



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, March 23, 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 – 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)

Notices:

- Requests for review of project plans or change of scheduling should be made to the City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, 93117; Telephone (805)961-7500.
 - In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City of Goleta at (805)961-7500. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City staff to make reasonable arrangements.
 - Preliminary approval or denial of a project by the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Goleta Planning Commission within ten (10) calendar days following the action. Please contact the Planning & Environmental Services Department for more information.
 - Design Review Board approvals do not constitute Land Use Clearances.
 - The square footage figures on this agenda are subject to change during the review process.
 - The length of Agenda items is only an estimate. Applicants are responsible for being available when their item is to be heard. Any item for which the applicant is not immediately available may be continued to the next meeting.
-

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 2 of 18

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for March 9, 2010

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

B-4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

B-5. APPOINTMENT TO SUBCOMMITTEES

C. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** General comments regarding topics over which the Design Review Board has discretion will be allowed. Comments from concerned parties regarding specific projects not on today's agenda will be limited to three minutes per person.

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

Staff recommendation to move item M-2 to the beginning of the Conceptual Calendar

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

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 2-9-10*, 1-12-10*, 12-8-09*, 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

10-27-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Herrera commented: a) The proposed project is a huge improvement on the site.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed project is a great improvement; b) The colors are appreciated; and c) He noticed that there is distinctive stone

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 3 of 18

material on the façade of the buildings on either side of the site which was not incorporated into the design; however, the design works well without it.

3. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with Member Branch's comments; b) The project fits in with the distinctive stone material on both sides of the project site and the warm, earthy palette of the building; and c) The idea of the bi-fold doors is appreciated.
4. Member Schneider commented: a) The design is somewhat simple and straight-forward, and works very well; and b) The intensity of the proposed color will be played down somewhat because the storefront faces north.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, as submitted; and to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, to December 8, 2009; for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-2. 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 2-23-10*, 1-26-10, 12-8-09*) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-26-10 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) There are a lot of two-story residences in the neighborhood, which is very nice neighborhood; b) The architectural design of the proposed project is appreciated; c) The proposed veranda is a nice aesthetic element to add to the house and it will probably have a lot of use, particularly in good weather; d) One existing bedroom will be eliminated; e) There have been no public comments from neighbors expressing concerns as far as he knows; f) He would support the proposed project, even though the size is ten percent over the recommended floor area ratio; and g) He believes this project shows justification that an exception can be made to the recommended floor area ratio guideline; and h) The applicant will need to provide cut sheets showing that proposed lighting fixtures comply with Dark Sky principles.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed architectural design is nice; and b) With regard to exceeding the recommended floor area ratio guideline, he believes this case is an example of a proposed project adding positively to the aesthetics of the neighborhood;

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 4 of 18

3. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed project is a nice aesthetic element that will enhance the neighborhood as well as the existing house; and b) Encouraged the use of board and bat materials to tie into the existing house.
4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed project with the addition of the veranda will be a very nice improvement and benefit for the neighborhood; and b) The appearance of the project does not seem to show that the recommended floor area ratio guideline is exceeded.
5. Member Messner commented: a) The project design works well with the neighborhood even though the project exceeds the recommended floor area ratio guidelines.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, 6560 Camino Caseta, as submitted, with the following Conditions: 1) The applicant shall provide the proposed color details; 2) The applicant shall provide cut sheets showing that the proposed light fixtures comply with Dark Sky principles; and 3) Board and bat material shall be used for the new addition element; and to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, to February 23, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-3. 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 *Final* 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. (Continued from 3-9-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-9-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

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

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 5 of 18

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.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-021-DRB

5444 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-330-003)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes Saint Raphael School with associated play yards and community buildings on a 7.55-acre parcel in the DR zone district. The applicant proposes to place a monument sign at the entrance to the school adjacent to the intersection of Sumida Gardens Lane and Hollister Avenue. The non-illuminated MDO plywood monument sign, located a minimum of 5-feet from City of Goleta right-of-way, will have 8.5-inch high blue letters stating "St. Raphael School" and a 13-inch high blue and gold logo with the top of the sign measuring 4 feet above grade. The 9-square foot sign will be mounted to wood posts with a total height of 4.5 feet above grade. The project was filed by agent Jim Slaughter on behalf of Saint Raphael Church and the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, property owner. Related cases: 59-CP-182; 10-021-LUP; 10-020-CUP AM. (Brian Hiefield)

