



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - UNAPPROVED

Planning & Environmental Services  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, CA 93117

(805)961-7500

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, March 9, 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**

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 Herrera exited the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Board Members absent: None.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

## **Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved**

March 9, 2010

Page 2 of 13

### **B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

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

A. Design Review Board Minutes for February 23, 2010.

**MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for February 23, 2010, as amended.**

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

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that 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) On March 2, 2010, the City Council considered appointments to the DRB. Simon Herrera was re-appointed to fill his vacant position. The City Council decided to conduct interviews for appointment to the at-large DRB position because two applications were received. 2) Staff recommends that the agenda items B-4 Election of Officers and B-5 Appointment to Subcommittees be continued to the next DRB meeting on March 23, 2010. 3) The next Stormwater Management Plan stakeholders meeting will be held on March 17, 2010. 4) On March 22, 2010, the Planning Commission is scheduled to review the T-Mobile monopine project.

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

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

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

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

### **C. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

No speakers.

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

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported that no requests for continuance have been received.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

March 9, 2010

Page 3 of 13

### E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

### F. CONSENT CALENDAR

- NONE

### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown reported that the Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-192-DRB, 5718 Hollister Avenue. She noted that the applicant shared his frustration with regard to unpermitted signs in Old Town.

Sign Subcommittee Member Brown stated that last year (in June), the DRB discussed the signage process path and forwarded a recommendation to the City Council for consideration that the requirements be removed for review by the Zoning Administrator of all Overall Sign Plans, and certain other signage. The DRB has not heard back with regard to the recommendation. She stated that the Sign Subcommittee continues to support the removal of this step from the sign review process, and would like the request to be acted upon, because the function is a step that is no longer needed, and the removal would save applicants time and money.

### 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. (Continued from 2-23-10) (Shine Ling)

The plans were presented by Jack Hira of J and S Properties, property owner. He expressed his frustration that there are unpermitted signs on other properties in the community and also that it is challenging for businesses that follow the permit process.

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) She noted that the tenant sign on Building "B", Sheet 4 of 8, has only one line of text which is shown on the first line and should be either centered or located on the bottom line.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-192-DRB, 5718**

**Hollister Avenue, to April 13, 2010, with the following comments: 1) The height of the address numbers and letters shall be 12" on Building A, and the height shall be 9" on Building "B" and Building "C"; 2) The size of the text for the tenant signs shall remain the same whether there are one or two lines; 3) The directory sign on the Building "C" south elevation shall be modified to be a little wider and shorter, to make room to add the building and unit number on the first line of text, so there are only two lines per tenant; 4) On the Building "B" inner east elevation, the address, "5718" should be added above the letter "B" for consistency; and 5) The language in the OSP shall be reviewed by staff and modified accordingly with regard to the suggestion to change the language in Item B.1 and Item B.2 to read "One directory wall sign" rather than "One directional wall sign".**

## **I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR**

### **I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-017-DRB RV**

6550 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-330-002)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a 38,000-square foot commercial building on a 3.43-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes a revised landscape plan for the project parcel. Revisions proposed include updated plantings for parking lot landscape islands, new patios and walkways, and the removal of coral trees at the Hollister/Los Carneros corner and replacement with Canary Island date palms. The project was filed by Derrik Eichelberger and Erin Carroll of Arcadia Studio, landscape architect, on behalf of Alan Grosbard of Park One LLC, property owner. Related cases: 10-017-LUPRV. (Shine Ling)

The plans were presented by Derrik Eichelberger and Erin Carroll of Arcadia Studio, landscape architects, agents on behalf of Alan Grosbard of Park One LLC, property owner. Derrik Eichelberger stated that the landscape plan has been revised because the applicant considered comments that were made during the DRB Final review that encouraged landscaping upgrades in the parking area and throughout the site. Erin Carroll presented the proposed revised landscape plan.

