 8 of 20

Bob Cunningham and Laurie Romano, Arcadia Studio, project landscape architects, responded to questions via speaker telephone. Bob Cunningham clarified that the entire proposed plant list for the restoration area has been reviewed by the project biologist to ensure that the species are not invasive.

### Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) He has read the minutes from the last DRB review on November 12, 2008, noting that he was absent from the meeting, and he has reviewed the plans submitted for similar buildings in this project; and he believes he is prepared to vote in support of the proposed project; and b) The applicant has done a very good job in responding to DRB concerns and making the appropriate changes.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The plans are consistent with the submittals from the applicant that have been reviewed.
3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) She was not present at the DRB meeting on November 12, 2008, but she has reviewed the landscape and lighting plans; and b) The applicant's efforts working with the DRB are appreciated, particularly with regard to the lighting plan because a quality lighting plan does make a difference when there are good lighting fixtures that provide downward light with no glare.
4. Member Messner commented: a) The proposed plans are fine.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) The proposed landscape plan is fine.
6. Chair Smith commented: a) The applicant's efforts and hard work are appreciated.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider), to grant Final Approval of Item J-1, DRB Permit No. 09-086-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, as submitted.**

## K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

## L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

### AGENDA MANAGEMENT:

There being no objections, Chair Smith moved Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-003-DRB, 270 Storke Road, ahead of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 811 Cambridge Drive.

### L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-189-DRB

811 Cambridge Drive (APN 069-080-009)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property is an undeveloped 1.01-acre parcel in the 20-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 3,150-square foot single-story residence with an additional 1,088-square foot 3-car garage, 154-square foot breezeway and 258 feet of porches. The resulting single-story structure would be 4,392 square feet, consisting of a 3,150-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached (via 154-square foot breezeway) 1,088-square foot 3-car garage. This proposal is within the maximum floor area ratio guidelines for this



## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 9 of 20

property, which is 4,379 square feet plus an allocation of 650 square feet for a 3-car garage. New materials consist of stucco siding painted "X-53 Pure Ivory (Base 100)," a wood front door with a natural stain, Loewen wood windows painted "Sage Green," and a red barrel tiled roof. The project was filed by agent Preston Mann of Mann Construction on behalf of Lindsay and Lesa Mann, property owner. Related cases: 09-183-CC, 09-189-LUP. (Scott Kolwitz)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Document: Letter received February 9, 2010, from Gary Wideman.

The plans were presented by agent Preston Mann of Mann Construction on behalf of Lindsay and Lesa Mann, property owner.

Speakers:

Tom Post, neighbor on the downhill side, stated that the power lines run between his property and the property just below. He expressed his concerns with regard to power as well as sewage.

Robert Philbin, neighbor, read into the record his letter submitted February 9, 2010, regarding his concerns. He acknowledged that the property is challenging to build on due to the elevation differences. He does not believe the setbacks are consistent with the neighborhood. He is especially concerned regarding the location of the garage to the north and the furthest west portion of the proposed structure. He requested that the proposed structure be moved southeast and reduced in elevation. Another concern is how much trimming is proposed for the Oak trees, particularly the largest Oak tree. He does not believe the proposed project will have a lot of effect on his property, except the possibility of blocking late afternoon sun. He requested story poles to show what space the proposed project will actually consume.

John Buss, neighbor directly to the north, expressed concern that the proposed house structure would block most of his views, with approximately 10 or 15 percent of the view left. Another concern is that the proposed garage is a huge blockage with regard to his property. He requested consideration regarding a type of easement for emergency access. He also requested story poles.