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-032-DRB

6550 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-330-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual* 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 requests a freestanding monument sign at the southwest corner of the property and a directional monument sign at the entrance driveway on Los Carneros Road. The project was filed by Derrik Eichelberger and Erin Carroll of Arcadia Studio, agent, on behalf of Park One LLC, property owner. Related cases: 10-032-LUP; 10-033-LUP; 10-032-SCC; 10-033-SCC; 10-033-CUP. (Shine Ling)

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

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 6 of 18

Alan Grosbard of Park One LLC, property owner. Related cases: 10-017-LUPRV.
(Continued from 3-9-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-9-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

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

- NONE

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 3-9-10, 2-9-10) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 7 of 18

3-9-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

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.
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.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 8 of 18

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-013-DRB

5660 Pembroke Court (APN 069-670-009)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,090-square foot residence and an attached 541-square foot 2-car garage on a 2,552-square foot condominium lot within the 2.5-acre Cambridge Residences development in the DR-3.3 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 150-square foot addition infilling exterior covered patio space at the rear of the dwelling under the existing roof line. The resulting 1-story structure would be 1,781 square feet, consisting of a 1,240-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 541-square foot 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Ben Woodall on behalf of Stanley Jagoda, property owner. Related cases: 86-DP-81; 10-013-SCD; 10-013-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-022-DRB

7404 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-064)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. On the eastern parcel of the HBP at 7404 Hollister (Building 8), the applicant proposes to construct a 160-square foot addition for a utility room, and also to install a 75-square foot diesel-powered emergency backup power generator. The generator would be enclosed within a 10-foot tall stucco wall with a corrugated metal gate, finished to match the existing building. The project was filed by Andrew Brenner of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park Ltd., property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 10-022-LUP; 10-022-SCD. (Shine Ling)

L-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-027-DRB

7716, 7717, 7726 & 7727 Kestrel Lane (APN 079-780-023; -024; -034; -035)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The properties include 4 vacant lots in the Bluffs along the Santa Barbara Coast Subdivision, a partially constructed 62-home subdivision in the 7-R-1 zone district (Coastal Zone). The applicant proposes to construct the following Bluffs single-family model dwelling types: on Lot 42, Plan 2C Farmhouse (3,230 square feet); on Lot 43, Plan 1BR Rustic (2,800 square feet); on Lot 56, Plan 2AR Villa (3,229 square feet); and on Lot 57, Plan 3BR Rustic (3,395 square feet). Materials would be light- to medium-earth tones, and would follow DRB-approved color schemes. The project was filed by Tiffany Sukay of Comstock Homes on behalf of Bob Comstock of Goleta Investment Partners, the property owner. Related cases: 67-SB-DRB; 10-027-LUP; 10-028-LUP; 10-029-LUP; 10-030-LUP. (Shine Ling)

Applicant request to be taken off calendar.

L-5. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-034-DRB

75 South Ellwood Station Road (APN 073-020-024)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review of a proposed, co-located wireless communications facility. The property includes a 19,000-square foot building that serves as an unattended Verizon telephone-call switching center as well as a 70-foot high mono-pine with a total of six panel antennae, two wall-

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 9 of 18

mounted GPS antennas, a back-up diesel generator, lighting, and associated appurtenant equipment on a 1.15 acre parcel in the PU zone district. The existing monopole is screened by a faux pine tree (a "mono-pine"). The applicant proposes to co-locate three directional panel antennae on the existing Verizon mono-pine as well as two directional micro-wave dishes to connect this site to other Clearwire cell sites.

The monopole would be medium-dark gray in a "slim-line" design with a base diameter of 24 inches tapering to a top diameter of 18 inches. The upper antenna array would be at a maximum height of 65 feet above grade, while the lower antenna array would be at 60 feet above grade, such that a 1-foot gap would be provided between the two arrays. Each antenna array would be approximately 3.5 feet in diameter, such that each antenna panel would protrude approximately 1-foot from the monopole.

All at-grade facility components would be located within a 60-square foot leased area enclosed by a wooden fence and gate inside a larger 595-square foot area enclosed by an existing chain-link fence. Power for the co-located facility would be provided by a new underground power line.

