APPENDIX A
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-075-DRB
6300 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-050-020)
This is a request for Conceptual review. This is a request for Conceptual review of a 140-room extended stay hotel on a vacant portion of a parcel located at 6300 Hollister Avenue, between La Patera Lane and Robin Hill Road. The project site occupies the westerly 3.81 acres of a larger 10.95-acre parcel that contains an existing research-manufacturing facility, known as the Hollister Center. The 3.81 acres would be split to create the separate parcel for the hotel development. Reciprocal access and parking with the Hollister Center would be provided. The property is presently zoned M-RP (Industrial Research Park).

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

A total of 132 surface parking spaces are provided around the building perimeter, with 27 additional spaces that would be provided through a reciprocal parking agreement with the Hollister Center.

The proposed architecture is characterized as contemporary Mediterranean with emphasis on smooth stucco finish, accent awnings, wood trellis, cornice moldings 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. (Natasha Campbell)
Site visits: Made by Members Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, Smith, and Wignot.
Ex-parte conversations: None.


Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, presented the staff report and background regarding the proposed project. She stated that the proposed project should be reviewed by the DRB as a new project application, and that the applicant will present minor changes that have been made since the previous project was last reviewed by the DRB. She also stated that Ron Stevens, Interacta, Inc., will present video simulations and drive-by animation of the proposed project that he prepared as part of the Environmental Impact Report process. The specific views chosen by staff for the visual simulations identify a required reasonable worst case assessment to evaluate the project's visual impacts that relate to loss of mountain views from Hollister Avenue.

Ron Stevens, Interacta, Inc., presented photo simulations and video drive-by animations entitled, "Marriott Residence Inn Photo Simulations & Drive-By Animation, Interacta, Inc., Ron Stevens, 22 Oct. 2009". Ron Stevens stated that the intent of the simulations was to look at the potential visual impacts that the proposed project might have on the Santa Ynez Mountains from Hollister Avenue.

The plans were presented by Tony Wrozek, with R. D. Olson Development, applicant, and Gene Fong, project architect. Tony Wrozek summarized the following two revisions that have occurred since the prior presentation to the DRB, stating that there were also a few other more minor changes: 1) The public sidewalk along Hollister Avenue would be moved within the Goleta city limits; and 2) The front lobby will be mirrored so that the major terrace area outside of the meeting rooms would be contiguous with the enclosed front landscaped area.

Patty Miller explained the status of the former and current project proposals.

Speakers:
Gary Earle, Santa Barbara, submitted three cut and paste panoramic photos of the site with the former story poles for a perspective on the size of the building. He believes that the size, bulk and scale of the proposed project should be reduced to better conform to the provisions in the City’s General Plan. He stated that the proposed project should be two-stories, rather than three-stories, in order to preserve the scenic corridors and to be in spatial harmony with the other buildings in the surrounding area. He said that there is no other project within a significant radius that matches the proposed project in size, bulk and scale. He commented that higher density and bigger size means more profit for the developer, and expressed concern that citizens who reside in this area will have to live with the consequences of decisions made in conflict with desires expressed in the General Plan. He thinks the DRB made a mistake last time and that the project is not conforming with the General Plan.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, agreed with the comments made by speaker Gary Earle. She stated that the proposed project needs to be reviewed as a new project. She believes that the proposed project appears to be both bigger and taller. She commented that when viewing the simulations from the east, the building appears prison-like with flat walls and a fence, and it also appears prison-like when coming from the west, with the block walls on the block-shaped building. She stated that the trees will cover up some of the building, but when looking at the building from behind the trees, it is still a poorly designed building that is far inferior to what was here before.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, expressed concern that the proposed project with three-stories is out of scale and needs to be reconsidered. He noted that the trees will act like a picket fence that you can see through to the building and that the building should be two stories.

Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager, clarified that during the Track 2.5 General Plan Amendment process, the Floor Area Ratios (FARs) were removed and certain other standards became recommended standards. However, the 0.50 FAR recommended standard for hotel uses is currently within the Hotel Overlay District in the Zoning Ordinance. She stated that the current version of the good cause finding applies to the proposed project. She also stated that staff believes that the results of the photo simulations are highly reliable and cover the visual aspects in combination with the prior story poles.

