



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - UNAPPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, February 23, 2010

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

Members:

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

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

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Smith at 3:20 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.

Board Members absent: None.

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

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 23, 2010

Page 2 of 12

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for February 9, 2010

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Abstain: Schneider) to approve the Design Review Board minutes for February 9, 2010, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the Subcommittee met today. There was an update by the City Arborist regarding the Urban Forestry Management Plan. The next Subcommittee meeting will be on March 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 Agenda Item B-5 Appointment to Subcommittees be continued to the next DRB meeting; 3) On February 16, 2010, the City Council upheld the original DRB approval of the proposed project at 7837 Langlo Ranch Road; 4) On February 17, 2010, the Stormwater Management Plan Community Interest Group kick-off meeting was held; 5) The Stormwater Management Plan Stakeholder's meeting is scheduled to be held on March 10, 2010, at 6:00 p.m.; 6) On March 22, 2010, the Planning Commission will consider the T-Mobile monopine proposed project that was reviewed by the DRB; and 7) Story poles have been installed at the Sturgeon Building, located at the southeast corner of Los Carneros and Calle Real, which were requested as part of the environmental review analysis.

B-4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

There being no objections, the Election of Officers was continued to the next DRB meeting on March 9, 2010.

B-5. APPOINTMENT TO SUBCOMMITTEES

There being no objections, the Appointment to Subcommittees was continued to the next DRB meeting on March 9, 2010.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 23, 2010

Page 3 of 12

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-1, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, 6560 Camino Caseta, requested a continuance to March 23, 2010; and the applicant for Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, requested a continuance to March 9, 2010.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, 6560 Camino Caseta, to March 23, 2010, per the applicant's request; and to continue Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, to March 9, 2010, per the applicant's request.

There being no objections, the DRB authorized that the Marriott Residence Inn Ad Hoc Committee be re-established with the same members appointed by Chair Smith (Members Branch, Schneider and Wignot, and Member Brown to serve as an alternate). A meeting with the Marriott Residence Inn Ad Hoc Committee and the applicant was set for February 24, 2010, at 2:30 p.m., in City Hall.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Chair Branch reported that today he reviewed Item F-2, DRB Permit No. 09-169-DRB, 75 Castilian Drive.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-159-DRB

6560 Camino Caseta (APN 077-412-024)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 3,053-square foot two-story residence with an attached two-car garage on a 9,148-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 380-square foot addition on the first floor and a 122-square foot unenclosed veranda on the front of the residence. The resulting two-story structure would be 3,433 square feet, consisting of a 2,971-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 462-square foot two-car garage. The proposed project exceeds the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district. Materials proposed would match those of the existing residence. The project was filed by James Zimmerman AIA, architect, on behalf of Francis and Catherine Donohoe, property owners. Related cases: 09-159-LUP. (Continued from 1-26-10, 12-8-09*) (Shine Ling)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, 6560 Camino Caseta, to March 23, 2010, per the applicant's request.

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

75 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-008)

This is a request for *Final* 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

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

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

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on February 23, 2010:

Consent Calendar Chair Branch reported that today he reviewed Item F-2, DRB Permit No. 09-169-DRB, 75 Castilian Drive, and that Final Approval was granted, as submitted.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown reported that the Subcommittee today reviewed Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-192-DRB, 5718 Hollister Avenue.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-192-DRB

5718 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-081-035)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The properties include three retail commercial buildings comprising a total of approximately 9,600 square feet on a 0.51-acre parcel in the C-2 zone district. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the shopping center. The proposed OSP provides for two (2) different types of signs: directional signs and wall signs. The project was filed by Jack Hira of J and S Properties, property owner. Related cases: 09-192-OSP; -CUP. (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review and Action on February 23, 2010:

Site visits: Made by Subcommittee Members Brown and Smith.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Jack Hira of J and S Properties, property owner. He stated that the property owner has been working for the last couple of years to clean up the property and make it look as attractive as possible, and he expressed his appreciation to staff regarding this process. The applicant has spent months on the sign plan and has been working with different sign companies. He stated that the signs at the Loreto Plaza and the Patterson Center have been inspiring. The challenge is that all of the tenants want signage. His goal is to assist the businesses to be successful. He believes when there are unpermitted signs on other properties in the community, it is challenging for businesses that follow the permit process.