Access to the lease area would be provided via an existing 12-foot wide access easement from Ellwood Station Road to the lease area. The easement would be aligned along the north side of the existing building and would utilize existing paved portions of the parking lot and drive aisles. No new landscaping is proposed, and no grading is required.

The project was filed by agent Norcal Consulting for Clearwire US LLC, applicant. Related case: 10-034-LUP. (Alan Hanson)

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

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 10 of 18

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 3-9-10, 2-23-10*, 2-9-10, 1-26-10, 12-8-09) (Natasha Campbell)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-9-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

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 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

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 11 of 18

- 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 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.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 12 of 18

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.

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-031-DRB

7414 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-063)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. On the western parcel of the HBP at 7414 Hollister (Building 3), the applicant proposes to construct a 1,635-square foot addition for a cafeteria by enclosing an existing patio cover structure with a glass and aluminum storefront window system. New concrete walkways for access to the cafeteria are also proposed. The project was filed by Andrew Brenner of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of IRE-SB Inc., property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 10-031-LUP; 10-031-DPAM. (Shine Ling)

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines

Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)

The purpose of the City Design Review Board (DRB) is to encourage development that exemplifies the best professional design practices so as to enhance the visual quality of the environment, benefit surrounding property values, and prevent poor quality of design.

Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)

The Goleta City Council established the DRB and DRB Bylaws in March of 2002 (Ordinance No. 02-14 as amended by Ordinance No. 02-26). DRB Bylaws have subsequently been amended through Resolutions 02-69, 04-03, 05-27, 07-22 & 09-04. The DRB currently operates under Bylaws from Resolution 09-04

Design Review Board Procedures

Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)

The DRB is guided by a set of general goals that define the major concerns and objectives of its review process. These goals are to:

- 1) ensure that development and building design is consistent with adopted community design standards (e.g. General Plan, Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architectural and Design Guidelines, Design Standards for Commercial Projects);
- 2) promote high standards in architectural design and the construction of aesthetically pleasing, architecturally correct, structures so that new development does not detract from existing neighborhood characteristics;
- 3) encourage the most appropriate use of land;
- 4) promote visual interest throughout the City through the preservation of public scenic, ocean and mountain vistas, creation of open space areas, and providing for a variety of architectural styles;
- 5) preserve creek areas through restoration and enhancement, discourage the removal of significant trees and foliage;
- 6) ensure neighborhood compatibility of all projects;
- 7) ensure that architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access;
- 8) ensure that grading and development are appropriate to the site and that long term visible scarring of the landscape is avoided where possible;
- 9) preserve and protect native and biologically and aesthetically valuable nonnative vegetation or to ensure adequate and appropriate replacement for vegetation loss;
- 10) ensure that the continued health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood are not compromised;
- 11) provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way;
- 12) ensure that construction is in appropriate proportion to lot size;
- 13) encourage energy efficiency; and
- 14) ensure that air circulation between structures is not impaired and shading is minimized on adjacent properties.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 14 of 18

Aspects Considered in Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.1)

The DRB shall review each project for conformity with the purpose of this Chapter, the applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects, and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations. The DRB's review shall include:

- 1) Height, bulk, scale and area coverage of buildings and structures and other site improvements.
- 2) Colors and types of building materials and application.
- 3) Physical and design relation with existing and proposed structures on the same site and in the immediately affected surrounding area.
- 4) Site layout, orientation, and location of buildings, and relationship with open areas and topography.
- 5) Height, materials, colors, and variations in boundary walls, fences, or screen planting.
- 6) Location and type of existing and proposed landscaping.
- 7) Sign design and exterior lighting.

Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)

In approving, approving with conditions, or denying an application, the DRB shall examine the materials submitted with the application and any other material provided to Planning and Environmental Services to determine whether the buildings, structures, or signs are appropriate and of good design in relation to other buildings, structures, or signs on the site and in the immediately affected surrounding area. Such determination shall be based upon the following findings, as well as any additional findings required pursuant to any applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations:

- 1) The development will be compatible with the neighborhood, and its size, bulk and scale will be appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.
- 2) Site layout, orientation, and location of structures, buildings, and signs are in an appropriate and well-designated relationship to one another, and to the environmental qualities, open spaces and topography of the property.
- 3) The project demonstrates a harmonious relationship with existing and proposed adjoining developments, avoiding excessive variety and monotonous repetition, but allowing similarity of style, if warranted.
- 4) There is harmony of material, color, and composition of all sides of a structure or buildings.
- 5) A limited number of materials will be on the exterior face of the building or structure.
- 6) There is consistency and unity of composition and treatment of exterior elevation.
- 7) Mechanical and electrical equipment is well integrated in the total design concept and screened from public view to the maximum extent practicable.
- 8) All visible onsite utility services are appropriate in size and location.
- 9) The grading will be appropriate to the site.
- 10) Adequate landscaping is provided in proportion to the project and the site with due regard to the preservation of specimen and landmark trees, and existing native vegetation.
- 11) The selection of plant materials is appropriate to the project and its environment, and adequate provision will be made for the long-term maintenance of such plant materials.
- 12) The project will preserve and protect, to the maximum extent practicable, any mature, specimen or skyline tree, or appropriately mitigate the loss.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 15 of 18

- 13) The development will not adversely affect significant public scenic views.
- 14) Signs, including their lighting, are well designed and are appropriate in size and location.
- 15) All exterior site, structure and building lighting is well-designed and appropriate in size and location.
- 16) The proposed development is consistent with any additional design standards as expressly adopted by the City Council.
- 17) The development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.
- 18) The public health, safety and welfare will be protected.
- 19) The project architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access.
- 20) The project will provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way.

Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

Conceptual Review

Conceptual review is a required step that allows the applicant and the DRB to participate in an informal discussion about the proposed project. Applicants are encouraged to initiate this review as early in the design process as possible. This level of review is intended to provide the applicant with good direction early in the process to avoid spending unnecessary time and money by developing a design concept that may be inconsistent with the City's architectural guidelines and development standards. When a project is scheduled for conceptual review, the DRB may grant preliminary approval if the required information is provided, the design and details are acceptable and the project is properly noticed for such dual approval.

Information required for conceptual review includes:

- a. Photographs which show the site from 3 to 5 vantage points or a panorama from the site and of the site as seen from the street, and photographs of the surrounding neighborhood showing the relationship of the site to such adjacent properties. Aerial photographs are helpful if available and may be required at later stages.
- b. Site plan showing vicinity map, topography, location of existing and proposed structures and driveways, and locations of all structures adjacent to the proposed structure. The site plan shall also indicate any proposed grading, an estimate of the amount of such grading, and any existing vegetation to be removed or retained.
- c. Site statistics including all proposed structures, square footage by use, and the number of covered and uncovered parking spaces.
- d. Schematics of the proposed project shall include rough floor plans and at least two elevations indicating the height of proposed structures. Perspective sketches of the project may also be required. Proposed materials and colors shall be indicated. (Schematics and sketches may be rough as long as they are to scale and describe the proposed development accurately and sufficiently well to allow review and discussion.)

Preliminary Review

Preliminary review involves the substantive analysis of a project's compliance with all applicable City architectural guidelines and development standards. Fundamental design issues such as precise size of all built elements, site plan, elevations and landscaping are resolved at this stage of review. The DRB will identify to the applicant those aspects of the project that are not in compliance with applicable architectural guidelines and development standards and the findings that the DRB is required to make.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 16 of 18

Preliminary approval of the project's design is the point in the process at which an appeal of DRB's decision can be made. Preliminary approval of the project's design is deemed a basis to proceed with working drawings, following the close of the appeal period and absent the filing of an appeal.

Information required for preliminary review, in addition to the information required for conceptual review, includes:

- a. Complete site plan showing all existing structures, proposed improvements, proposed grading, including cut and fill calculations, lot coverage statistics (i.e., building, paving, usable open space and landscape areas), vicinity map, and topography.
- b. Floor plans and roof plans (1/8" scale minimum).
- c. All elevations (1/8" scale minimum) with heights, materials and colors specified.
- d. Preliminary landscape plan, when required, showing existing and proposed trees and shrubs, including any existing vegetation to be removed. This landscape plan shall also include all retaining and freestanding walls, fences, gates and gateposts and proposed paving and should specify proposed materials and colors of all these items.
- e. Site section for projects on slopes of 20 percent or greater, and when required by the DRB.