After the DRB comments were made, Tony Wrozek, representing R.D. Olson Development, stated that the applicant will step back to explore all
of the options available, and meet with the Planning staff to discuss aspects with regard to the good cause finding and the DRB comments.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The photo simulations and drive-by animations are very helpful – a picture is worth a thousand words; b) Upon review of the current Conceptual plans and design, there are a number of DRB Findings for approval that he would not be able to make because of concerns regarding neighborhood compatibility; size, bulk and scale; harmonious relationship with adjoining developments; impacts to the viewshed of significant public scenic views; and sufficient parking; c) The parking that is available onsite is not adequate; and d) The size, bulk and scale needs to be reduced.

2. Member Branch commented: a) Agreed with comments from Member Wignot; b) The photo simulations make it clear that the proposed project is too big; c) The current configuration is bigger than he would support; d) There should be a lower frontage at the street elevation; e) The possibility of three-stories at the rear of the project might work; f) The difference between the proposed architectural style and the adjoining styles in the neighborhood is okay; g) The mass, bulk and scale make the project look too big and like it is something that should be located in Los Angeles; and h) He noted that the photo simulations, and the story poles that were viewed previously, provided a clearer understanding.

3. Member Schneider commented: a) The visual simulations help provide a clear understanding; b) It would be difficult to make the good cause finding that the proposed project will provide a significant community benefit, keeping in mind the request for a 20 percent increase in the FAR, the shared parking concept, and the proposed mass, bulk and scale; c) A two-story building would be the easiest solution; d) Although the building is set back far from Hollister Avenue, the third floor is overpowering, particularly because of the flatness of the three-story façade; e) He believes that removing the third floor on the front wing of the hotel needs to be considered in a direction between removing it and doing a two-story solution; f) The photo simulation showed monotone colors on the building, however the color breaks would be an improvement, noting that color breaks were discussed previously; g) When viewing the simulations while moving down the road where there are low-scale buildings, it is apparent that the proposed hotel, which is twice as high or more, feels out of character; and h) In his opinion, the proposed style of the building should be more contemporary to tie in stylistically into the buildings around the proposed project.
4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) This was a struggle before, but the DRB tried to make it better; b) With the visual simulations, the proposed project as presented appears to be out of character with its surroundings with regard to size, bulk and scale; c) There are four or five DRB Findings of approval that she would not be able to make; d) Reducing the proposed project from three-stories to two-stories would help the project fit in with the neighborhood; e) Her biggest concern is making the good cause finding when considering the issues of the impact to community character, the aesthetics, and the preservation of public views; f) The viewshed is very important and defines the character of the community, however, the proposed project detracts from the viewshed; g) Requested staff explore the difference in language between the current good cause finding requirements and the good cause finding in effect when the previous proposed project was reviewed by the DRB: and h) She noted that story poles were not available when the previous project was reviewed by the DRB.

5. Member Messner commented: a) Agreed with comments made by Member Wignot and Member Schneider; b) The proposed project is too big; and c) He noted that he believes a monument sign would be more appropriate at the street level rather than the sample signage shown on the proposed plans that appear as a billboard.

6. Member Herrera commented: a) Agreed with comments made by the DRB members; b) The proposed project looks out of place and too big for the site on Hollister Avenue; and c) If the project were two stories it would be better.

7. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with the DRB comments; b) His biggest concern is that the massing that is closest to the street obliterates the sweep of the mountain range which is something he believes needs to be preserved and which he has said needs to be preserved on other projects; and c) He does not have a concern that the architectural style is different than the styles in the neighborhood, noting there is a Moorish, Spanish Colonial style in the neighborhood.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to take off calendar with comments Item M-3, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue,
D. REVIEW OF AGENDA: A brief review of the agenda for requests for continuance.

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

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Branch), to continue Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, to February 9, 2010, per the applicant's request; and to take off calendar Item M-4, DRB Permit No. 09-106-DRB, 6878 Hollister Avenue/6868 Cortona Drive, per the applicant's request.

CHANGE ORDER OF AGENDA:

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

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

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

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

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. MARRIOTT RESIDENCE INN AD HOC COMMITTEE FORMATION

There being no objections, Chair Smith appointed Members Branch, Schneider, and Wignot, to serve on the Marriott Residence Inn Ad Hoc Committee, and Member Brown to serve as an alternate.
M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-075-DRB
6300 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-050-020)
This is a request for Conceptual review. This is a request for Conceptual review of a 140-room extended stay hotel on a vacant portion of a parcel located at 6300 Hollister Avenue, between La Patera Lane and Robin Hill Road. The project site occupies the westerly 3.81 acres of a larger 10.95-acre parcel that contains an existing research-manufacturing facility, known as the Hollister Center. The 3.81 acres would be split to create the separate parcel for the hotel development. Reciprocal access and parking with the Hollister Center would be provided. The property is presently zoned M-RP (Industrial Research Park).

