



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES – APPROVED

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, January 12, 2010

### CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

### STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

### ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

### REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

#### Members:

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

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

---

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

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

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

\* Member Branch entered the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

Board Members absent: None.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 2 of 22

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Steve Chase, Director of Planning and Environmental Services; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Assistant Planner; Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

### B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

#### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for December 8, 2009

**MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Branch), to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for December 8, 2009, as amended.**

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

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

#### B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported: 1) On December 14, 2009, the Planning Commission approved the Jordano's Project. 2) The DRB meeting for December 22, 2009, was cancelled due to the holiday schedule. 3) The DRB positions will expire this month for Chair Smith and Member Herrera. 4) All interested parties may submit an application to fill the upcoming vacancies on the DRB. 5) There is a current vacancy on the Planning Commission. 6) When the DRB vacancies have been filled, the election for Chair and Vice Chair will be conducted at the next meeting, as well as consideration with regard to sub-committee changes. 7) The Community Services Department will make a presentation regarding the City's Stormwater Management Plan, tentatively scheduled for the DRB meeting on February 9, 2010.

### C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

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

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that the applicant for Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, requested a continuance to February 9, 2010; and that the applicant for Item M-4, DRB Permit No. 09-106-DRB, 6878 Hollister Avenue/6868 Cortona Drive, requested that the item be taken off calendar. He stated that staff recommends that the order of the agenda be moved to consider Item O-1 Marriott Residence Inn Ad Hoc Committee Formation after the Review of Agenda item.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Branch), to continue Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, to February 9, 2010, per the applicant's request; and to take off calendar**

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 3 of 22

**Item M-4, DRB Permit No. 09-106-DRB, 6878 Hollister Avenue/6868 Cortona Drive, per the applicant's request.**

### CHANGE ORDER OF AGENDA:

There being no objections, Chair Smith moved forward for consideration Item O-1 Marriott Residence Inn Ad Hoc Committee Formation.

Steve Chase, Director of Planning and Environmental Services, provided background information regarding the review process for the Marriott Residence Inn. He recommended that the DRB allow an Ad Hoc Committee to be formed as part of the review process regarding the Marriott Residence Inn proposed project.

By consensus, the DRB members agreed that there would be value in the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee regarding the Marriott Residence Inn proposed project.

There being no objections, the discussion regarding the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee was continued to the end of the agenda so that Member Branch will be in attendance for the discussion.

### E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Member Schneider reported that he reviewed today Item F-2, DRB Permit No. 09-190-DRB, 550 Cambridge Drive, and that Revised Final Approval was granted as submitted.

### F. CONSENT CALENDAR

#### F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-141-DRB

5877 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-112-003)

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

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Branch), to continue Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, to February 9, 2010, per the applicant's request.**

#### F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-190-DRB RV

550 Cambridge Drive (APN 069-560-030)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes an existing 2,640-square foot church sanctuary, an existing 1,450-square foot classroom building, and an existing 2,200-square foot office/classroom building on a 2.4-acre lot in the DR-3.3 zone district. Approvals for a 449-square foot office addition to the

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 4 of 22

education/classroom building, which will result in a 1,899-square foot one-story structure. The proposed changes include:

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

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

*Consent Calendar Action on January 12, 2010:*

Member Schneider reported that he reviewed today Item F-2, DRB Permit No. 09-190-DRB, 550 Cambridge Drive, and that Revised Final Approval was granted as submitted.

### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

### H. SIGN CALENDAR

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

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

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

*Sign Subcommittee Action on January 12, 2010:*

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by agent Mark Kuwahara, Pacific Sign Center, on behalf of Cox Communications, property owner. He stated that Cox Communications is in the process of changing their logo to "COX". The purpose of the proposed project is to re-face an existing wall sign and re-face an existing monument sign to change the text to match the new logo. Mark Kuwahara also stated that the existing ground up-light fixture will be removed.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 5 of 22

### Sign Subcommittee Comments

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

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

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

### L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

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

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

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

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 6 of 22

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Justin Van Mullem, On Design Architects, on behalf of the Goleta Valley Housing Committee, property owner. He noted that the Goleta Valley Housing Committee is a non-profit agency that provides affordable housing.

