



MINUTES – UNAPPROVED

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Tuesday, November 13, 2018

3:00 P.M.
City Hall – Council Chambers
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B,
Goleta, California

Members of the Design Review Board

Scott Branch (Architect), Chair
Erin Carroll (Landscape Architect)
Karis Clinton (Landscape Professional)
Jennifer Fullerton (At-Large Member)

Bill Shelor (At-Large Member)
Craig Shallenberger (Architect)
Dennis Whelan (Alternate)

Mary Chang, Secretary
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE - < 2:15 P.M. >
Members: Scott Branch, Erin Carroll, Bill Shelor

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Branch at 3:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL OF DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Board Members present: Chair Branch, Member Carroll, *Member Clinton,
**Member Shelor, Member Shallenberger
*Member Clinton entered the meeting at 3:07 p.m.
**Member Shelor exited the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Board Members absent: Member Fullerton, Alternate Whelan

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

November 13, 2018

Page 2 of 11

Staff Present: Mary Chang, Supervising Senior Planner; Kathy Allen, Supervising Senior Planner; Brian Hiefield, Associate Planner; Darryl Mimick, Associate Planner; Joe Pearson II, Associate Planner; Chris Noddings, Assistant Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

PUBLIC FORUM

No speakers.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A.1 Review and approve the Design Review Board Minutes for October 23, 2018

[10-23-2018 DRB Minutes - Unapproved](#)

MOTION: Member Shelor moved, seconded by Chair Branch, to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for October 23, 2018, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Branch, Member Shallenberger, and Member Shelor. Noes: None. Abstain: Member Carroll. Absent: Member Clinton, Member Fullerton, and Member Whelan.

A.2 PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mary Chang, Supervising Senior Planner, reported that the appointments to fill the Vice Chair position and the vacancy on the Sign Subcommittee will be on the next agenda. The Design Review Board meeting of November 27, 2018, is cancelled. The next Design Review Board meeting will be held on December 11, 2018.

A.3 REVIEW OF AGENDA

Mary Chang, Supervising Senior Planner, reported that Items B.5 and B.6 will be heard by the full Design Review Board. Also, Item C.3 will be heard prior to Item C.2 on today's agenda, noting that the applicants for Item C.2 agree.

B. SIGN REVIEW

B.1 7798 Calle Real (APN 079-121-016) Union 76 Monument Sign and Canopy Refacing Case No. 18-129-DRB

[Union 76 Monument Sign and Canopy Refacing - Staff Report](#)

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

November 13, 2018

Page 3 of 11

[Union 76 Monument Sign and Canopy Refacing - Project Plans](#)

Chair Branch reported that today the Sign Subcommittee reviewed Item B.1, Union 76 Monument Sign Canopy Refacing, with Darryl Mimick, Associate Planner, and the applicant; and recommended approval as submitted. Chair Branch noted that a letter was received from Barbara Massey regarding the lighting on the west side of the canopy. Chair Branch reported that he viewed the light and observed it is a soft light and not intrusive.

MOTION: Chair Branch moved, seconded by Member Shelor to grant Design review approval of Item B.1, Union 76 Monument Sign and Canopy Refacing, 7798 Calle Real (APN 079-121-016), Case No. 18-129-DRB, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Branch, Member Carroll, Member Shallenberger, and Member Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Member Clinton, Member Fullerton, and Member Whelan.

B.2 5648 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-082-006) Union 76 Monument Sign and Canopy Refacing Case No. 18-130-DRB

[Union 76 Monument Sign and Canopy Refacing - Staff Report](#)

[Union 76 Monument Sign and Canopy Refacing - Project Plans](#)

[Union 76 Monument Sign and Canopy Refacing - Public Comment](#)

Chair Branch reported that today the Sign Subcommittee reviewed Item B.2, Union 76 Monument Sign Canopy Refacing, with Darryl Mimick, Associate Planner, and agent David Bullen, on behalf of World Oil Marketing Company, property owner; and recommended approval as submitted.