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

A total of 132 surface parking spaces are provided around the building perimeter, with 27 additional spaces that would be provided through a reciprocal parking agreement with the Hollister Center.

The proposed architecture is characterized as contemporary Mediterranean with emphasis on smooth stucco finish, accent awnings, wood trellis, cornice mouldings and concrete roof tile. Proposed uses include a pool, fitness center, library, guest laundry, and approximately 1,875 square feet of meeting space. The proposed hotel is intended to accommodate extended stay guests and would have full kitchens in each room. The project does not include a restaurant, but it is proposed to have a small ground floor kitchen to provide complimentary breakfast and a manager's reception in the evening.

Trees would be placed along frontages, entry ways, parking areas, and elsewhere throughout the property. The plan also includes shrubs, groundcovers, vines, and biofiltration plants.

Utilities along the property's Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road frontage would be placed underground. An existing lift station located along Hollister Avenue is planned to be relocated eastward on Hollister Avenue by the GSD prior to construction of the hotel. Water service
would be provided by the Goleta Water District. (Continued from 1-26-10, 12-8-09) (Natasha Campbell)


The plans were presented by Tony Wrzosek, with R. D. Olson Development, applicant; Randolph Itaya, project architect, Gene Fong Associates; and Steve Fedde, property owner.

Tony Wrzosek, applicant, stated that in response to the previous DRB review, the following three changes were made which are shown in Option D: 1) The third floor westerly room was relocated to the east side of the entrance so the stair mass can be tucked back to open up more of the view corridors towards the mountains; 2) The stairway near the southwest corner has been relocated behind the three-story entrance, thus clearing some more views of the ridgeline beyond; and 3) Santa Barbara sandstone will be implemented in lieu of the stacked stone material that was previously proposed. He presented a supplementary set of plans that show minor improvements to the proposed massing of Option D, and incorporates a roof on the one-story elements. He also presented an exhibit showing a hypothetical building that meets the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. This building would be 35 feet in height at the front setback to provide an example of the impact of views per the exhibit in comparison to the proposed project. He noted that the applicant considered a comment at the previous meeting with regard to Santa Barbara sandstone and believes that the sandstone material would be more compatible with the environment.

Randolph Itaya, project architect, identified and discussed the specific changes and revisions, and responded to questions from the DRB members. He clarified that no solar study has been done to determine what the three-story structure does to the terrace garden/pool area.

Tony Wrzosek, applicant, stated that there was some discussion at the last DRB meeting that a Marriott Residence Inn product with 114 rooms would meet the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR of 0.50, and fit on the specific site in a two-story plus three-story building, but it would not be financially feasible.
Steve Fedde, property owner, stated that there is an alternative included in the package that would meet the parameters of the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR of 0.50, but it is a Courtyard product which is different than the Residence Inn product. Each of the rooms in an extended stay hotel are larger.

Tony Wrzosek, applicant, clarified that the applicant studied the alternative for a Courtyard product and realized that 169 rooms, in a three-story building, could be accommodated within the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR of 0.50.

Speakers:

Marc Chytilo, attorney, representing Friends of Saspili, commented that the proposed project seems to be overbuilt for a site that is constrained, particularly with regard to the General Plan requirement to protect public views of the mountains and the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR. He believes that the site should be preserved because of the significant cultural, historical, and archaeological constraints on the site. In his view, both the visual and archaeological impacts are Class 1 Impacts. He requested that the applicant be directed to completely redesign the project and that consideration be given to what could be built on the site that does not exceed the FAR, which respects the archaeological and cultural heritage at the site, and also protects the visual characteristics and quality of the Hollister Avenue corridor. He discussed the notion of economic infeasibility with regard to this setting, stating that economic feasibility should be discussed with hard evidence as part of the CEQA EIR process, He also noted, in his opinion, that economics should be considered regarding a parcel as a whole. There is currently one existing parcel that already has development on it. The existing parcel is proposed to be divided. The hotel would be on a portion of the existing larger parcel.