Comments:

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

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

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

75 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-008)

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

Site visits: Made by Members \*Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, Smith, and \*Wignot. \*Members Branch and Wignot stated that their site visits were made when the DRB previously reviewed the proposed project.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Rex Ruskauff, project architect, and Trey Pinner, property manager, on behalf of Castilian LLC, property owner. Rex Ruskauff clarified that the only exterior lighting will be the lights under the canopy for the loading dock. He stated that the proposed materials and colors will be within the same palette of the existing building. Also, he stated that the applicant will study the details with regard to the function of the current gutter and drain box located inside the masonry wall so that no water will be shed off of the building onto the neighbor's property;

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The applicant will need to study the drainage and gutter issues with the intent to have the gutter around the perimeter of the entirety of the canopy; and b) The signage will need to be addressed as a separate application.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) There will need to be a resolution with regard to the unpermitted signs; and b) Consider permitting the existing signs.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-169-DRB, 75 Castilian Drive, with the following conditions: 1) The applicant shall study the gutter and drainage issues with the intent to have the gutter around the entirety of the canopy; and 2) There needs to be a resolution with regard to the unpermitted signs and the signage will be addressed as a separate application; and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-169-DRB, to February 23, 2010, for Final Review on the Consent Calendar.**

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

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,229-square foot two-story residence with an attached three-car garage on a 5,227-square foot lot in the DR-4.6 zone district (Coastal Zone). The applicant proposes to construct a 425-square foot wooden trellis on the rear of the residence with a seat wall and outdoor gas fireplace. A new sliding/folding wall system is also proposed to replace existing doors and windows on the rear elevation. No new floor area is proposed. Materials proposed include wood for the trellis and stone veneer for the seat wall/outdoor gas fireplace. The proposed project was approved by the Storke Ranch Master Owners Association. The project was filed by Ryan Mills, agent, on behalf of Dan Grotenhuis, property owner. Related cases: 09-170-LUP. (Shine Ling)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Ryan Mills, agent, on behalf of Dan Grotenhuis, property owner. In response to the comments from speaker Gary Vandeman, Ryan Mills stated that the trellis itself provides for some shade, and that there are existing canopy trees that line the back fence wall.

Speaker:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, expressed concern that the drawings do not show any plans with regard to the trellis, or to provide for some shading. For example, he stated that there is no indication of a proposal for vines or for a canvas awning.

Comments:

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

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-170-DRB, 6865 Silver Fern Court, as submitted; and to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-170-DRB, to January 26, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

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

5750 Dawson Avenue (APN 071-121-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes 7,020 square feet in the C-3 zone district and is currently vacant as a result of a 2007 fire. The applicant proposes to construct a new 1,440-square foot two-story contractor's workshop building and an equipment storage yard. Access would be provided via an existing curb cut on Dawson Avenue and a new curb cut on Rutherford Street. A 6-foot tall wall with rolling gates and landscaping would be installed along the perimeter



## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 9 of 22

of the property. Materials proposed include split-face block on the first floor and board and batting on the second floor. No grading is proposed. The project was filed by Mark Sauter of John S. Carter, Inc., agent, for Tom Kennedy, property owner. Related cases: 09-171-LUP. (Shine Ling)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Russ Banko, designer, representing Mark Sauter, of John S. Carter, Inc., agent, for Tom Kennedy, property owner. Russ Banko stated that the proposed use of the property is for a service yard to facilitate a structural retrofitting business

Shine Ling, Assistant Planner, stated that the plans presented by the applicant today have not been reviewed by staff. He noted that the plans are not materially different from the plans that were distributed with the agenda packet, but the plans include details added by the applicant with regard to drainage and landscaping.

Speaker:

John K. Bowman, spoke on behalf of the owner of the Michelle Apartments which are located across the street on Rutherford Street, adjacent to the corner. He stated that the apartment owner is concerned regarding parking for the Michelle Apartments for visitors. The apartment owner requests that consideration be given that approximately three parking spaces would be eliminated by placing the driveway on Rutherford Street. He noted that there is a paint store next to this property that does not have a curb where cars can be parked. He also stated that the apartment owner is enthusiastic about the proposed building.