In response to the comment by Member Wignot regarding the threshold for existing projects to comply with the new Stormwater Management Plan requirements, Derrik Eichelberger, applicant, stated that trash enclosures have not been installed yet, and that the applicant has not been involved in any conversations with staff with regard to this matter.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that the Community Services Department has jurisdiction with regard to the Stormwater Management Plan. Staff will work with the applicant and Community Services to determine what, if any, enclosure would be required.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

March 9, 2010

Page 5 of 13

### Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) He questioned staff regarding the threshold to require existing projects to conform with the new Stormwater Management Plan requirements, in particular, with regard to covering trash enclosures.
2. Member Messner commented: a) The applicant needs to call out and note on the landscape plan the proposed plant sizes and specifications; and b) He prefers that the sizes for the trees will be the larger sizes.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item I-1, DRB Permit No. 10-017-DRB RV, 6550 Hollister Avenue, to March 23, 2010, for Revised Final review on the Revised Final Calendar, with the following comment: 1) The applicant is directed to call out and note the proposed plant sizes and specifications on the landscape plan.**

## J. FINAL CALENDAR

### J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-003-DRB

270 Storke Road (APN 073-100-032)

This is a request for *Final* 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 2-23-10, 2-9-10) (Shine Ling)

Recused: Member Branch recused himself.

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.

### Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed landscaping around the accessory building is fine; b) With regard to the proposed project, including the patio, his comments #a through #f are still valid from the previous hearing on February 23, 2010; c) He would not be able to support an outdoor patio at this location, and cannot make DRB Finding #1 that the development is compatible with the neighborhood because there are not many outdoor patios in this neighborhood for a good reason; d) He 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. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The trees will need to be planted far enough away from the accessory building so there is room for the canopy to develop; and b) Consider for a solution to plant some shrub-like plantings to screen the wall.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

March 9, 2010

Page 6 of 13

3. Member Messner commented: a) Replace the proposed Firewheel trees with the Wax Leaf Privet species, and b) Suggested that the landscape plan should call out for three of the larger trees and approximately five or six of the Wax Leaf Privet species.

**MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 5 to 1 vote (No: Wignot; Recused: Branch) to grant Final Approval of Item J-1, DRB Permit 10-003-DRB, 270 Storke Road, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The landscape plan shall be modified by substituting the proposed Firewheel trees with the Wax Leaf Privet species, to be verified by staff.**

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

### L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

811 Cambridge Drive (APN 069-080-009)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property is an undeveloped 1.01-acre parcel 20-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 3,150-square foot single-story residence with an additional 1,088-square foot 3-car garage, 154-square foot breezeway and 258 feet of porches. The resulting single-story structure would be 4,392 square feet, consisting of a 3,150-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached (via 154-square foot breezeway) 1,088-square foot 3-car garage. This proposal is within the maximum floor area ratio guidelines for this property, which is 4,379 square feet plus an allocation of 650 square feet for a 3-car garage. New materials consist of stucco siding painted "X-53 Pure Ivory (Base 100)," a wood front door with a natural stain, Loewen wood windows painted "Sage Green," and a red barrel tiled roof. The project was filed by agent Preston Mann of Mann Construction on behalf of Lindsay and Lesa Mann, property owner. Related cases: 09-183-CC, 09-189-LUP. (Continued from 2-9-10) (Scott Kolwitz)

The plans were presented by agent Preston Mann of Mann Construction, project designer, on behalf of Lindsay and Lesa Mann, property owner. Lesa Mann, property owner, was also present. Preston Mann presented a conceptual grading plan, stating that the applicant is in the process of completing a final grading plan. He stated that an Inspector from the Fire Department visited the site and conceptually agreed to the conceptual plans for the proposed turnaround. He noted that the garage, which is located to the east of the neighbor's property, is buried almost five feet into the ground, and will not impact the neighbor's view. He stated that, in terms of the proposed residence, the view of the neighbor to the north will be impacted.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, stated that staff has requested that the applicant submit a hydrology report and an arborist report which would be provided to Community Services for review prior to the next hearing. He also stated that he visited the site with the City Arborist who looked at the health of the existing oak trees and advised that the health of all of the trees onsite was good except for oak tree #3 which was

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

March 9, 2010

Page 7 of 13

rated at fifty percent of health. He said the City Arborist noted that with some proper pruning, oak tree #3 may be brought back to good health.