Gary Earle, Santa Barbara, read the DRB members' comments from the minutes of the previous DRB reviews of the proposed project on December 8, 2009, and January 26, 2010. Mr. Earle commented that every DRB member and public speaker said that the proposed project was too big. He noted that there was also significant agreement that the project should be two stories. He also noted that there was unanimous agreement that the size, bulk, and scale of the project was too big. He expressed concern that the applicant has not complied very well with the comments from previous meetings. It is still three stories, the size of the project has been reduced by less than five percent of the original project, and the FAR is still exceeded by 14%. He thinks that little has changed with the project and doesn't understand how the good cause finding could be made. He believes that the project should be redesigned to be
consistent with the community standards and General Plan and the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR of 0.50. He thinks the applicant asked for too much, now is asking for less, but is still asking for more than what they would have gotten, and the proposed project is still too big in size, bulk and scale. He does not believe the applicant's business problems with regard to land costs should be the community's problem. If the land deal hasn't closed, he suggested the applicant go back and renegotiate the difference in land costs or the lease with the owner, or the applicant just paid too much.

Note: After the DRB members completed their comments, Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, clarified the role of the DRB as it relates to the environmental document. He stated that due to the subjective nature of aesthetics, staff will refer heavily to the DRB comments when analyzing Aesthetic Impacts. He stated that the final determinations will be made by the appropriate decision-makers with regard to items that include certification of the final environmental document and mitigations.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The DRB has worked with the applicant to try to reduce the visual impacts and to move the proposed project further back from Hollister Avenue; b) At this point, if the applicant believes that they have taken the revisions as far as they can, it would be beneficial to have the City's consultant update the visual simulations and video drive by simulations to reflect the revised hotel design and how it affects scenic views of the mountains for persons traveling along Hollister Avenue; c) The updated visual simulations will provide an opportunity to compare the current revised project design with the original design to see if there have been some significant changes and it will help the DRB consider whether the proposed project that exceeds the recommended Floor Area Ratio guidelines can be supported; d) The information provided by the updated visual simulations will be an important component with regard to his review of the proposed project; and e) He questioned whether the applicant conducted a solar study regarding how shading from the three-story building may affect the terrace garden pool area.

2. Member Branch commented: a) Some of the changes made by the applicant in response to suggestions by the DRB to address concerns regarding mass, bulk, and scale, have been helpful and are appreciated, which include reduction in the height and massing on the hotel's southeast and southwest corners, and the additional setback on Hollister Avenue; b) The current revised scheme is better, particularly as shown on Sheet A-5.0, with the two-story component on the southwest corner, and it makes a noticeable difference when driving eastbound on Hollister Avenue; c) The southwest corner of
the building is a critical component of the proposed project, and the information provided by the updated visual and drive by video simulations will be very useful; d) There is a lot of building proposed on this site, but at the same time, one aspect of the proposed project is that he has been told there is a community need for this type of product, therefore, he suggests it may be appropriate to consider how significant is that need; he doesn't have the data to know how much it's needed; e) In his opinion, the proposed style of architecture as a whole is too non-descript. It looks like a hotel that you'd see in San Jose. It doesn't look right for Goleta, although the solution and details can be worked out later.

3. Vice Chair Brown commented:  a) The changes that have been made by the applicant to try and meet the City's standards are appreciated, but she still has issues; b) The applicant's constraints are economic, ours are the General Plan; c) The main issues of her concern are still being able to make the findings regarding the project being compatible with the neighborhood, the size bulk and scale of the proposed project, and how the project fits in with this viewscape on Hollister Avenue; d) She believes that the proposed project is very big and expressed concern that issues regarding size, bulk and scale, and neighborhood compatibility, may continue unless the project does not exceed the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR in the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance; e) She expressed concern regarding the possibility that the community standards that were set by the General Plan process may be compromised; f) At this time, she recommends that the updated visual and drive by simulations be prepared by the City's consultant which will provide a better understanding of how the project will fit into the viewscape and streetscape; and g) Although the review today is not focused on the architectural style, she noted that the proposed style is a kind of anomaly and does not fit.

4. Member Herrera commented:  a) He thanked the applicant for the efforts to comply with community standards; and b) He believes a hotel is very much needed in Goleta, but the proposed project is still too high on the south elevation and too large for the site.

5. Chair Smith commented:  a) Wanted to know more about the hotel room numbers discussed in Trey Pinner's letter as well as related land costs and land improvement costs; b) Agreed with the DRB members' comments; c) The proposed project still feels too big, although the applicant has been working with the DRB and the Ad Hoc Committee; d) He noted that the community has worked hard with regard to setting standards in the General Plan; and e) The updated visual and drive by simulations should provide for a good understanding with regard to the proposed project at this point.
MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Schneider) to continue Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, to February 23, 2010; and direct staff to work with the applicant to determine if the applicant will decide to respond to DRB comments with further revisions to the proposed project, or provide staff with information that is needed for the City's consultant to prepare updated visual simulations and video drive by showing how the project redesign affects the scenic views of the mountains for vehicles, cyclists or pedestrians traveling along Hollister Avenue, as well as the perceived massing and height of the proposed structure.

Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, clarified that the City's consultant will do his best to provide updated visual simulations and video drive by for the DRB meeting on February 23, 2010, subject to receipt of the necessary criteria from the applicant.
D. REVIEW OF AGENDA: A brief review of the agenda for requests for continuance.

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

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

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

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 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 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 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-by 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 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, per their respective Street Tree list; 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 heat 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.
A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Vice Chair Brown at 3:04 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

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

Board Members absent: Thomas Smith, Chair.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Patricia Miller, Current Planning Manager; Alan Hanson, Senior Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Assistant Planner; Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.
B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES


MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for March 9, 2010, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the Subcommittee met today and that Bill Millar, City Arborist, reported on the status of the Urban Forest Management Plan. Subcommittee Member Wignot stated that currently staff is waiting to receive a draft of the Urban Forest Management Plan that will include the guiding principles which is being prepared by Goleta Valley Beautiful. The next Subcommittee meeting will be on April 27, 2010, at 2:00 p.m.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported: 1) On March 17, 2010, another Stormwater Management Plan stakeholders meeting was held. Interested persons may contact him or the City’s Environmental Services Coordinator. 2) On March 22, 2010, the Planning Commission public hearing agenda item regarding the T-Mobile monopine project was continued to April 12, 2010. 3) 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 April 13, 2010. 4) On April 6, 2010, the City Council is scheduled to interview the applicants for the vacant position on the DRB. 5) On April 6, 2010, the City Council is scheduled to take action regarding the Citrus Village Project.

B-4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

There being no objections, the Election of Officers was continued to the next DRB meeting on April 13, 2010.

B-5. APPOINTMENT TO SUBCOMMITTEES

There being no objections, the Appointment to Subcommittees was continued to the next DRB meeting on April 13, 2010.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No speakers.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
D. REVIEW OF AGENDA: A brief review of the agenda for requests for continuance.

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, reported that the applicant for Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, requested a continuance to April 13, 2010; the applicant for Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 5632 Cielo Avenue (formerly known as 811 Cambridge Drive), requested a continuance to April 13, 2010; and the applicant for Item L-4, DRB Permit No. 10-027-DRB, 7716, 7717, 7726 & 7727 Kestrel Lane, requested that the item be taken off agenda. He stated that staff recommends for agenda management purposes that Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 10-031-DRB, 7414 Hollister Avenue, be moved ahead of Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to continue Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, to April 13, 2010, per the applicant’s request; to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 5632 Cielo Avenue (formerly known as 811 Cambridge Drive), to April 13, 2010, per the applicant’s request; and to take off calendar Item L-4, DRB Permit No. 10-027-DRB, 7716, 7717, 7726 & 7727 Kestrel Lane, per the applicant’s request.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Chair Branch reported that today he reviewed Item F-2, DRB Permit No. 09-159, DRB, 6560 Camino Caseta; and Item F-3, DRB Permit No. 10-015-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, 98-110 Hollister Avenue.

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)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to continue Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, to April 13, 2010, per the applicant’s request.

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.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
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)

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on March 23, 2010:

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Chair Branch reported that today he reviewed Item F-2, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, 6560 Camino Caseta, and that the Final Approval was granted as submitted.

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)

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Action on March 23, 2010:

Consent Calendar Subcommittee Chair Branch reported that today he reviewed Item F-3, DRB Permit No. 10-015-DRB, 98-110 South Kellogg Avenue, and that the Final Approval was granted as submitted.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Schneider reported that the Sign Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 01-021-DRB, 5444 Hollister Avenue; and Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 10-032-DRB, 6550 Hollister Avenue.

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-acres 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

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
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 Slaught 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)

Sign Subcommittee Action on March 23, 2010:

The plans were presented by Mario Coronado and Jim Slaught, agent, on behalf of Saint Raphael Church and the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, property owner. Jim Slaught brought in the finished sign which was donated anonymously to the school. He stated that the entire graphic design on the sign is the logo for the school. He indicated that the applicant will add groundcover or low shrub landscaping around the base of the sign in the future.

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) When a sign is reviewed, typically the proposed landscaping plans are included; and b) The sign design is fine.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed sign is acceptable; and b) Initially, he would have suggested changing the orientation of the graphic to shrink the height of the sign; however, the applicant has indicated the design is the logo for the school.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 10-021-DRB, 5444 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) Groundcovers or low shrub landscaping shall be installed around the base of the sign at a later date; and to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 10-021-DRB, to April 27, 2010, for Final review.