Shine Ling, Assistant Planner, stated that the Department of Community Services staff is in the process of reviewing the proposed plans with regard to a new curb cut on Rutherford Street.

Vice Chair Brown commented in general that it would be really nice to have an option to consider placing a mural on a proposed wall, as something decorative, if the City should decide to set up a mural program in the future.

Comments:

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

1. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) There is a problem with regard to the proposed Blood Red Trumpet Vine species because it will require consistent pruning, otherwise it will overgrow and impact those species on the sidewalk; b) There needs to be more green vegetation in front, but the Sword Fern species is not appropriate because it will not grow very big; c) Suggested replacing the proposed

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 10 of 22

- Sword Fern species in front with King Palms, with gravel around them, which will require less maintenance and less water; d) Adding the King Palms in front will be somewhat reflective of the landscaping across the street which includes King Palms; e) The site is actually an industrial yard, therefore, the proposed little planting pockets for landscaping, as well as the proposed planting species for the pockets, are not appropriate and should be removed and replaced with a wheel stop; and f) The proposed board and batting material will not work for the project.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The landscaping is an important component to help facilitate the success of the project; b) Matching the King Palm trees with the project across the street is moving in a good direction; c) The proposed board and batting material will not be appropriate for the design; d) The building design and materials should keep with the area; and e) Suggested bronze window material rather than white to tie in with the colors.
  3. Member Messner commented: a) The proposed Sword Fern species would be fine but he would suggest adding some King Palms with the Sword Fern species around them; b) In his opinion, the proposed landscape plan is fine with regard to line of sight concerns; c) Within the Trumpet Vine species, there are different variations that will grow which are less tenacious and will require less maintenance, but they will still need to be watered and fertilized; and d) Consider using a pre-cast concrete fence material, noting that an example exists at the condominium project on Fairview Avenue across from Berkeley Road.
  4. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed roof drainage system needs to be shown on the plans.
  5. Member Herrera commented: a) Suggested the Landscape Plan include planting the Queen Palms, then a couple of King Palms, then a couple of Sword Fern plants to cover the dirt.
  6. Member Branch commented: a) The applicant needs to consider the Landscape Plan with regard to maintenance issues.
  7. Chair Smith commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide a drawing showing the appearance of the proposed wall.

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

**RECESS HELD FROM 4:40 P.M. TO 4:50 P.M.**

### **M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR**

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

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

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The properties consist of five parcels in the M-1 zone district (Coastal Zone), comprising a total of 28,346 square feet. An existing 3,656-square foot two-story commercial/industrial building is located at 5940 Olney Street; vacant paved lots are located at 5912, 5920, 5930, 5940, and 5960 Olney

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 11 of 22

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

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Leland J. Smith of Chester Smith Associates, architect, on behalf of Andrew Jaksich of AVIS Budget Group, tenant, and the Duckett Family Trust and Graziano and Romana Bernardi, property owners.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) Suggested that the proposed plans should include landscaping to comply closely with the City's standards requiring not less than 10 percent of the property landscaped; and b) The proprietor of the cement factory and storage yard near the site has discussed plans with the DRB regarding landscaping along the fencing on the cement factory property;
2. Chair Smith commented: a) Concurred with Member Wignot's comment suggesting that landscaping would be appropriate on the site, possibly around the entrance in tree wells; and b) The applicant will need to provide lighting plans.
3. Member Messner commented: a) Suggested consideration be given to planting one or two trees that would fit in a narrow area, rather than planting landscaping on the ground, which would be more appropriate because a canopy would be provided that would be more visible in the area that is very industrial; b) It is a good idea to plant one or more trees because of the canopy and oxygen source, but it is not suggested as being mandatory; and c) Suggested that there would be a motivation for the property owner to maintain landscaping if it was located at the entry area where there are customers.
4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) She does not believe there should be any landscaping but if the DRB requires landscaping, she would concur with Member Messner's suggestion to consider planting one or two trees; b) There does not seem to be any place for planting trees; c) Expressed concern that if landscaping is not maintained it will look very bad; d) The proposed lighting plans should comply with Dark Sky principles; and e) The existing lighting wall packs are

unshielded and it appears there is an attempt to light the parking lot with the wall packs.