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) The applicant has done a good job in cleaning up the appearance of the site (she noted that when she made her site visit there were unpermitted signs on the property); b) The proposed directory sign on the southern façade should be moved to the right, closer to the public's entrance to the complex, and the directory sign will only need to identify the tenants in Building "B" and Building "C"; c) The preference is for the building to look clean and neat, and not have too many signs that would clutter the southern façade; d) The proposed tenant sign for "Draperies by Renga" on the southern façade is deceiving regarding the location of this business because it is not located in Building "A"; and e) It may be useful to add the appropriate letters on the buildings to identify Buildings "A", "B", and "C".
2. Member Smith commented: a) The lettering on the proposed directory sign on the southern façade is too small to read from vehicles passing by; b) Suggested moving the directory sign on the southern façade to the right where "5718" is located, and listing only the tenants in Building "B" and Building "C", in a vertical format; c) The proposed directory sign on the western side of Building "A" is confusing and would direct people to the wrong property; and d) A directory sign on the south elevation of Building "C" would help identify tenants in Building "B" and Building "C" for persons driving into the property.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The text on the proposed directory on the south façade along Hollister Avenue is so small that the sign will become useless; b) A directory sign on the southern elevation of Building "C" would be useful to identify tenants in Building "B" and Building "C", but a directory sign is not needed on the fronts of Building "B" and Building "C" because once the public has entered the complex, the tenant signs will be visible on the buildings; c) The directory sign on the south façade should be more vertical; and d) The proposed directory sign on the western side of Building "A" should be eliminated.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-192-DRB, 5718 Hollister Avenue, to March 9, 2010, with the following comments: 1) The tenant signs on the southern façade of Building "A" will be only for the tenants in Building "A", and should be the approximate size that has been proposed by the applicant; 2) The proposed directory sign on the southern façade of Building "A" should be moved towards the right side (to where "5718" is currently shown on the southern façade), and this directory sign should only have the names of the tenants for Building "B" and Building "C", with the applicant to rework the size of text and spacing, and consider a vertical format; 3) The proposed directory sign on the southern façade of Building "C", that is visible from Hollister Avenue, should only have the names of the tenants for Building "B" and Building "C", which should be listed under the name of the respective building, and should be in a uniform size, approximately 12" in height; 4) Remove the proposed directory sign on the west elevation of Building "A" because it is superfluous and would be confusing; 5) A directory sign on the east elevation of Building "A" would not be appropriate; 6) The tenant signs on Building "B" and Building "C" should be the same size and design as the

tenant signs on Building “A”; 7) The address of the building, “5718”, should be added to the southern elevation of Building “C”; and 8) The proposed height of the address, “5718”, on the southern façade of Building “A”, should be taller, approximately 12 inches in height, and it would be preferable for the address to be located next to the name of the building complex.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-087-DRB

266 Spruce Drive (APN 079-530-027)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 2,061-square foot residence and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,968-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 1,081-square foot basement, demolish the existing 450-square foot garage, and construct an attached 472-square foot 2-car garage in the same location as the existing garage. The resulting 1-story structure with basement would be 3,449 square feet, consisting of a 2,977-square foot single-family dwelling with basement and an attached 472-square foot 2-car garage. 684-cubic yards of cut for grading is proposed for construction of the basement. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence aside from new doors, windows, and exterior lighting as shown on plans. The project was filed by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. Related cases: 09-092-MOD. (Continued from 12-8-09, 10-27-09, 10-14-08, 09-23-08*, 9-09-08*, 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

The plans were presented by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. He provided the color and material board, the cut sheets for the lighting fixtures, the landscape plan for the front yard, and the wrought iron detail for the rail around the exterior stair.

Comments:

1. Member Messner commented: a) If the property owner agrees, he proposes that the two existing Pygmy Dwarf Date Palm trees be removed and replaced with a species that is listed on the City’s Recommended Street Tree Planting List.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to grant Final Approval of Item J-1, DRB Permit No. 08-087-DRB, 266 Spruce Drive, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The applicant’s agent is directed to talk with the property owner regarding the proposal that the applicant remove the two existing Pygmy Dwarf Date Palm trees, which are not on the City’s Recommended Street Tree Planting List, and replace the trees with a species that is on the City’s Recommended Street Tree Planting List, if the property owner agrees.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. 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. (Continued from 2-9-10) (Shine Ling)

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

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 discussed the applicant's response to the DRB comments from the previous meeting. He stated that it seems premature to continue to address the ADA handicapped accessibility at this time because this aspect will be reviewed further by the Building Officer as the project moves forward, and may require DRB review later if there are aesthetics issues. With regard to the concerns about locating the outdoor dining area on the west side of the building, he believes this should be a business decision made by the tenant; however, he agrees there may be concerns by some patrons, but noted there would be a choice for patrons to be inside. He believes that the aesthetics are what should be of concern, and also that the proposed project, with the revisions made in response to the DRB review, is a vast improvement to the existing building.

