



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - APPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, May 11, 2010

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Chair's Designee and Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Scott Branch, Carl Schneider, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Simon Herrera, Chris Messner, Bob Wignot

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:

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

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Carl Schneider (Architect)
Thomas Smith (At-Large Member)
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 Brown at 3:00 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Cecilia Brown, Chair; Scott Branch; Chris Messner; and Carl Schneider.

Board Members absent: Simon Herrera, Vice Chair; Thomas Smith and Bob Wignot.

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

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

May 11, 2010

Page 2 of 8

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for April 27, 2010.

There being no objections, Chair Brown continued Item B-1, Design Review Board Minutes, to the end of today's agenda.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the next Subcommittee meeting will be held on May 25, 2010, at 2:00 P.M.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported: 1) On Arbor Day, April 30, 2010, the City planted a 15-gallon Coast Live Oak Tree at Girsh Park adjacent to the soccer fields. 2) On May 12, 2010, an Urban Forest Management Plan stakeholders meeting will be held at City Hall at 6:00 p.m. 3) The DRB meeting for June 22, 2010, may be cancelled.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

D. REVIEW OF AGENDA & PROJECTED AGENDA: A brief review of the agenda for requests for continuance and scheduled projects on the next agenda.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported that the applicant for Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, requested a continuation to June 8, 2010; and the applicant for Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 5632 Cielo Avenue, requested a continuation to May 25, 2010.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith, Wignot) to continue Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, to June 8, 2010, per the applicant's request; and to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 5632 Cielo Avenue, to May 25, 2010, per the applicant's request.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported that there are five new items scheduled for the DRB meeting on May 25, 2010, as well as the continuation of DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 5632 Cielo Avenue. The built vs. approved presentation by staff is also scheduled for the meeting on May 25, 2010.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

May 11, 2010

Page 3 of 8

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No 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 4-13-10*, 3-23-10*, 2-9-10*, 1-12-10*, 12-8-09*, 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith, Wignot) to continue Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, to June 8, 2010, per the applicant's request.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

- NONE

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

5632 Cielo Avenue (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,

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

May 11, 2010

Page 4 of 8

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. This property was formerly addressed 811 Cambridge Drive. Related cases: 09-183-CC, 09-189-LUP. (Continued from 4-27-10*, 4-13-10*, 3-23-10*, 3-9-10, 2-9-10) (Scott Kolwitz)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith, Wignot) to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 5632 Cielo Avenue, to May 25, 2010, per the applicant's request.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-049-DRB

44 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-003)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 46,750-square foot commercial building, a 650-square foot water filtration equipment yard, and a 3,623-square foot rear equipment yard, and a 138-square foot emergency generator/equipment area, on a 3.25-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to replace two liquid nitrogen storage tanks within the rear equipment yard with two larger tanks. The tanks occupy an area of approximately 105 square feet and have a height of 31 feet. The project would be constructed in phases, with one tank to be installed in 2010 and the other in 2011. No changes to parking or landscaping are proposed. The project was filed by Brian Beebe of Anderson Systems, agent, on behalf of Peter Goodell for Castilian Associates, property owner. Related cases: 09-147-LUP. (Shine Ling)

Site visits: Made by Member Schneider. Members Branch, Brown and Messner are familiar with the site.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Brian Beebe of Anderson Systems, agent, on behalf of Peter Goodell for Castilian Associates, property owner. He clarified that the proposed project will replace two existing liquid nitrogen tanks.

Speaker:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, commented that the plans that were submitted are inadequate because they do not provide sufficient information with regard to the project specifications. From his review of the plans, he believes there needs to be clarity with regard to the location of the tanks.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

May 11, 2010

Page 5 of 8

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed liquid nitrogen storage tanks would probably not be seen from Hollister Avenue, and possibly not from Castilian Drive; b) The proposed tanks will be seen from Highway 101 because there is no vegetation on the site and the whole back of the building is exposed; c) The project is located in an area where an industrial use already exists; d) Unfortunately, the existing tanks are painted white which stand out when viewed from Highway 101; and e) The color of the proposed tanks should be toned down to blend in.
2. Chair Brown commented: a) Recommended that the new tanks be painted a gray or tan color; b) The plans need to accurately reflect the proposed plans, including placement of the tanks; and c) It would be nice to have a whole row of trees at the back of the property within the view from Highway 101.
3. Member Branch commented: a) Recommended that the proposed tanks be painted a gray color to help provide a contrast to the sky; and b) The plans need to reflect the existing and the proposed project.
4. Member Messner commented: a) Recommended that the proposed tanks be painted a gray or greenish color.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-049-DRB, 44 Castilian Drive, with the following condition: 1) The applicant shall provide plans that accurately reflect the existing and the proposed plans including the location, scale, height, and colors; and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-049-DRB, to May 25, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

RECESS HELD FROM 3:23 TO 3:30 P.M.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-174-DRB

5484 Overpass Road (APN 071-220-033)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 5,780-square foot shop building, a 1,362-square foot office building, a 18,835-square foot unenclosed materials storage area, a 640-square foot storage unit, and two unused fuel pumps and associated underground fuel tanks on a 84,070-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a wireless communications facility 10 feet from the northern property line in the rear yard. A 70-foot tall monopine would be constructed to support 9 antennae. The service area would occupy 1,000 square feet and would include the monopine structure, associated equipment cabinets, and an emergency generator. The facility would connect to a power/telephone pole adjacent to the lease site. Access to the site is via an existing access road to the construction yard. The project was filed by Jay Higgins of SAC Wireless, agent, on behalf of Verizon Wireless, lessee, and Randy and Susan Douglas, property owners. Related cases: 09-174-CUP. (Continued from 4-27-10) (Shine Ling)

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

May 11, 2010

Page 6 of 8

Additional Site visits: Chair Brown reported that she visited the site.