5. Member Branch commented: a) It may be difficult to find space for landscaping; and b) The suggestion to plant trees, which is a temporary solution, is a good solution because it would provide a tree canopy; however, to some degree it may not be worth it because of the nature of the asphalt and concrete.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 08-037-DRB, 5912-5940 & 5960 Olney Street, with comments, including the request for the applicant to provide proposed lighting plans, and with the suggestion that some trees could be incorporated around the public area with a tree well; and to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 08-037-DRB, to February 23, 2010.**

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

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

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is currently vacant. The 4.92 acre (214,122 square feet) property is located north of Hollister Avenue, between the Aero Camino Industrial area on the east and Los Carneros Way/Calle Coral on the west. The project site is located immediately north of and would be internally connected to the existing Willow Springs residential development and common open space within the Inland Area of the City zoned Design Residential (DR-20).

The applicant proposes to construct a 100-unit condominium project, to be known as Willow Springs Phase II. The project's 100 units would be incorporated into 10 new, two-story, residential, stacked flats of four to sixteen units per building, with one building containing a single-story element, a 480-square foot common laundry room. There would be a mix of unit types, as follows: 48 – 1 Bed/1 Bath; 12 – 2 Bed/1 Bath; 16 – 2 Bed/2 Bath; 24 – 3 Bed/2 Bath.

Each of the 100 units is proposed to have its own washer and dryer hook-up, in addition to the one common laundry area. Building coverage, including patios, would be 59,780 square feet and the total gross building area of the project would be 97,992 square feet.

The proposed architectural style and elevations would match the existing 235-unit Willow Springs development. In addition, the proposed second phase would be incorporated into the existing development and utilize the existing amenities, which include (i) a natural soft-surfaced path around the perimeter of the 2.37-acre open space area on APN 073-060-050, together with a wooden split-rail fence; (ii) a community swimming pool and two spas; (iii) tot lot, group picnic and barbeque area; and (iv) a 3,140-square foot clubhouse with fitness facilities. All active and passive recreational areas and common open space areas are proposed to be for the use of all residents of the proposed project and of the existing Willow Springs project.

Vehicular access to the site will be from Los Carneros Road via Calle Koral and Camino Vista; both are public roadways. Camino Vista will be extended from its current terminus at the boundary of the existing Willow Springs development

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 13 of 22

connecting with the short section of Camino Vista at Aero Camino. The development itself will be served by Willow Springs Court, a private roadway. Camino Vista will include bicycle lanes on both sides of the street. No on-street parking would be provided on either side of Camino Vista. The applicant proposes 184 parking spaces within the project site.

Grading quantities are estimated at 450-cubic yards of cut, 33,100-cubic yards of fill and 32,650-cubic yards of import. All major grading will be completed on the entire site before occupancy phasing would begin. Parking and landscaping for every building in a phase will be completed before occupancy clearance for that phase.

The project provides 61,504 square feet of landscaping around the buildings, parking lot, and along Camino Vista Road. The intent of the landscape design is to blend the new development with the existing by using a similar plant palette and informal landscape style. The proposed landscape palette is comprised of drought-tolerant California native and Mediterranean plants. A bio-swale planted with native moderate-water use carex will cleanse first-flush stormwater and dry season flows from the parking area. Landscape irrigation will be regulated with a climate-based irrigation control system, and supplied by a mix of efficient spray and drip irrigation.

Lot 20 of the Willow Springs property provides 103,368 square feet (2.37 acres) of protected open space (recreational access is limited to decomposed granite path around the perimeter of the open space). Replacement plantings to mitigate project impacts on Coastal Sage Scrub are proposed on Lot 20 by replacing ornamental plantings with Coastal Sage Scrub mitigation plantings. The applicant proposes the same treatment for the eastern project boundary as is in place at the existing Willow Springs development: construction of a concrete block retaining wall, and behind that wall construction of a concrete plank wall to partially shield the residential development from the adjacent industrial uses. The overall wall height will be a maximum of 10 feet above the flow line of the drainage channel on the east side of the wall and 6 feet above finish grade on the west side of the wall. Screening is proposed to be provided for the residential development through vines on the wall, and trees and shrubs.