Chuck McClure, project landscape architect, presented the proposed landscape plan.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) He believes that his comments at the previous meeting are still valid with regard to the proposed location of the outdoor eating area close to the busy Storke/Hollister intersection because of the potential for impacts that would include traffic noise and exposure to air pollution, and the western exposure on a hot day; b) His concerns include the proximity of the bus stop and the amount of delivery truck traffic presently on Storke Road which will probably increase over time as the population increases; c) The west elevation is a very poor location for outside dining; d) An alternate solution would be to consider a design similar to Rusty's Pizza Parlor, next door, which would be to make an entryway with steps, that would have room for a ramp allowing for ADA

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 23, 2010

Page 8 of 12

access to the entrance coming from the north, and to possibly continue Rusty's theme of having interior window seats and bay windows on the west elevation; e) There may be room to add a few more tables and chairs to the east side, thus eliminating outdoor dining on the west side; f) The objective of DRB Goal #10 is to ensure that the continued health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood are not compromised; g) He does not support the project as proposed and would not be able to make DRB Finding #17 that the development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood, or Finding #18 that the public health, safety and welfare will be protected.

2. Member Schneider commented: a) From the standpoints of aesthetics and usability, the proposed project is a nice project; b) He believes there will be people who will utilize the outdoor dining area; c) He understands Member Wignot's concerns and comments regarding the intersection; d) He noted that presently this intersection is fairly non-pedestrian, because of the amount of traffic and width of the lanes, however, this project will help bring the pedestrian aspect to the intersection in the future; and e) He was not present at the previous hearing.
3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) She appreciates Member Wignot's concerns, and noted that there are other outdoor café areas in the City that are being used while traffic goes by; b) The proposed green screen, vines, and trees, as well as the windows, will help soften the western elevation; and c) The applicant's revisions are appreciated.
4. Member Herrera commented: a) The revisions are appreciated; and b) The proximity of the bus stop and the traffic are aspects that are not nice; however, the project will be an improvement to the whole area.
5. Member Messner commented: a) When making a site visit today, he noticed that the traffic echoes; b) Consider adding some windows or other elements along the second bay (kitchen, restroom area) that would make the elevation more inviting and open; c) There may be an opportunity for ADA access near the driveway/stairway area; d) Planting trees with different heights will successfully help break up the landscaping in the accessory area; and e) The proposed *Ficus* plantings should be variegated species which would be less aggressive.
6. Chair Smith commented: a) The proposed project will be a big improvement with regard to the streetscape along Storke Road; b) He could support the proposed project, especially with the proposed landscaping that will make the elevation more "friendly"; c) He did acknowledge there is a lot of traffic with regard to the outdoor dining area, and noted how this aspect may relate to personal preferences; d) Member Wignot's comments regarding ADA handicapped access are appreciated, but this aspect will need to be dealt with technically by the appropriate process; and e) He understands that there is ADA handicapped access from the parking lot side of the site.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 1 vote (No: Wignot; Recused: Branch) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 10-003-DRB, 270 Storke Road, with the following conditions: 1) The proposed trees in the pots in the patio area shall be a variegated species; and 2) The Bottlebrush species proposed for the storage area shall be changed to a species that is located on the current City Recommended Street Tree Planting List; and 3) As projects move forward on this property site, efforts to increase

the tree canopy in the parking lot will be appreciated; and to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 10-003-DRB, to March 9, 2010, for Final review on the Final Calendar.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

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

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

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The properties consist of five parcels in the M-1 zone district (Coastal Zone), comprising a total of 28,346 square feet. An existing 3,656-square foot two-story commercial/industrial building is located at 5940 Olney Street; vacant paved lots are located at 5912, 5920, 5930, 5940, and 5960 Olney Street. The applicant proposes an as-built development plan and major conditional use permit for a car rental facility. The first floor of the existing building would be used for a rental office and four car repair bays for light car maintenance and hand car washing. One of the offices on the second floor is used for AVIS administration. The hours of operation would be from 4:30 a.m. to 11:30 p.m. An average of 50 cars per day would be rented from the facility. The total number of employees would be 20, spread over 3 work shifts, with a maximum of 8 during a typical day shift. The existing building is proposed to be used 'as-is' with no physical changes proposed. AVIS customer operations are restricted to the first floor office area. A total of 10 customer parking stalls are proposed (5 on the lot at 5940 Olney Street and 5 on the lots adjacent at 5912-5930 Olney Street). The project was filed by Leland J. Smith of Chester Smith Associates, architect, on behalf of Andrew Jaksich of AVIS Budget Group, tenant, and the Duckett Family Trust and Graziano and Romana Bernardi, property owners. Related cases: 08-037-DP; -CUP. (Continued from 1-12-10) (Shine Ling)

The plans were presented by Leland J. Smith, of Chester Smith Associates, project architect, and Marilyn Smith, who prepared the plans, on behalf of Andrew Jaksich of AVIS Budget Group, tenant, and the Duckett Family Trust and Graziano and Romana Bernardi, property owners. Leland J. Smith stated that the landscape plan has been revised to add more landscaping, which is now approximately nine percent of the lot coverage, which he believes is as close as practical to the required ten percent of lot coverage.