Final Review

Final review confirms that the working drawings are in conformance with the project that received preliminary approval. In addition to reviewing site plan and elevations for conformance, building details and the landscape plan will be reviewed for acceptability.

Final review is conducted by the Planning and Environmental Services staff, in consultation with the DRB Chair or the Chair's designees. In the event that final plans are not in substantial conformance with the approved preliminary plans, the DRB Chair and Planning staff shall refer the matter to the full DRB for a final determination.

Information required for final review, in addition to the previous review requirements, includes:

- a. Complete set of architectural details, which must include window, eave & rake, chimney, railing and other pertinent architectural details, including building sections with finished floor, plate, and ridge heights indicated.
- b. 8 1/2" X 11" materials sample board of materials and colors to be used, as well as an indication of the materials and colors on the drawings. Sheet metal colors (for vents, exposed chimneys, flashing, etc.) shall also be indicated. All this information shall be included on the working drawings.
- c. Final site grading and drainage plan when required, including exact cut and fill calculations.
- d. Final landscape drawings, when required, showing the dripline of all trees and shrubs, and all wall, fence, and gate details. The drawings must show the size, name and location of plantings that will be visible from the street frontage, landscape screening which will integrate with the surrounding neighborhood, and irrigation for landscaping. Landscape drawings shall include a planting plan specifying layout of all plant materials, sizes, quantities and botanical and common names; and a final irrigation plan depicting layout and sizes of all equipment and components of a complete irrigation system (automated system required on commercial and multiple-residential developments). Planting and irrigation plans shall depict all site utilities, both above and below grade.

Revised Final

Revised final review occurs when a substantial revision (e.g., grading, orientation, materials, height) to a project is proposed after final DRB approval has been granted. Plans submitted shall include all

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 17 of 18

information on drawings that reflect the proposed revisions. If the revisions are not clearly delineated, they cannot be construed as approved.

Multiple Levels of Approval at a Single Meeting

Planning staff may accept and process signs for two or more levels of DRB review (e.g., conceptual and preliminary) at a single meeting provided all required information is submitted and the project is properly noticed and agendized for such multiple levels of approval.

Presentation of Projects (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.3)

All levels of review with the exception of the consent agenda require the presentation of the project by the applicant or the applicant's representative. Items on the regular agenda that do not have a representative will be continued to a later hearing or removed from the agenda. The applicant or representative will be responsible for rescheduling the project if the project is removed from the agenda.

Public Testimony (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.4)

Members of the public attending a DRB meeting are encouraged to present testimony on agenda items. At the appropriate time, the DRB Chair will ask for public testimony, and will recognize those persons desiring to speak. A copy of any written statements read by a member of the public shall be given to the DRB Secretary. All speakers should provide all pertinent facts within their knowledge, including the reasons for their position. Testimony should relate to the design issues of the project and the findings upon which the DRB must base its decision. An interested party who cannot appear at a hearing may write a letter to the DRB indicating their support of or opposition to the project, including their reasoning and concerns. The letter will be included as a part of the public record.

Continuances, Postponements, and Absences (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.5)

A continuance is the carrying forward of an item to a future meeting. The applicant may request continuance of a project to a specified date if additional time is required to respond to comments or if they will be unable to attend the meeting. This is done either during the DRB meeting or by calling the DRB Secretary prior to the scheduled meeting so that the request may be discussed as part of the agenda status report at the beginning of the meeting.

Appeals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.8)

Sign Appeal Periods

The **Final** or **Revised Final** approval or **denial** of a sign project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person withstanding may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. An appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within the ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed or closed early (such as on Fridays which close at 1:00 p.m.), the appeal period is extended until 5:30 p.m. on the following business day. Planning and Environmental Services will notify the DRB as to the scheduled date of the appeal hearing. The DRB will designate a member to attend an appeal hearing.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 23, 2010

Page 18 of 18

All Other Appeal Periods

The **Preliminary** or **Revised Final** approval or **denial** of a non-sign project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person withstanding may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. An appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within the ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed or closed early (such as on Fridays which close at 1:00 p.m.), the appeal period is extended until 5:30 p.m. on the following business day. Planning and Environmental Services will notify the DRB as to the scheduled date of the appeal hearing. The DRB will designate a member to attend an appeal hearing.