A drainage channel will be located east of the wall. A 10 foot sewer easement exists on the west side of the proposed perimeter wall. All drainage from the proposed Willow Springs II development is tributary to the previously constructed Willow Springs development. Storm drains, the detention basin and bio-filters in the existing Willow Springs project are sized to accommodate the future phased development of Willow Springs II. All runoff will ultimately drain to the existing vegetated open space (wetland) located along the southern boundary of Willow Springs. This vegetated open space of approximately 7.25 acres serves as an on-site retention basin and bio-filter.

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

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 14 of 22

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

Documents: Memorandum from Natasha Heifetz Campbell, Contract Planner, dated January 12, 2010, Subject: 08-128-DRB; Willow Springs Phase II; Camino Vista Road; APN 073-060-044, -045, -046, -047, -048 (Phase II).

Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, presented the staff report. She stated that in response to direction from the DRB, the applicant considered relocation of the carports adjacent to the open space area to open up views, and has made specific changes. Another change made by the applicant was to relocate the sewer line along the eastern property line which allows for more screening between the future residences and the industrial area to the east.

The plans were presented by Courtney Seeples, project manager, and Michael Towbes, developer, of the Towbes Group, property owner; and the project team including Ed Lenvik, Lenvik & Minor, project architect; Kim True, Suding Design, project landscape architect; and Dale Weber, MAC Design Associates, project civil engineer. Ed Lenvik, project architect, stated that in response to DRB comments, the applicant has met with the Goleta West Sanitary District and has revised the project landscape plan to relocate the Goleta West Sanitary District easement which will now allow trees to be planted along the eastern boundary. In doing that, some of the covered parking spaces (carports) have been relocated from the area on the northern edge of the central open space area to the area along the eastern property line, creating additional views into and through the open space area to a much greater extent from both existing (Phase I) and proposed (Phase II) residential units and common area. He said the applicant believes the changes are a very good solution.

Courtney Seeples, The Towbes Group, provided cut sheets and specifications showing a lighting fixture that has been preliminarily chosen which meets the new Dark Sky requirements and also matches the existing lights in Phase I that do not meet the Dark Sky requirements. He also provided a photometrics plan for review.

Michael Towbes, project developer, commented that the Preliminary Landscape Plan showed additional Coastal Sage Scrub; however, since the City has now changed the General Plan, the applicant does not believe that the Coastal Sage Scrub shown now qualifies for protection and relocation, which will be addressed in the environmental review process. In response to a comment from Member Wignot expressing concern regarding big rigs and delivery trucks using Camino Vista Road, Michael Towbes stated that the applicant does not have control over whether delivery trucks are allowed to use the road; however, he stated it would be fine if the City wants to place some sort of restriction. Michael Towbes said that he just returned from New Zealand and commented that their pampas blooms everywhere.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) Requested that the City consider placing signage that would restrict big rig trucks and delivery vehicles from having to use Camino Vista Road to access Aero Camino for ingress and egress purposes,

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 15 of 22

- possibly with weight or multi-axle restrictions, so that the heavy vehicles would continue to use Hollister Avenue to enter and exit Aero Camino.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Thanked the applicant for making an effort to make the revisions which have made the proposed project better; b) The applicant is requested to provide a drawing and details regarding the trash enclosures; and c) The above-ground utility boxes will need to be identified and incorporated into the landscape plan.
  3. Member Branch commented: a) He is very appreciative of the revised plans which he believes are a positive change.
  4. Chair Smith commented: a) He expressed support for the revised plans.

**MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to take off calendar Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 08-128-DRB, Camino Vista Road, with comments,**

### **M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-143-DRB**

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

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

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

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

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

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 16 of 22

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)

Member Wignot stated that he was not present at the DRB meeting on November 10, 2009, when this project was first reviewed by the DRB; however, he has read the minutes and he feels that he is able to participate in the DRB review.

Documents: 1) Letter from Michael Towbes, The Towbes Group, dated November 11, 2009, Re: Westar Apartment Project. 2) Memorandum from Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, dated January 8, 2010, Subject: 08-143-DRB; Westar Mixed-Use Project, Hollister Avenue NW of Glen Annie Road, APN 073-030-020, -021.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that his Memorandum to the Design Review Board, dated January 8, 2010, summarizes the revisions that were made by the applicant in response to DRB comments on November 10, 2009.