### Speaker

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, commented that some of the plans have a minimal amount of information which makes it difficult to understand. For example, on Sheet 4, the finished floor elevations should be included for the adjacent buildings on the property. He believes that the current proposal is not egregious, and that it fits the site and looks pretty reasonable. He noted that the zoning has always allowed for a home on the site. With regard to the concern that views to the ocean will be lost, he commented, on the flip side, if the applicant had built on the site earlier, the applicant would have lost the view to the mountains due to the houses on the other side.

Documents: 1) Letter from Nancy & Miles Hartfield, dated March 9, 2010, requesting that their concerns regarding the proposed project be incorporated within the official record/minutes of this meeting, that include a) Grading Sections AA and Grading Section BB are mislabeled; and b) Questions and issues submitted with regard to the Preliminary Drainage Plan, March 2, 2010, Sheet L-4; and 2) Letter from Joan Buss, received March 9, 2010, expressing concern that no consideration was given in regard to the DRB Finding #19 that the project architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access.

### Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide a section through the hammerhead for review.
2. Member Branch commented: a) From an aesthetic standpoint, the applicant will need to provide the details that include materials and heights with regard to the hammerhead area; b) The applicant will need to address the comments regarding retaining as much water onsite as possible and also consider the concept of berms; c) After visiting the site, he believes the proposed placement of the house is the most logical choice; d) The size of the house works from the standpoint of floor area ratio; e) In his opinion, the proposed architectural style is acceptable in this situation on this site, noting that it is on an infill lot and one-story design; f) The heights of the project could possibly be reduced a little bit in a couple of places, and maybe lower the tower, but the project is not too ostentatious; g) More details will be needed in the grading plan; and h) Conceptually, the plans are okay.
3. Member Schneider commented; a) The Conceptual plans including the grading plan will need more detailing; b) The placement and orientation of the house is fine; c) The architectural character is probably fine; d) Encouraged darker colors, more earth tones, rather than the typical red tile roof and white color; e) The water retention system will need to meet the Stormwater Management Plan requirements, which will be reviewed within the jurisdiction of the Department of Community Services; f) He is not sure that the proposed surface ponds will be a solution that will be acceptable long-term; and g) The applicant is requested to provide an Arborist Report regarding plans to address the health of oak tree #3 and oak tree #5 which is a fairly significant tree.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

March 9, 2010

Page 8 of 13

4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The grading plan and arborist report will be very helpful to facilitate the review of this project; b) Agreed with Member Branch that the plate heights could possibly be reduced in a couple of places; and c) It would be helpful for the project landscape architect to be present at the next review to answer questions because there are a lot of issues related to landscape.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) The water retention basin should look natural, and could look like a bioswale but still serve as a retention basin.
6. Chair Smith commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide a grading section through the hammerhead area for review; and b) There is a need for the retention basins, noting that a design with something bermed would be preferable and would blend in better rather than a design that is more industrial.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 811 Cambridge Drive, to March 23, 2010, with the following Conceptual comments: 1) The applicant is requested to present a grading plan that is more developed, especially with respect to the runoff; 2) The applicant shall submit an Arborist Report to staff for review; 3) The retention basins should be more natural in shape; 3) Restudy and consider lowering the plate heights, at least possibly around the tower portion of the house; 4) The applicant is requested to provide the grading section through the hammerhead and an elevation showing specific details with regard to materials and heights at the hammerhead area; and 5) The project landscape architect should attend the next review on March 23, 2010.**