Mark McClintock requested that the applicant address his concerns regarding runoff from the proposed site onto his property which is located below on Cielo Avenue. He noted from his experience there has been runoff from the property, especially in 1995 when there was an enormous amount of water.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) When looking at the floor plan, there seems to be a number of areas that have unused space, for example, the entryway, the study and the walk-in closet; b) Possibly consider whether reorienting the building

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 10 of 20

- somewhat would simplify the structure and roofline, and may address some of the concerns; c) Consider whether orienting the southerly rooms and breakfast room more southwesterly would eliminate the need to add so much fill; and d) The shape of the proposed three-car garage design seems to be well thought-out, without commenting on its location on the property.
2. Member Branch commented: a) It appears that the applicant's goal is to do a project that is tasteful; b) Site sections, and details regarding the retaining walls, will be useful to understand the plans for the fill and cut soil; c) The one-story plan will be helpful when trying to fit the project in with the neighborhood; d) Restudy whether using an 8-foot plate possibly at the back of the garage may help address the concern of the neighbor behind the garage; e) Consider methods to address neighbors' concerns regarding keeping the stormwater runoff on site, for example, utilizing permeable materials; f) The proposed style of architecture is acceptable, in his opinion, because it is an infill lot, but the details are somewhat overdone in terms of the some of the heights and masses which can be worked out, for example re-considering the height of some of the towers; and g) Story poles will be needed at some point when the design is more developed;
  3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed architecture seems a little overdone; b) A style that is somewhat simpler would be more preferable; c) Consider toning down some of the Spanish influences, for example, the turrets; d) The runoff should be fully captured on site and there should be no runoff going to other properties; e) Because of the runoff concerns, it would seem that the footprint may need to be minimized; f) Expressed concern regarding the proposed grading and suggested not grading at the southern edge; g) An arborist report is requested with regard to existing Oak tree; h) It would be helpful for the project landscape architect to be present at the next meeting to provide details regarding drainage, runoff, and swales; and i) She noted that the private views cannot be protected but the DRB may try to work with the applicant and neighbors to address concerns regarding private views.
  4. Member Herrera commented: a) Swales would help address concerns regarding stormwater runoff; and b) He appreciates the proposed architectural style.
  5. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with Member Branch's suggestion that lowering the plate in the garage to 8 feet, possibly at the back wall area, might diminish the profile; b) The elevations need to be shown in conjunction with the grading plan; c) Details are needed regarding the grading at the turnaround at the bottom of the property; d) Adding permeable materials in the hardscape area in front of the house might help address runoff concerns; e) The placement of the house is in the logical spot; f) He does not have a concern with regard to the proposed architectural style; and g) Story poles will be needed at the appropriate time in the process.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Schneider), to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-0189-DRB, 811 Cambridge Drive, to March 9, 2010, with comments and the following direction: 1) The applicant shall provide a more developed grading plan showing the drainage and addressing areas of concern that include the hammerhead and drainage from the hardscape area around the house; 2) An arborist report shall be provided showing City standards with regard to adding**

**hardscape under the drip line of the existing Oak tree; 3) The applicant shall provide elevations that are more developed showing the how the project relates in conjunction with the topography and grading plan; 4) The applicant shall provide site sections; 5) Consider the suggestion to reduce the plate heights in the garage; and 6) The existing retaining wall shall be labeled on the plans.**

**L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-003-DRB**

270 Storke Road (APN 073-100-032)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes the Storke Plaza Shopping Center, which contains 2 buildings totaling 31,970 square feet on 2.25 gross acres in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a new 437-square foot outdoor patio on the Storke Road frontage for a tenant space at the northern end of the building at 270 Storke Road. Minor changes to the primary storefront windows and doors are also proposed. The tenant space would be converted to restaurant use. An updated landscaping plan is proposed. The project was filed by Scott Branch of Burnell, Branch & Pester Architecture, agent, on behalf of Marc Winnikoff of Storke Road II LLP, property owner. (Shine Ling)

Recused: Member Branch recused himself and exited the Council Chambers.

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Tracy Burnell of Burnell, Branch & Pester Architecture, agent, on behalf of Marc Winnikoff of Storke Road II LLP, property owner. He provided updated plans with minor changes that include a correction to a drafting error on the partial west elevation that had shown the rail extended over further than it extended, and also the addition of Detail 1 on Sheet D-2 which is an enlarged view of the guard rail. He stated that the proposed plans include putting a patio in place of the existing planter. The plans also include landscaping an existing building in the parking lot, shown on the site plan, which currently stores equipment. Mr. Burnell stated that the applicant is in the process of working with the City to determine if the height of the proposed patio might affect the sight distance visibility when driving out onto Storke Road, looking to the left.