The plans were presented by Peter Koetting, Westar Associates, on behalf of Goleta Hollister, LLC, property owner. Members of the project team who also participated in the presentation included Jeff Chelwick and Denise Ashton of William Hezmalhalch Architects, Inc., and Vasilis Papadatos, of CPAC Architects, project retail shopping center architect. Peter Koetting discussed the key architectural changes regarding the residential component of the proposed project that were made in response to the DRB comments. He stated that the Fire Department reviewed the emergency access road plans and found the turning radii and access points to be acceptable. He noted that the road shown at 40-foot width can be narrowed to 32 feet with no parking, which was the applicant's intention.

Vasilis Papadatos, project retail shopping center architect, and Jeff Chelwick, project residential architect, provided an overview of the live/work component and how the residential architecture can be incorporated into the commercial architecture. Peter Koetting stated that flexibility is the key consideration when designing the live/work units so they can be integrated as one unit and separated if the owner cannot both live and work in the same space. Denise Ashton presented the site plan and open space elements. She stated that all vehicular access to the proposed project will be through the main access and a secondary access point on the west side of the development. From a site design standpoint, she stated that the applicant believes it is important that the project attempts to create collector streets without garage doors, which will help create communities and mini neighborhoods within the larger



## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 17 of 22

development. Overall, in summary, Peter Koetting stated that the basic changes have to do with the circulation, parking, and the loss of 12 residential units.

Courtney Miller, project landscape architect, presented the proposed landscape plan regarding the residential and commercial components.

Don Donaldson, project civil engineer, discussed the function of the drainage and stormwater quality aspect of the proposed project, including the bioswales, and presented a written handout.

Speakers:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, commented that it appears the access out of the residential area would require a lot of driving to be done to get to Hollister Avenue. He noted that there is a constant flow of traffic at the Marketplace any time of day, in addition to traffic during peak hours, and expressed concern regarding potential traffic circulation problems. Therefore, he suggested adding a right turn lane that would allow better access for vehicles to make the turn and then merge into traffic, both at the bus stop and at the western access point. He also commented that there does not seem to be any open space except at the soccer field.

Cyrus Morici, Pacific Glen resident, stated that the proposed project is beautiful aesthetically. His main concern is traffic and the total amount of parking provided. He noted that for the past 10-1/2 years there has been a problem with having enough parking to accommodate the residents for the Pacific Glen area, therefore, he would like to see parking increased. He does not believe that a 42" fence would deter a person from climbing over the fence to go to the parking spaces. He spoke in support of closing the entrance into the residential development from Glen Annie Road. He would support funneling traffic through the front of the complex and potentially towards the left by adding a merge lane. He noted that there are very divergent elevations of approximately four to five feet between Pacific Glen and the proposed project, when going down Glen Annie Road and crossing Sespe. Therefore, he expressed quality of life concerns regarding aesthetics and privacy exposures.

Ira Gladnick, Pacific Glen resident, stated that there is a concern regarding parking because currently barely enough parking spaces exist on Glen Annie Road for the existing community. He does not believe that a screen will block people from using the parking spaces and that the only way to preserve the equilibrium on the street with the parking is to block it off and have the main entrance through the other end. Another concern is potential traffic circulation issues regarding access to the freeway.

Bonnie Muench, representing a property on Santa Felicia Drive, expressed concerns regarding the wall that is proposed to be constructed between Santa Felicia Drive properties and the proposed project, and the easement. (In response to Bonnie Muench's concern, Peter Koetting, Westar Associates, stated that the applicant will provide a copy of the specific section of the grading plan which is in the process of being refined).

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 18 of 22

Gilbert Perleberg, Goleta, suggested that there should be a berm or heavy vegetation along Hollister Avenue so the cars and buildings are not visible. He believes that two of the buildings according to the site plan, which include the restaurant, are grossly oversized in terms of elevation, and they block the views of the mountains. He recommended that careful consideration should be given regarding the overall commercial area so there will be good use of the property and economic viability. For example, University Village, which seems similar to the proposed project, is limited in its economic vitality. When considering the aesthetics, the commercial buildings should be tied together so people can conveniently walk from one to another. Also, people should be able to enjoy being at the project site and have the ability to see the mountains and not the back of cars.