MOTION: Chair Branch moved, seconded by Member Carroll, to grant Design review approval of Item B.2, Union 76 Monument Sign and Canopy Refacing, 5648 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-082-006), Case No. 18-130-DRB, as submitted

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Branch, Member Carroll, Member Shallenberger, and Member Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Member Clinton, Member Fullerton, and Member Whelan.

B.3 Calle Koral & Cortona Drive (APN 073-330-041) Village at Los Carneros Park Useage/Environmental Protection Signs

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

November 13, 2018

Page 4 of 11

Case No. 18-140-DRB

[Village at Los Carneros Park Useage/Environmental Protection Signs - Staff Report](#)

[Village at Los Carneros Park Useage/Environmental Protection Signs - Project Plans](#)

Chair Branch reported that today the Sign Subcommittee reviewed Item B.3, Village at Los Carneros Park Useage/Environmental Protection Signs, with Kathy Allen, Supervising Senior Planner, and agent Kim True with True Nature Landscape Architecture; and recommended approval as submitted.

MOTION: Chair Branch moved, seconded by Member Carroll, to grant Design review approval of Item B.3, Village at Los Carneros Park Useage/Environmental Protection Signs, Calle Koral & Cortona Drive (APN 073-330-041), Case No. 18-140-DRB, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Branch, Member Carroll, Member Shallanberger, and Member Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Member Clinton, Member Fullerton, and Member Whelan.

B.4 301 Mentor Drive (APN 071-140-079) Freestanding and Wall Signs Case No. 18-147-DRB

[Freestanding and Wall Signs - Staff Report](#)

[Freestanding and Wall Signs - Project Plans](#)

Chair Branch reported that today the Sign Subcommittee reviewed Item B.4, Freestanding and Wall Signs, with Chris Noddings, Assistant Planner, and agent Michael Burch on behalf of Bradley Green of Transwestern, agent for the property owner.

MOTION: Chair Branch moved, seconded by Member Shelor, to grant Design review approval of Item B.4, Freestanding and Wall Signs, 301 Mentor Drive (APN 071-140-079), Case No. 18-147-DRB, with the following Conditions:

1. Lower the height of the sign by 24 inches such that the total height does not exceed 5 feet above street level. Staff shall confirm as liaison with the Design Review Board at Conformance review.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

November 13, 2018

Page 5 of 11

2. Hand dig the footings to minimize impacts to the root systems of the adjacent trees.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Branch, Member Carroll, Member Clinton, Member Shallenberger, and Member Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Member Fullerton and Member Whelan.

B.5 139 N. Fairview Ave. (APN 077-170-042) New Signs for Berkshire Hathaway Case No. 18-138-DRB

[New Signs for Berkshire Hathaway - Staff Report](#)

[New Signs for Berkshire Hathaway - Project Plans](#)

Staff Speaker:
Chris Noddings, Assistant Planner

The plans were presented by agent Jack Woodruff on behalf of Michael Prochels of the property owner, Fairview Shopping Center LLC.

MOTION: Member Shelor moved, seconded by Member Carroll, to grant Design review approval of Item B.5, New Signs for Berkshire Hathaway, 139 N. Fairview Avenue (APN 077-170-042), Case No. 18-138-DRB, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Branch, Member Carroll, Member Clinton, Member Shallenberger, and Member Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Member Fullerton and Member Whelan.

B.6 6861 & 6865 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-100-033, -034, -035) Target Building & Shopping Center Overall Sign Plan Case No. 18-116-DRB

[Target Building & Shopping Center Overall Sign Plan - Staff Report](#)

[Target Building & Shopping Center Overall Sign Plan - Project Plans](#)

Staff Speaker:
Joe Pearson II, Associate Planner

The plans revised in response to Design Review Board comments were presented by agent Andy Neff on behalf of Merlone Geier Partners, property owner; and Michael Wekesser, Target, project design architect.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

November 13, 2018

Page 6 of 11

MOTION: Member Shelor moved, seconded by Member Shallenberger, to grant Design review approval of Item B.6, Target Building & Shopping Center Overall Sign Plan, 6861 & 6865 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-100-033, -034, -035), Case No. 18-116-DRB, as submitted, with the following Conditions:

1. Eliminate the “wine and spirits” sign and move the “CVS pharmacy” sign in the same location with the same proposed dimensions.
2. Update Section 3.3 of the Master Sign Program with the revisions regarding the monument sign as approved.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Branch, Member Carroll, Member Clinton, Member Shallenberger, and Member Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Member Fullerton and Member Whelan.