Shine Ling, Assistant Planner, reported that there is no minimum landscape requirement with regard to the proposed project because the shopping center was approved when a Development Plan was not required. He stated that staff requests that the DRB members comment as to the sufficiency of the proposed landscape plan which is 6.8 percent of lot coverage.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The busy Storke Road frontage does not seem like an appropriate location for an outdoor eating area because of the potential for impacts that would include traffic noise and exposure to air pollution, noting that the photographs show a bus stop nearby; b) The west exposure at the outdoor eating area on a hot day would be a concern – possibly umbrellas or screening

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 12 of 20

- would help; c) It seems problematic that someone wanting to enter the building from across Storke Road by ADA handicapped access would need to circle around three-fourths of the existing building to get to the front door; and d) He does not believe that he can support the proposed project.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Requested the applicant provide details with regard to the proposed outdoor seating space on the eastern side; b) The proposed project would benefit by the addition of more landscaping; c) Some landscaping on the western side is needed to help soften the starkness of the architecture, and provide some sort of shade trees in big pots and some sort of vine on the fence; and d) She noted that she has concerns with regard to outdoor seating that is located next to a major roadway.
  3. Member Messner commented: a) The project landscape architect should consider that there are some trees and vines that would do well in pots, and that some species actually prefer being in a container, for the western patio area; b) The proposed Weeping Bottlebrush tree in the accessory area seems to just “date” the area and should be replaced by a species that is possibly lacy and more upright with an upper canopy, that is non-deciduous and evergreen; and c) Possibly consider planting a mix of some different trees that are in the same family to provide for some aesthetic variety, for example, some trees that may flower at different times of the year.
  4. Member Herrera commented: a) The proposed tree species around the building are okay; and b) Agreed with Member Messner’s comments regarding landscaping that is needed on the western side patio.
  5. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with DRB comments that landscaping is needed on the western patio; b) More details are needed with regard to the outdoor seating area on the east elevation; c) With regard to ADA handicapped access, it may also be difficult to access the building from Hollister Avenue, which should at least be restudied; and d) In general, the railing at least helps break up the architecture on the lower level of the building.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 4 to 1 vote (No: Wignot; Absent: Schneider; Recused: Branch), to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-003-DRB, 270 Storke Road, to February 23, 2010, with comments, that include: 1) The applicant shall present plans for additional landscaping on the western and eastern elevations; 2) The applicant shall provide landscaping details with regard to the area around the accessory structure; 3) The applicant shall provide details with regard to any additional outdoor seating areas to the east and north; and 4) Restudy the ADA handicapped access to the building from Hollister Avenue and from Storke Road.**

**RECESS HELD FROM 6:07 TO 6:12 P.M.** (Next item: L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB)

### **M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR**

**RECESS HELD FROM 6:07 TO 6:12 P.M.**

**M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-143-DRB**

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

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

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

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

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

Estimated project grading would involve 51,000-cubic yards of cut and 33,000-cubic yards of fill (net export of 18,000-cubic yards of cut). Southern California Edison power-lines are proposed to be relocated from the southern property line to the northern and western boundaries of the project. Water and sewer would be provided by the Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District. The project was filed by agent Ken Marshall of Dudek, Inc on behalf of Goleta Hollister, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 08-143-GPA; -RZ; -OA, -TM (TM 32,048); -DP; -CUP. (Continued from 11-10-09) (Scott Kolwitz)

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 14 of 20

Document: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, presented a Memorandum dated February 9, 2010, Subject: 08-143-DRB; Westar Mixed-Use Project, Hollister Avenue NW of Glen Annie Road; APN 073-030-020, -021, summarizing the revisions to the project that have been made by the applicant since the last hearing.

The revised plans were presented by the project team including Peter Koetting, developer; and Don Donaldson, project civil engineer; on behalf of Goleta Hollister, LLC, property owner, applicant. Peter Koetting stated revisions have been made to the proposed plans that respond to the comments, concerns and suggestions which have been studied by the applicant. He also presented photovoltaic plans, stating that the applicant is in the process of exploring photovoltaics for both the retail and residential areas.