Tasha Williams, Pacific Glen resident, expressed concern that approximately three hundred cars will be driving in and out of Glen Annie Road every day. Another concern is that Pacific Glen residents may not be able to make a left-hand turn on Glen Annie Road as they have been able to in the past, and they will need to drive through the commercial area to exit their residential area. She noted that there are many children who live in this area where traffic will be increased, and requested finding a way to circumvent the use of Glen Annie Road for the residential area.

Patricia Moreno, Pacific Glen resident, expressed concern regarding the potential noise from the shops and restaurants in the proposed project, particularly if the businesses close around 8:00 p.m. and then need to close down and clean up. Another concern is potential noise from functions that would be held. She noted that she needs to be in bed at 8:00 p.m. to be at work at 4:00 a.m.

Patricia Vaughn, resident on Glen Annie Drive, near Sespe, expressed concern that the traffic flow will be extremely high going past her house. Another concern is parking. She believes there are approximately 34 proposed parking spots that are perpendicular to Glen Annie Road for 33 apartment units, which means approximately 15 residences on Glen Annie Road will be viewing taillights which will look like a parking lot. She requested consideration that the traffic and aesthetics on Glen Annie Road will be highly impacted. She stated that the proposed project is massive and requested that it be reduced in size.

Rob Williams, Pacific Glen resident, expressed concern regarding potential traffic problems; for example, the proposed plan to funnel the Pacific Glen traffic, as well as traffic from the proposed project, through the proposed development. Also, the ability to make a left-hand turn for easy access to the freeway would be eliminated. Another concern is that the proposed project will not ease the existing parking problems for the Pacific Glen area. Regarding parking, he supports no entrance off Glen Annie.

Peter Koetting, Westar Associates, presented, for discussion and possible consideration, plans showing the deletion of Building 21 to be replaced by a pocket park.

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 19 of 22

### Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed project is a beautiful layout, but when looking at it from a “big picture” standpoint, he questions what the City is getting out of the project - for example, dedicated open space or features unique to Goleta have been provided by other large projects; b) The proposed restaurants are located too close to Hollister Avenue and trash enclosures; c) Consider an elevated deck or patios on the north side so restaurant diners can take advantage of mountain views which are part of the beauty of the site; and d) He recommended that a video drive-by animation would be very informative.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The reduction in density is appreciated; b) The traffic issue is a realistic concern, especially at peak times; c) The proposed project seems large enough to warrant another ancillary access on the west side of the project; d) The parking concerns regarding Glen Annie Road would depend on the functionality of the onsite parking; e) Aesthetically, adding the gateways and providing a kind of cul-de-sac for the residential units in the northeast area are good revisions; f) The proposed plans show quality but he believes that Member Wignot’s comment regarding the “big picture” is noteworthy; g) Overall, the proposed project is moving forward in a good direction; and h) The visual analysis computer renderings provided for this hearing are acceptable and adequate.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) He understands the concerns of the Pacific Glen neighborhood residents and he believes that the issues of traffic and parking can be dealt with more appropriately by the Planning Commission and the environmental review process; b) The proposed project is moving in a good direction architecturally and aesthetically, and the styles for both residential and commercial architecture are workable; c) Some of his concerns relative to the number of roof materials can be worked out later in the process; d) His main issue is open space, and therefore the applicant’s suggestion to consider a pocket park is a good start; e) The whole residential area feels a little too tight, even though there are open spaces; f) One suggested method to gain some open space included looking at the loop between Building 5 and Building 7 to eliminate some units and some parking, and therefore, Building 7 could be shifted away from the pool area which would allow for a bigger green space where the paving is removed; g) Consider relocating the green space from inside the cul-de-sac in the northeast corner to be near the basketball court or some other method to gain open space on this portion of the site; h) One suggestion to address the grade differential would be to eliminate the third-floor unit at the southernmost end of the buildings so there would be a two-story facade which would help lessen the perception when driving by which would otherwise be overwhelming; i) The site plan should enhance and encourage as much pedestrian activity as possible to the commercial areas and movies; j) The pedestrian linkages work well on the west side of the residential development, but the area near Building 7 and Building 8 needs to be studied and it seems like there needs to be a secondary stairway or connection down to the road; and k) The visual analysis computer renderings provided are acceptable.
4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Expressed appreciation that the applicant is working with the neighbors; b) She appreciates Member Wignot’s comment regarding the “big picture”; c) When developing an urban village, finding a