### **L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-015-DRB**

98-110 South Kellogg Avenue (APN 071-340-001; -002; -003; -004; -005; -006; 007)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property comprises the Kellogg Ranch, which includes 7 condominiums on a 1.44-acre lot in the DR-20 zone district. The applicant proposes to repaint the existing buildings with a new color scheme, including an olive green color for the body, off-white for the trim, and slate gray for the roof (Frazee CLC 1209 Demon Days, CLW 1013W Akamina, and CL 3225D Fate, respectively). No new floor area or other exterior modifications to the structures are proposed. The project was filed by Reilly Pollard of the Kellogg Ranch Homeowners Association, property owner. (Shine Ling)

Site visits: Made by Members Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, and Wignot. Member Branch stated that he has been to the site several times in the past.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Reilly Pollard of the Kellogg Ranch Homeowners Association, property owner; and Connie Easton, resident and member of the Landscape Committee of the Kellogg Ranch Homeowners Association. Reilly Pollard stated that the property has not been painted for approximately fifteen years in some cases, and longer in another case. He stated that he provided the proposed plans to the Housing Authority, located adjacent to the north, and that the Housing Authority basically expressed approval of the plans via e-mail correspondence. Connie Easton stated that the proposed color scheme was approved by vote of the residents of the Homeowners Association.



## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

March 9, 2010

Page 9 of 13

### Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed color scheme is handsome and appropriate.
2. Member Wignot commented: a) He noticed when driving around the area that traditionally there are buildings, for example the Goleta Depot and the Sexton House, with the trim color that is darker than the main building color, similar to the existing color scheme on the site; however, the trim color is lighter on the Housing Authority building located adjacent to the project site, which seems to work well; and b) The proposed color scheme was approved by a vote of the residents.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) He noted that the photograph image presented by the applicant shows the color a bit darker than it is actually.
4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) She realizes the photograph example was made on a color printer, but she prefers the color with less yellow and more blue.
5. Chair Smith commented: a) The proposed color scheme is good; and b) He recalls he has seen some original older buildings with a similar kind of green color, that are located in the general area, near Patterson Avenue and Cathedral Oaks, for example, the original farmhouse buildings.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-015-DRB, 98-110 South Kellogg Avenue, as submitted; and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-015-DRB, to March 23, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

**RECESS HELD FROM 4:35 TO 4:40 P.M.**

## M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

### M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-075-DRB

6300 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-050-020)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. This is a request for *Conceptual* review of a 140-room extended stay hotel on a vacant portion of a parcel located at 6300 Hollister Avenue, between La Patera Lane and Robin Hill Road. The project site occupies the westerly 3.81 acres of a larger 10.95-acre parcel that contains an existing research-manufacturing facility, known as the Hollister Center. The 3.81 acres would be split to create the separate parcel for the hotel development. Reciprocal access and parking with the Hollister Center would be provided. The property is presently zoned M-RP (Industrial Research Park).

The proposed hotel is approximately 99,634 square feet and is designed in a U-shape configuration around a pool, framed by three building wings, each three-stories in height. The main entrance is oriented toward Hollister Avenue with access served from both Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. A new landscaped island in Hollister Avenue and a new left turn lane for eastbound vehicles approaching the hotel would be provided. Vehicles exiting the hotel's Hollister Avenue driveway would be limited to right turns only.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

March 9, 2010

Page 10 of 13

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 2-23-10\*, 2-9-10, 1-26-10, 12-8-09) (Natasha Campbell)

Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, stated that the Staff Memorandum, dated March 9, 2010, includes a table that identifies how the proposed project has changed as it has moved through the DRB review process. At the end of the review today, staff would be looking for direction with regard to whether to proceed with updating the visual simulation and video drive by.