### Speakers:

Nancy Gillett, neighbor across the street on Glen Annie Road, expressed appreciation for the addition of residential open space. She expressed concern that Glen Annie Road will be very congested with traffic coming in and out of the proposed project, while at the same time, people will be parking and backing out of the parking spaces. She requested a review to see if those parking spaces are in a good spot.

Leslie Lund, neighbor on Glen Annie Road, expressed appreciation for the addition of the park triangle located near the front of her front door. She requested that the portion of the proposed project along Hollister Avenue mirrors the development across the street so there is a nice corridor view and both sides of Hollister Avenue are balanced. She agreed with concerns expressed by speaker Nancy Gillett regarding the impact on traffic flow when people are backing out of parking spaces into traffic along Glen Annie Road, particularly in the morning.

Patricia Vaughn, neighbor on Glen Annie Road, expressed appreciation for the addition of the green park area. She expressed concern about the impact on traffic circulation from vehicles backing out of the parking spaces along Glen Annie Road. She suggested perhaps the parking at the live/work area could be relocated, or parallel parking could be installed along Glen Annie Road. She requested clarification that there will be enough parking for residents and employees of the retail area.

### Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The revisions made by the applicant are appreciated; b) The project is moving in a good direction, particularly with regard to open space; c) He hopes there could be some more open space, for example adding a bioswale that is large and fenced off like at the Camino Real Marketplace, or adding an area planted with native materials and fenced off with a walking path around it; d) Dedicating some portion of the property to a bioswale area that provides some habitat for wildlife would be a good feature; e) The circulation for the trucks near the market needs to be restudied, noting that the circulation still seems awkward in the loading dock area because the trucks would have to turn around and then back in across the oncoming traffic lane, and also

- there may be traffic impacts from delivery trucks; f) The use of photovoltaics is encouraged; and g) It still seems that traffic circulation will be problematic for vehicles exiting from Glen Annie Road going east.
2. Member Branch commented: a) Sespe Lane will likely be highly utilized as an access road to exit going east; b) Continuous double lanes on Sespe Lane in both directions would be worth considering; c) The addition of open space and also relocating the live/work area to the east side are appreciated; d) Parallel parking spaces may work better along Glen Annie Road south of Sespe Lane; e) The proposed parking at the front is not a concern; f) The photovoltaic exploration is encouraged, noting that there is a good opportunity on the carports; g) The circulation aspect for delivery trucks should be restudied; h) The west alley may need to be more formalized because it is likely to be used by a lot of traffic; and i) The proposed project is moving along well with the revisions and the circulation in the northeast portion has been improved.
  3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Consider the possibility of adding a couple of parallel parking spaces on Sespe Lane; b) When the traffic circulation is further studied, consider formalizing the area near the west alley and street; c) The additional open space is appreciated; d) It is important that the landscaping along Hollister Avenue is very lush and robust; e) The photovoltaics exploration is appreciated; and f) The traffic circulation is vastly improved.
  4. Member Herrera commented: a) The revisions are major improvements, particularly the addition of open space and the reduction of buildings; and b) Consider adding an additional above-ground bioswale with vegetation that would be able to filter out some of the residues from the buildings and parking lot.
  5. Chair Smith commented: a) The changes are appreciated, especially the addition of the open space along Glen Annie Road; b) The circulation has been improved which has addressed neighbors' concerns and helped reduce anxiety; c) The eastern-most access road has been more fully developed which will be useful for the residential units, but he has some concern that there needs to be sufficient space so delivery trucks will not conflict with residential traffic; and d) Photovoltaics are a good idea, particularly for the carports and anchor buildings with flat roofs, but hopefully solar panels would not affect the appearance of the retail urban village and residences which have a very nice look.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Schneider) to take off calendar with Conceptual comments, Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 08-143-DRB, Hollister Avenue Northwest of Glen Annie Road.**

**RECESS HELD FROM 7:05 TO 7:12 P.M.**

**M-2. 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

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 16 of 20

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 1-26-10, 12-8-09) (Natasha Campbell)

Documents: 1) Letter from Trey Pinner, Pacifica Suites Hotel, dated February 9, 2010, Re: Case No. 09-075-DP, with attachment letter entitled Comments for Marriott Residence Inn Project, dated December 8, 2009; 2) Replacement pages for Sheet A-4.7 and Sheet A-4.8 received February 4, 2010; and 3) Memorandum from Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, dated February 9, 2010, Subject: Agenda Item M-2.