## Design Review Board Minutes – Approved

January 12, 2010

Page 20 of 22

balance between density and providing open space is a problem to be solved; d) The inter-connectivity of neighborhoods is important; e) Consider opening up some of the dead-end alleys, and adding an ancillary entry on the west side, to help facilitate traffic flow; f) Parallel parking would eliminate some of the neighbors' concerns regarding the visibility of taillights from cars parked perpendicularly on the eastern side; g) In her opinion, under-cover parking without garage doors would make the project more successful rather than garages because people tend to use garages for storage which would impact parking spaces; h) Study the internal circulation, particularly pedestrian access to the restaurant on the southeast corner; i) Building D needs to feel more like it is more articulated rather than just the back side of a building; j) The tower element on the clubhouse should be reduced on the southeast corner; k) It is important to the community to preserve the viewshed; l) There needs to be a better understanding regarding the western edge of the project and Santa Felicia Drive to address some of the neighbors' issues; m) The applicant is requested to study whether there are some privacy issues related to the Pacific Glen neighbors and Buildings 14, 16, and 18; n) The landscape plan should adhere to City standards regarding the number of trees in parking lots; o) The photovoltaic studies are appreciated; p) Consider flipping the live/work units with the shops to the east; and q) The proposed landscape palette is appreciated except for the London Plane Tree which is typically eliminated from palettes in the South Coast area because of its tendency to hybridize with the Sycamore trees.

5. Member Messner commented: a) The revisions are appreciated including the gateways and planting materials; b) He would support the perpendicular parking on Glen Annie because it would provide for more parking spaces; c) The size of the parking spaces should be adequate rather than too compact; d) Some of the landscaping concepts are appreciated; and e) The proposed project is moving in the right direction.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) Drainage and water detention efforts are important considerations to prevent impacts from flooding; b) Parking and traffic problems will need to be addressed; c) The proposed plant palate is appreciated; d) Suggested rotating the proposed project 90 degrees so the residences abut the residences and the commercial part abuts Santa Felicia Drive; and e) Agreed with Vice Chair Brown that "garage ports", without doors, would be appropriate.
7. Chair Smith commented: a) His previous concern regarding the viewshed off Hollister Avenue seems to have been software-related; b) The proposed architecture looks very good, especially the commercial architecture; c) The extra variety of materials is appreciated because it gives a Main Street, small town U.S.A., kind of feel; d) Parking and traffic flow issues are major concerns; e) The proposed plan for the fence at Glen Annie Road is okay, while not closing off the property, and he does not envision anyone attempting to climb over the fence regularly; f) Requested more study to relieve ingress and egress on the west end; g) The revisions are appreciated; and h) The visual analysis provided is acceptable.
8. The majority of the DRB members agreed that the Conceptual Review should be continued to address some issues, with the understanding that staff may proceed with the environmental review process.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 1 vote, (Noes: Wignot), to continue Item M-3, DRB Permit No. 08-143-DRB, Hollister Avenue Northwest of Glen Annie Road, with comments, to February 9, 2010.**

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

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

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

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

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Branch), to take off calendar Item M-4, DRB Permit No. 09-106-DRB, 6878 Hollister Avenue/6868 Cortona Drive, per the applicant's request.**

**N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- **NONE**

**O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**O-1. MARRIOTT RESIDENCE INN AD HOC COMMITTEE FORMATION**

There being no objections, Chair Smith appointed Members Branch, Schneider, and Wignot, to serve on the Marriott Residence Inn Ad Hoc Committee, and Member Brown to serve as an alternate.

## **Design Review Board Minutes – Approved**

January 12, 2010

Page 22 of 22

### **O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

No requests.

### **O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

Member Herrera announced that he will not be able to attend the DRB meeting on February 9, 2010.

Member Messner announced that his book is half-way completed.

### **P. ADJOURNMENT: 8:00 P.M.**

Minutes approved on January 26, 2010.