Ex-parte conversations: Member Schneider stated that after the DRB meeting on April 27, 2010, he had a conversation with Jay Higgins, agent, regarding other possible sites that had been researched.

The plans were presented by Nick Gonzalez and Jay Higgins of SAC Wireless, agent, on behalf of Verizon Wireless, lessee, and Randy and Susan Douglas, property owners. Nick Gonzales presented photo simulations from various viewpoints on Highway 217. He stated that the applicant looked for alternate locations for the monopine on the parcel, and considered another grouping of trees in the general vicinity, but it would interfere with the active construction yard and proposed further development on the property as well. Jay Higgins, agent, stated that the applicant has looked at 13 alternate locations over the last two years but the properties were too far away from the search area, or the property owners were not interested or could not come to an agreement with Verizon.

SPEAKER:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, commented that the proposed monopine design is ugly. He does not know if a bare monopole would be any better, and may be just one percent better. He is not against all cell phone antennas but requests that the design looks reasonable and fits in the neighborhood. He appreciates the direction of the DRB review. He noted that there is an existing monopine that is visible from the end of Cathedral Oaks Road when looking towards the mountain ridge that doesn't look right because it is too symmetrical and the colors are too dark green. One of the problems when trying to get a good conical shape for the monopine is that the lower limbs may extend over adjacent properties, which may be of concern.

Comments:

1. Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed monopine design is not acceptable in this location and it draws attention because it is so poorly designed, particularly in the context because it is a different tree species than the existing trees which include the eucalyptus species; b) She suggested for discussion purposes whether the DRB would consider a monopole rather than a monopine; c) The applicant is requested to provide photo simulations that show the monopine design revised with longer limbs at the bottom and a shape that tapers from the top to the bottom; d) When the DRB Conceptual review is completed, the plans will need to be updated before the project is reviewed by the Planning Commission; and e) Requested that the applicant check the map showing the service areas with regard to whether there will be some overlap.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) Since the last meeting, he has driven around the site many times trying to visualize the proposed project; b) His main concern is that the proposed monopine is so close to Highway 217 that there would be no question when driving by that it is a fake tree; c) Monopine designs can work well if the majority of the public is viewing the monopine from a distance; d) For example, the Schwann property on Kellogg Avenue would be located farther away

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

May 11, 2010

Page 7 of 8

from the public view and a preferred location; e) He thought about considering a bare monopole but expressed concern that it would still have the antenna structure on top; f) The proposed monopine design is better than the monopine on Ellwood Station Road which is very symmetrical and the different layers of limbs can be seen right through from a distance; g) The monopine design needs to have a slight taper from the top to the bottom, and the density is critical; and h) He expressed concern that the plans have not shown the proposed project in the field very accurately.

3. Member Branch commented: a) He would rather not support a monopole design; b) If an alternative location cannot be found, he believes the difference in the colors of the foliage will make the monopine stand out the most; c) The color of the monopine should match the existing eucalyptus trees as much as possible; d) The proposed color of the monopine is stark while the eucalyptus foliage has a blend of brown and red colors; e) The limbs of the tree need to be longer and more substantial at the bottom; f) He noted that it would be desirable for other tree species to be emulated, for example, the eucalyptus canopy is narrow at the bottom while the canopy of a pine tree is the opposite; g) The faux monopine is more noticeable right next to the freeway; and h) Requested that the applicant obtain a sample of the foliage from the existing eucalyptus tree at the proposed site and present it along with a sample of the proposed monopine faux foliage.
4. Member Messner commented: a) It is very important that the placement of a lot of the limbs on the monopine are uneven; and b) The color of the trunk and the leaves need to have some unevenness between the brown and green which he believes will blend in well among the existing trees.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent Herrera, Smith, Wignot) to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-174-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, to May 25, 2010, with comments, and to direct the applicant as follows: 1) Respond to comments with regard to the branch structure, branch placement and branch density; 2) Present new photo simulations showing the view from Highway 217; and 3) Present color samples from the existing foliage on the site and proposed colors for the monopine.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

No requests.

Design Review Board Minutes - Approved

May 11, 2010

Page 8 of 8

ITEM CONTINUED FROM ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA:

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES (CONTINUED FROM ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA)

A. Design Review Board Minutes for April 27, 2010

Chair Brown announced that she was absent from the DRB meeting on April 27, 2010. She noted that there would not be a quorum to approve the minutes from the meeting of April 27, 2010, if she abstained from voting.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith, Wignot) to continue Administrative Agenda Item B-1, Meeting Minutes, Design Review Board Minutes for April 27, 2010, to the next DRB meeting on May 25, 2010.

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Chair Brown commented that she has observed that efforts are not made on the East Coast to hide or screen wireless communications facilities. For example, facilities are placed on a corner with no landscaping, and with as many antennas as possible.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 4:10 P.M.

Minutes approved on May 25, 2010.