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

Tony Wrzosek, applicant, stated that in response to the previous DRB review, the following three changes were made which are shown in Option D: 1) The third floor westerly room was relocated to the east side of the entrance so the stair mass can be



## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 17 of 20

tucked back to open up more of the view corridors towards the mountains; 2) The stairway near the southwest corner has been relocated behind the three-story entrance, thus clearing some more views of the ridgeline beyond; and 3) Santa Barbara sandstone will be implemented in lieu of the stacked stone material that was previously proposed. He presented a supplementary set of plans that show minor improvements to the proposed massing of Option D, and incorporates a roof on the one-story elements. He also presented an exhibit showing a hypothetical building that meets the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. This building would be 35 feet in height at the front setback to provide an example of the impact of views per the exhibit in comparison to the proposed project. He noted that the applicant considered a comment at the previous meeting with regard to Santa Barbara sandstone and believes that the sandstone material would be more compatible with the environment.

Randolph Itaya, project architect, identified and discussed the specific changes and revisions, and responded to questions from the DRB members. He clarified that no solar study has been done to determine what the three-story structure does to the terrace garden/pool area.

Tony Wrzosek, applicant, stated that there was some discussion at the last DRB meeting that a Marriott Residence Inn product with 114 rooms would meet the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR of 0.50, and fit on the specific site in a two-story plus three-story building, but it would not be financially feasible.

Steve Fedde, property owner, stated that there is an alternative included in the package that would meet the parameters of the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR of 0.50, but it is a Courtyard product which is different than the Residence Inn product. Each of the rooms in an extended stay hotel are larger.

Tony Wrzosek, applicant, clarified that the applicant studied the alternative for a Courtyard product and realized that 169 rooms, in a three-story building, could be accommodated within the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR of 0.50.

Speakers:

Marc Chytilo, attorney, representing Friends of Saspili, commented that the proposed project seems to be overbuilt for a site that is constrained, particularly with regard to the General Plan requirement to protect public views of the mountains and the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR. He believes that the site should be preserved because of the significant cultural, historical, and archaeological constraints on the site. In his view, both the visual and archaeological impacts are Class I Impacts. He requested that the applicant be directed to completely redesign the project and that consideration be given to what could be built on the site that does not exceed the FAR, which respects the archaeological and cultural heritage at the site, and also protects the visual characteristics and quality of the Hollister Avenue corridor. He discussed the notion of economic infeasibility with regard to this setting, stating that economic feasibility should be discussed with hard evidence as part of the CEQA EIR process. He also noted, in his opinion, that economics should be considered

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 18 of 20

regarding a parcel as a whole. There is currently one existing parcel that already has development on it. The existing parcel is proposed to be divided. The hotel would be on a portion of the existing larger parcel.

Gary Earle, Santa Barbara, read the DRB members' comments from the minutes of the previous DRB reviews of the proposed project on December 8, 2009, and January 26, 2010. Mr. Earle commented that every DRB member and public speaker said that the proposed project was too big. He noted that there was also significant agreement that the project should be two stories. He also noted that there was unanimous agreement that the size, bulk, and scale of the project was too big. He expressed concern that the applicant has not complied very well with the comments from previous meetings. It is still three stories, the size of the project has been reduced by less than five percent of the original project, and the FAR is still exceeded by 14%. He thinks that little has changed with the project and doesn't understand how the good cause finding could be made. He believes that the project should be redesigned to be consistent with the community standards and General Plan and the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR of 0.50. He thinks the applicant asked for too much, now is asking for less, but is still asking for more than what they would have gotten, and the proposed project is still too big in size, bulk and scale. He does not believe the applicant's business problems with regard to land costs should be the community's problem. If the land deal hasn't closed, he suggested the applicant go back and renegotiate the difference in land costs or the lease with the owner, or the applicant just paid too much.

Note: After the DRB members completed their comments, Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, clarified the role of the DRB as it relates to the environmental document. He stated that due to the subjective nature of aesthetics, staff will refer heavily to the DRB comments when analyzing Aesthetic Impacts. He stated that the final determinations will be made by the appropriate decision-makers with regard to items that include certification of the final environmental document and mitigations.

### Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The DRB has worked with the applicant to try to reduce the visual impacts and to move the proposed project further back from Hollister Avenue; b) At this point, if the applicant believes that they have taken the revisions as far as they can, it would be beneficial to have the City's consultant update the visual simulations and video drive by simulations to reflect the revised hotel design and how it affects scenic views of the mountains for persons traveling along Hollister Avenue; c) The updated visual simulations will provide an opportunity to compare the current revised project design with the original design to see if there have been some significant changes and it will help the DRB consider whether the proposed project that exceeds the recommended Floor Area Ratio guidelines can be supported; d) The information provided by the updated visual simulations will be an important component with regard to his review of the proposed project; and e) He questioned whether the applicant conducted a solar study regarding how shading from the three-story building may affect the terrace garden pool area.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 9, 2010

Page 19 of 20

2. Member Branch commented: a) Some of the changes made by the applicant in response to suggestions by the DRB to address concerns regarding mass, bulk, and scale, have been helpful and are appreciated, which include reduction in the height and massing on the hotel's southeast and southwest corners, and the additional setback on Hollister Avenue; b) The current revised scheme is better, particularly as shown on Sheet A-5.0, with the two-story component on the southwest corner, and it makes a noticeable difference when driving eastbound on Hollister Avenue; c) The southwest corner of the building is a critical component of the proposed project, and the information provided by the updated visual and drive by video simulations will be very useful; d) There is a lot of building proposed on this site, but at the same time, one aspect of the proposed project is that he has been told there is a community need for this type of product, therefore, he suggests it may be appropriate to consider how significant is that need; he doesn't have the data to know how much it's needed; e) In his opinion, the proposed style of architecture as a whole is too non-descript. It looks like a hotel that you'd see in San Jose. It doesn't look right for Goleta, although the solution and details can be worked out later.
3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The changes that have been made by the applicant to try and meet the City's standards are appreciated, but she still has issues; b) The applicant's constraints are economic, ours are the General Plan; c) The main issues of her concern are still being able to make the findings regarding the project being compatible with the neighborhood, the size bulk and scale of the proposed project, and how the project fits in with this viewscape on Hollister Avenue; d) She believes that the proposed project is very big and expressed concern that issues regarding size, bulk and scale, and neighborhood compatibility, may continue unless the project does not exceed the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR in the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance; e) She expressed concern regarding the possibility that the community standards that were set by the General Plan process may be compromised; f) At this time, she recommends that the updated visual and drive by simulations be prepared by the City's consultant which will provide a better understanding of how the project will fit into the viewshed and streetscape; and g) Although the review today is not focused on the architectural style, she noted that the proposed style is a kind of anomaly and does not fit.
4. Member Herrera commented: a) He thanked the applicant for the efforts to comply with community standards; and b) He believes a hotel is very much needed in Goleta, but the proposed project is still too high on the south elevation and too large for the site.
5. Chair Smith commented: a) Wanted to know more about the hotel room numbers discussed in Trey Pinner's letter as well as related land costs and land improvement costs; b) Agreed with the DRB members' comments; c) The proposed project still feels too big, although the applicant has been working with the DRB and the Ad Hoc Committee; d) He noted that the community has worked hard with regard to setting standards in the General Plan; and e) The updated visual and drive by simulations should provide for a good understanding with regard to the proposed project at this point.

**MOTION:** Smith moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Schneider) to continue Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, to February 23, 2010; and direct staff to work with the applicant to determine if the applicant will decide to respond to DRB comments with further revisions to the proposed project, or provide staff with information that is needed for the City's consultant to prepare updated visual simulations and video drive by showing how the project redesign affects the scenic views of the mountains for vehicles, cyclists or pedestrians traveling along Hollister Avenue, as well as the perceived massing and height of the proposed structure.

Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, clarified that the City's consultant will do his best to provide updated visual simulations and video drive by for the DRB meeting on February 23, 2010, subject to receipt of the necessary criteria from the applicant.

**N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- NONE

**O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

None.

**O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

None.

**P. ADJOURNMENT: 8:11 P.M.**