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)

The plans were presented by Derrik Eichelberger of Arcadia Studio, agent, on behalf of Park One LLC, property owner. In response to the DRB comments at today’s review requesting that the applicant restudy lighting, Derrik Eichelberger requested that the proposed design of the signs be approved conceptually without the lighting. He stated that the applicant will restudy the lighting and then make a determination with regard to lighting.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
Comments:

1. Member Brown commented:  a) Expressed concern that the proposed lighting fixtures are up-lights because it is difficult sometimes to control the light trespass; and b) The applicant is requested to restudy the lighting plan and consider some other type of lighting to address the concern regarding light trespass.

2. Member Schneider commented:  a) The proposed designs for the two signs are acceptable but without the proposed lighting; b) Halo-lit lighting would be very nice rather than the proposed lighting; and c) The applicant is requested to present a proposed resolution with regard to the lighting at the next review.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:  Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to support approval of the designs for the proposed two signs at Conceptual review, without the proposed lighting; and to continue Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 10-032-DRB, 6550 Hollister Avenue, to April 13, 2010, with comments.

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. (Continued from 3-9-10) (Shine Ling)

The plans were presented by Derrik Eichelberger of Arcadia Studio, landscape architect, on behalf of Alan Grosbard of Park One LLC, property owner. He stated that the proposed revisions include an updated revised landscaping plan as well as some site improvements that are shown on the plans.

MOTION:  Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to grant Revised Final Approval of Item I-1, DRB Permit No. 10-017-DRB RV, 6550 Hollister Avenue, as submitted.

J. FINAL CALENDAR

• NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

• NONE

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-189-DRB
5632 Cielo Avenue (formerly known as 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)

Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner, announced that the address for Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, has been changed from 811 Cambridge Drive to the new address which is 5632 Cielo Avenue.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 5632 Cielo Avenue (formerly known as 811 Cambridge Drive), to April 13, 2010, per the applicant’s request.

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)

Site visits: Made by Members Branch, Brown, Messner, Schneider, and Wignot.
Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by agent Ben Woodall and Stanley Jagoda, property owner. Stanley Jagoda clarified that one existing exterior light fixture which projects the light downward is located outside of the French doors in the corner in the patio. He stated that there is also another existing exterior light.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
Brian Hiefield, Assistant Planner, clarified that the proposed project would not impact the landscape area requirements in the Final Development Plan because the project is located on a condominium lot within the development.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide details regarding the plans for exterior lighting; and b) Suggested the applicant consider reusing the existing exterior light fixture that projects the light downward.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Requested that the applicant restudy the exterior lighting requirements for the proposed project.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) Questioned whether the proposed project would reduce the original landscape area that was required when the Final Development Plan was originally approved.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-013-DRB, 5660 Pembroke Court, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The applicant shall restudy the exterior lighting and present the details at Final review for clarification; and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-013-DRB, to April 13, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

RECESS HELD FROM 3:30 P.M. TO 3:35 P.M.

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)

Site visits: Made by Members Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, and Wignot.
Ex-partite conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Mark Kellogg, project architect, with Poliquin Kellogg Design Group, on behalf of Hollister Business Park Ltd., property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. He stated that the purpose of the project is to add a few new exterior windows to the existing building as well as the creation of a yard to house a generator for the use by the tenant. He noted that there is an existing wall sconce on the wall by the roll-up door which may be changed to a lighting fixture that would look similar...
to the newer wall packs that have been installed on the site. He clarified that the applicant is not proposing to add any additional lighting. He noted that the tenant has done a good job with regard to providing signage on the site, which is a work in progress. He stated that the tenant will continue to add appropriate signage.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) Although it may not be within the purview of the DRB, he noted from his experience that the exhaust stack that is usually associated with this type of product is typically a problem if it is not extended higher up because of the potential for fumes in the immediate area, which is something the applicant may want to consider; and b) On his site visit, he noticed that some of the buildings on the site were not as well marked as others with regard to signage that shows the street address and other identification.

MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 10-022-DRB, 7404 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The applicant shall present the cut sheets for the proposed lighting fixture and clarify whether the existing lighting fixture will be reused or replaced; and to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 10-022-DRB, to April 13, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

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)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to take off calendar Item L-4, DRB Permit No. 10-027-DRB, 7716, 7717, 7726 & 7727 Kestrel Lane, per the applicant's request.