Shine Ling, Assistant Planner, stated that when the DRB has completed Conceptual review, the proposed project will be taken off calendar and it will move forward in the planning process. Staff recommends that the DRB Conceptual review includes comments as to the aesthetics of the proposed project, as well as the sufficiency of the proposed landscape plan because the landscaping is less than ten percent of the lot coverage.

Speaker:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, stated that when he visited the site approximately one month ago, he noticed the existing rag-like sign on top of the building. He requested

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

February 23, 2010

Page 10 of 12

that something be done very soon regarding the sign with the intent of the beautification of Goleta.

Comments:

General Comment: By unanimous concurrence (7-0) regarding Conceptual review, the DRB supports the proposed project, including the proposed landscape plan, even though the proposed landscaping is less than ten percent of the lot coverage. The DRB members also expressed appreciation for the applicant's efforts to provide some landscaping in response to the DRB concerns.

1. Member Wignot commented: a) It seemed like that there may be some obstruction to the center light pole in the parking lot with the proposed tree being so close, and that the tree foliage may shade the lot while the tree is growing; however, it appears that the height of the tree will be kept down because the tree will be planted in a three-foot pot.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed periwinkle and *Lantana* plantings, which are very invasive and will be located in the proximity of San Jose Creek, will need to be eliminated and replaced with another appropriate species, noting that the *Gazania* species is her preferred replacement; b) The *Ficus benjamina* should be a variegated species; c) The problem with the four existing wall packs on the back wall is that they are not shielded, which needs to be restudied; d) She noted that the applicant's proposal to shield the existing wall packs will change the photometrics; e) It may be easier to replace the existing wall packs; f) The applicant is requested to restudy the lighting plan to address the concern that the lighting should be directed downward, and to consider shortening the fixtures to approximately 20 feet which would probably tend to reduce some of the lighting trespass along the edges of the site; g) The proposed new lighting standards are good with the full cut-off design; h) She supports the proposed project with the suggested landscape revisions and the restudy of the wall packs; and i) The good faith efforts that the applicant has brought to the proposed project are appreciated, noting that this area is industrial and it is difficult with regard to landscaping and aesthetic considerations;
3. Member Messner commented: a) Expressed concern that the proposed *Lantana* plantings will get thick around the edges; b) Suggested that the *Gazania* species would be the best solution to replace the proposed periwinkle and *Lantana* plantings; and c) "Freeway daisies" are another suggested species to replace the periwinkle and *Lantana* plantings, although the *Gazania* species will need less maintenance.
4. Member Branch commented: a) Expressed appreciation that the applicant has added trees to the proposed landscape plan.
5. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with the DRB Conceptual comments.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to take off calendar Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 08-037-DRB, 5912-5940 & 5960 Olney Street, with Conceptual comments.

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 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 2-9-10, 1-26-10, 12-8-09) (Natasha Campbell)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, to March 9, 2010, per the applicant's request.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- **NONE**

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. CALIFORNIA INVASIVE PLANT COUNCIL LIST

Vice Chair Brown stated she became aware of informative and educational material that is available from the California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC) website, www.CNPS.org, which raises awareness regarding invasive plants and provides alternatives to invasive garden plants. She presented copies to the DRB members and staff of a document prepared by Cal-IPC entitled, "Don't Plant a Pest! Give them an inch and they'll take an acre..." She also provided a sample of a smaller brochure from Cal-IPC regarding invasive plants entitled, "Stop the Invasion".

Chair Smith stated that he appreciates the information which will be useful.

Member Herrera stated that the information will be a good resource to help address concerns regarding invasive grasses and plants.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, asked if the DRB members would want staff to bring the brochure to meetings if there are questions from the public and applicants.

Vice Chair Brown suggested that staff order some of the brochures and have them available for the public at the Planning Counter. Member Branch and Chair Smith agreed it would be a good idea to order brochures and make them available for the public and applicants. There were no objections from the DRB members.

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Member Branch suggested moving the Appointment to Subcommittees agenda item from the Administrative Agenda towards the end of the meeting.

After discussion, Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, suggested keeping the current agenda format, noting that items may be moved in terms of agenda management.

O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Member Wignot announced that the DRB members each received an invitation to attend the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital open house/groundbreaking ceremony on March 11, 2010, from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Member Branch announced that his brother's film, "Multiple Sarcasms", opens in New York, Los Angeles, Seattle, Salt Lake City, Santa Barbara, and probably Goleta on May 7, 8, and 9, 2010.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 4:40 P.M.