The plans were presented by Robert Olson, R.D. Olson Development, applicant; and the project team including project architect Gene Fong, Gene Fong Associates; Russ Goodman, Regional President, Sares-Regis Group; Tony Wrzosek, R.D. Olson Development; and project landscape architect Ricardo Castellanos, Katie O'Reilly Rogers, Inc.

Robert Olson, applicant, summarized the most recent revisions to the proposed project. He stated that the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) now meets, and is below, the 0.50 FAR for the Hotel Overlay. The room count has been reduced to 118 rooms. The main part of the building is now set back almost 200 feet from Hollister Avenue. All of the parking spaces are onsite. He does not believe that any variances will be requested. Mr. Olson stated that the Ad Hoc Committee meetings have been very constructive, noting that many issues were brought up, of which the applicant has been in agreement. For example, the number of compact parking spaces has been reduced significantly. Also, more architectural details were created in some areas which he believes enhanced the project.

Gene Fong, project architect, stated that the pool was offset further north so there would be more exposure onto the pool and the terrace in the courtyard. This revision

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

March 9, 2010

Page 11 of 13

allows for a lawn area in front of the patio. He summarized the architectural details that have been modified in response to the Ad Hoc Committee meetings. He clarified that the reduction in the footprint of the proposed project will allow for avoidance of more of the cultural resources.

Ricardo Castellanos, project landscape architect, presented the changes to the proposed landscape plan and summarized the location of existing and proposed trees. He noted that the addition of accent trees, as well as existing trees, will screen the existing buildings on the east side. He stated that setting the building back farther away from Hollister Avenue will allow for a larger garden area in front.

Speaker:

Ana Citrin, Law Office of Marc Chytilo, representing Friends of Saspili, expressed appreciation that the applicant has made some recent changes that address the FAR and the cultural resources issues. However, she believes the latest reiteration of the project does not resolve the fundamental concerns raised by members of the public and by the DRB that the overall size, bulk and scale of this project is incompatible with the surrounding environment, that it continues to obstruct and interfere with public views of the mountains from a scenic corridor, and that it continues to impact the intact Chumash village site that lies beneath it. Due to the scenic and cultural value of this site, and based on their assessment of the City's CEQA thresholds, she expressed the belief that each iteration of this project continues to have Class I impacts to both aesthetics and cultural resources. She also expressed the belief that each iteration of this project does not meet the standards in the DRB Findings which include the development is compatible with the neighborhood; the development is an appropriate size, bulk, and scale; and it will not adversely affect public scenic resources. Accordingly, she continued to urge the DRB against Conceptual approval. She expressed hope that the applicant would be more flexible with the overall concept for this site, and that more significant changes would result at this early stage before the EIR process. She understands that, as part of the CEQA process, alternatives will be developed that seek to avoid or substantially reduce the significant cultural and aesthetic impacts. If the DRB directs staff to proceed with updating the visual simulations and video drive by, she urged that Conceptual review action be deferred until the visual simulations and video drive by are prepared and made available to the DRB and the public. She suggested that the DRB defer making recommendations with regard to the architectural style of the building at this time, and instead recommended that Chumash representatives be involved in making that determination.

Comments:

General Comment: By consensus, the DRB directed staff to proceed with updating the visual simulations and video drive by to reflect the revised proposed hotel design.

1. Member Wignot commented: a) Having served on the Ad Hoc Committee, he believes the applicant has made a good faith effort to consider the concerns; b) The applicant has scaled the project back to meet the FAR which eliminates the

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

March 9, 2010

Page 12 of 13

need for a Good Cause Finding; c) With the reduction in the FAR, the site coverage has been reduced from 24% to 20%; d) A reciprocal parking agreement is no longer needed because all parking will be accommodated onsite; e) The number of compact parking spaces has been substantially decreased and the number of standard spaces has been increased; f) The building is still a three-story building for the most part; although the frontage along Hollister Avenue has been scaled back to two-stories, but even the three stories are within the 35-foot height limit that is appropriate for this zoning; and g) There have been many good revisions and the next step should be to update the visual simulations and video drive by. The updated visuals should include the same view angles as the original visual simulations and video drive so that these can be compared, “apples to apples”. If additional view angles are included also, that would be fine.