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

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
high mono-pine with a total of six panel antennae, two wall-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)

Site visits: Made by Members Branch, Herrera, Messner, and Wignot. Members Brown and Schneider have previously visited the site.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Nick Gonzales, agent, Norcal Consulting for Clearwire US LLC and Sprint Now. He clarified that some branches will be removed from the existing monopine where the new antennas will be added. He noted that these branches could be relocated and additional branches can be added, if requested by the DRB. He stated that a mesh coating material will be placed over the new antennas which can be fitted with additional branches to help further conceal the antennas. He noted that the industry is constantly updating the materials and that there are ways to paint the antennas that don’t interfere with signal reception and transmission. He presented photographs of the existing monopine.

In response to the comment from Member Wignot expressing concern that graffiti was observed on the low wall at the project site which detracts from the streetscape, Senior Planner Alan Hanson stated that staff will notify the City’s Enforcement Officer and request that the DRB Members be kept informed.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) When he visited the site today, he drove further up north on Ellwood Station Road and parked near the Vulcan cement factory. He looked southwesterly towards the existing monopine and first noticed three power poles, which were more visible, before observing the monopine in the distance. Since the applicant is proposing to co-locate on the existing monopine which is pretty much concealed, he does not have concerns regarding the proposed project; and b) On his site visit, he observed that the low wall that separates the sidewalk from the parking lot on the site is heavily tagged with graffiti which detracts visually from the streetscape. He questioned staff regarding how to address the responsibility with regard to graffiti clean-up. He also observed an employee of the Vulcan factory who was painting out graffiti on a fence located on the Vulcan property.

2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The new antennas will be placed on the existing monopine in an area where the branches are somewhat sparse, therefore, it would be good to relocate and add branches to increase the foliage in that area in a manner similar to the top of the monopine which is denser where there are existing antennae; b) The proposed colors should match or blend in with the existing colors; and c) The applicant is requested to present more detailed plans at the next review, including materials and colors, and visual simulations showing a mock-up.

3. Member Schneider commented: a) The branches that are removed to add the new antennas should be replaced and some new branches should be added, similar to the top of the existing monopine where there is more branch density.

4. Member Branch commented: a) Relocate and add branches in the co-location area so the branch density at the top of the existing monopine will be continued further down on the monopine.

**MOTION:** Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-5, DRB Permit No. 10-034-DRB, 75 South Ellwood Station Road, with the following conditions: 1) Additional branches shall be added to the existing monopine, down around the co-location area for the new antennas to continue the density of the limbs in a manner similar to the top of the monopine; 2) The colors shall match existing and/or blend in; and 3) The applicant shall present visual simulations showing a mock-up at Final review; and to continue Item L-5, DRB Permit No. 10-034-DRB, to April 13, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

**AGENDA MANAGEMENT:**

There being no objections, Vice Chair Brown moved the review of Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 10-031-DRB, 7414 Hollister Avenue, ahead of Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, for agenda management purposes, per staff recommendation.

**RECESS HELD FROM 4:15 P.M. TO 4:30 P.M.**

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-075-DRB

6300 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-050-020)

**Revised Project Description.** This is a request for *Conceptual* review. This is a request for *Conceptual* review of a 118-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 a separate parcel for the hotel development. In addition a third lot is proposed to be dedicated to the City of Santa Barbara. The property is presently zoned M-RP (Industrial Research Park).

The proposed hotel is approximately 80,989 square feet, with a floor area ratio of .49, and is designed in a U-shape configuration around a pool, framed by three building wings, each with a maximum of three-stories in height. The main entrance is oriented toward Hollister Avenue with access served from both Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. A new landscaped island in Hollister Avenue and a new left turn lane for eastbound vehicles approaching the hotel would be provided. Vehicles exiting the hotel’s Hollister Avenue driveway would be limited to right turns only.

A total of 122 surface parking spaces are provided around the building perimeter.

The proposed architecture is Spanish in style, with wood trellis and balcony features and overhanging tile roofs. Proposed uses include a pool, fitness center, library, guest laundry, and 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)

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

**Ex-parte conversations:** None.

Natasha Campbell, Contract Planner, stated that the Staff Memorandum, dated March 18, 2010, identifies the changes to the project plans since the March 9, 2010, meeting.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
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.

Ron Stevens of Interacta, under contract with the City, presented the revised visual simulations and video drive-by that reflect the current project design. He also presented the visual simulations and video drive-by shown at the December 8, 2009, DRB meeting which was prepared for the previous design as a comparison. He stated that the revised and the previous visual simulations are based on the same site model, and the camera settings and lighting are the same, to provide a direct comparison. The tree locations have been updated to match the current landscape plan on the site model for the revised visual simulations which also reflects the current parking plan.

Robert Olson, R.D. Olson Development, stated that the applicant is pleased with the current project design which is a better looking project. He expressed appreciation for the work with the DRB that has been helpful along the way during the process. He believes that the current project falls well within the zoning guidelines. He commented that the applicant has received general support from people the project team has spoken with who are members of the community.

 Speakers:

Frank Arredondo, representing Chumash, expressed concerns with regard to the “hacienda” style referred to by a DRB comment, and how well the revised project design will fit within the community and neighborhood. From a small survey he conducted from Fairview to Los Carneros, he believes the project will stand out visually. He thinks it will be especially noticeable when looking from the Los Carneros overpass, which he suggested is an aspect to be considered. He noted that he objected earlier to the proposed “Southwestern” style. He suggested the applicant contact the Native American community regarding what style would be appropriate. In his opinion, the Spanish Colonial Revival style hacienda design does not take into the consideration the area where it is located. He believes that the style design needs to be conscious of the setting. Also, he believes the physical design with regard to the architectural style, aesthetics, materials, landscaping, and lighting are very important items to be considered and these items will need to be in harmony within the neighborhood. He pointed out his concern regarding red tiles. Another concern is that the current project design is big and bulky. He believes that all aspects of the DRB review and findings in the DRB Bylaws should be addressed during the review process. He understands that the environmental review process will look at the project in greater detail, including some of the items brought up by the DRB which he believes are considerably significant.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, commented that the current project design is a bit better looking, unquestionably. She thought the previous design resembled a prison. But, she believes the proposed project is still really massive for that site.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
Comments:

1. Member Branch commented:  a) He is very pleased and comfortable with the current project design; and believes the DRB “dodged a bullet” with what was originally approved; and b) He believes the revised project is completely appropriate after viewing the revised photo simulations and video drive-by.

2. Member Schneider commented:  a) Thanked the applicant, Sares-Regis, and everyone involved in the process; b) The revised project design will fit in better, feels more residential, and will be more marketable overall with regard to the type of product; and c) While this has been a tough process at times, the results turned out very well and only some minor details will need to be worked out later in the process.

3. Member Wignot commented:  a) Echoed comments by Members Branch and Schneider, and expressed appreciation for the efforts made by the applicant; b) The revised visual simulations and video drive-by point out how dramatically the project has been improved – “a picture is worth a thousand words”; c) He understands that the number of rooms were reduced by the applicant at some cost, which was a key element that allowed the project to meet the floor area ratio for the Hotel Overlay; and d) The additional setback distance from Hollister Avenue has made a significant difference.

4. Member Messner commented:   a) The revised project design is very nice and a good example of the results when an applicant and the DRB work together; and b) He commented that over the years the DRB gets “hammered” sometimes for doing their job, or for decisions that are made, but this project is a textbook case of how the sparring back and forth comes out with a much better project.

5. Member Herrera commented:  a) He supports the current project design; b) He thanked the applicant for making revisions during the process and reducing the number of rooms which makes a difference.

6. Vice Chair Brown commented:  a) The current design looks more residential, and fits in nicely, more on a human scale, rather than the previous design that looked very institutional; b) The current design looks somewhat like a hacienda, noting that there is a smaller Spanish-style building on La Patera that it somehow fits in with; and c) Expressed appreciation for the applicant’s participation in the process which she believes made a difference.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to take off calendar Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, based on the completion of Conceptual review, with support by the majority of the DRB for the revised photo and video drive-by simulations that reflect the current project design.

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

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.
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)

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

Ex-parte conversations: None.

The plans were presented by Mark Kellogg, project architect, with Poliquin Kellogg Design Group, on behalf of IRE-SB Inc., property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. He stated that the intent is for the eating area to essentially remain outdoors; however, a folding glass partition will be installed for use in the event that protection from the weather is needed for the diners. He clarified that there are currently no plans to add heaters or ceiling fans. He stated that the applicant is considering installing a folding glass partition manufactured by NanaWall which is a good system that will stay in place and function well.

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) Questioned whether the applicant plans to add heaters or ceiling fans; and b) He mentioned tinting the windows to address the possibility that birds would strike the clear glass because, from his experience, this problem has occurred which he now addresses by placing tape on glass windows.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The product being considered by the applicant for the moving partition is a great system.

**MOTION:** Branch moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to continue Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 10-031-DRB, 7414 Hollister Avenue, with positive comments in support of the proposed project as submitted for Conceptual review, to April 13, 2010, for Preliminary review.

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: 5:45 P.M.

Minutes approved on April 13, 2010.