2. Member Branch commented: a) Thanked the applicant for working with the DRB, noting that the revised proposed project is a better product from a mass, bulk and scale standpoint; and how it is situated on the site plan; as well as with regard to the style that the architecture is moving towards; b) At this point, the actual massing of the building is not as much of a concern as are the smaller details; c) The revisions that moved the swimming pool and added the lawn area outside the patio public space will work well because the public space will feel bigger and there will be more of a separation of space between the pool and the public space; and d) He is comfortable with proceeding with the visual simulations.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) Thanked the applicant and everyone involved in the process that allowed the footprint to come down and the FAR to meet the 0.50 FAR for the Hotel Overlay; b) The overall massing of the revised proposed project is much nicer and presents much better to Hollister Avenue; c) There have been some big improvements relative to the proposed architectural style of the building but some refinements and adjustments regarding details will be needed as the project moves forward; d) With regard to visual concerns, driving westbound on Hollister is probably not as much of an issue as driving eastbound; e) When he recently drove eastbound on Hollister Avenue, he noticed that there are several big buildings located along the street scene that intermittently appear in front of the mountains, and he realized that when he arrived at the proposed site, a large panorama of the mountain ridgeline gets exposed, but also a large amount of the mountains will still be visible when continuing driving east on Hollister Avenue; and f) The next step should be updating the visual simulations and video drive by.
4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Echoed Member Schneider’s comments and thanked the applicant and property owner for the nice changes and for working with the DRB; b) The proposed project is much better with the revisions; c) It will be useful to review the updated visual simulations at this point; d) Probably, some of the viewshed issues have been resolved; e) Rather than planting accent trees along the edge of the parking lot on the eastern edge, plant canopy trees that extend over into the parking lot to help provide some shade, and which should not conflict with the trees in the finger planters; f) There are probably lots of opportunities in front to plant big trees next to the parking lot; g) The proposed landscaping is appreciated; h) The newly proposed areas with the lawn will be an improvement; i) Suggested eliminating the Catalina Ironwood tree, which is a problematic tree, and replacing it with a canopy tree, which would be more

## Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

March 9, 2010

Page 13 of 13

appropriate; j) The inner courtyard elevation is appreciated, but consider embellishing the interior on the western elevation so it appears richer, and also consider this revision on the eastern elevation; k) It would be helpful for the applicant to work with the Chumash representatives and incorporate some of their comments regarding the architecture which they feel is important; l) The proposed lighting plan should not have any conflict with the trees; and m) There is only one public speaker this time which may be indicating people are happier with this project.

5. Member Messner commented: a) Lowering the placement of the sign on the front of the building is a good improvement; b) Requested that the applicant note on the landscape plan whether the trees are located in Goleta or Santa Barbara; c) The landscape plan is good; and d) Agreed with Vice Chair Brown's recommendation to plant canopy trees along the edge of the parking lot to provide some shading.
6. Chair Smith commented: a) Thanked the applicant and project team for making the revisions; b) Also, the work of the Ad Hoc Committee with the applicant was helpful; c) The proposed project is a lot better with the revisions; d) The revision that sets the building back farther from Hollister Avenue and reducing the FAR was unexpected and is appreciated; and e) At this point, the visual simulations will be useful.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera), to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, with Conceptual comments, to March 23, 2010; and to direct staff to proceed with updating the visual simulations and video drive by, and include the previous visual simulations and video drive for comparison, to be prepared by Ron Stevens of Interacta, under contract by the City.**

### N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

### O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

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

No requests.

#### O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

No announcements.

### P. ADJOURNMENT: 5:20 P.M.