C. CONCEPTUAL/DESIGN REVIEW

C.1 6221 Momouth Avenue (APN 077-202-007) Lenvik Single Family Residence Addition Case No. 18-131-DRB

[Lenvik Single Family Residence Addition - Staff Report](#)

[Lenvik Single Family Residence Addition - Attachment 1 DRB Findings](#)

[Lenvik Single Family Residence Addition - Attachment 2 Project Plans](#)

[Lenvik Single Family Residence Addition - Attachment 3 Finish Schedule](#)

[Lenvik Single Family Residence Addition - Attachment 4 Site Photos](#)

[Lenvik Single Family Residence Addition - Public Comment](#)

Staff Speaker:
Joe Pearson II, Associate Planner

The plans were presented by agent Dawn Sherry of Sherry & Associates Architects, Inc., on behalf of Peter and Lisa Lenvik, property owners; and Peter Lenvik, property owner.

Member Shelor commented that he will not be able to make the findings of Neighborhood Compatibility based on his concerns that the proposal is out of proportion with the vast majority of the neighborhood and with making an exception to exceeding the Floor Area Ratio (FAR).

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

November 13, 2018

Page 7 of 11

MOTION: Member Shallenberger moved, seconded by Member Carroll to grant Design review approval of Item C.1, Lenvik Single Family Residence Addition, 6221 Momouth Avenue (APN 077-202-007), Case No. 18-131-DRB, as submitted, with the following Conditions; and to determine that Item C.1 is in conformance with the Design Review Board Findings with regard to Neighborhood Compatibility, Quality of Architectural Design, Quality of Landscape Design, and Zoning:

1. Plant a fast-growing tree in the back yard to fill in the gap.
2. The applicant shall submit a landscape plan for Conformance review by staff and the Landscape Architect or Landscape Professional DRB Member.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Branch, Member Carroll, Member Clinton, and Member Shallenberger. Noes: Member Shelor. Absent: Member Fullerton and Member Whelan.

C.3 5955 Calle Real (APN 069-110-018) Calle Real Hotel Project Case No. 16-097-DRB

[Calle Real Hotel Project - Staff Report](#)

[Calle Real Hotel Project - Attachment 1 Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects](#)

[Calle Real Hotel Project - Attachment 2 Project Plans](#)

[Calle Real Hotel Project - Public Comment](#)

Site visits and ex-parte conversations: Site visits reported by Members Carroll, Clinton, Shallenberger, and Shelor. Member Branch reported he is familiar with the site. No ex-parte conversations reported.

Staff Speaker:
Brian Hiefield, Associate Planner

The plans were presented by Troy White of TW Land Planning & Development on behalf of Peninsular Investments Inc., property owner; Bill Cross with Stanton Architecture, project architect; and David Foote with Firma Consultants, project landscape architect.

Public Speakers:

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

November 13, 2018

Page 8 of 11

Fermina Murray expressed opposition to the project and requested the Design Review Board reject the proposal and demand a re-design that significantly reduces the size, bulk, scale, height, massing, and proportion of the building to a two-story project. Ms. Murray commented that she believes that most of the architectural style of the building must be compatible to the modest scale and distinctive styles found in the Calle Real area.

Barbara Massey expressed concerns that the hotel is not compatible with the neighborhood because of size, bulk, scale, and scale, and also because the architecture is too tall, big, and boxy. Ms. Massey spoke in support of a hotel building that is less than 35 feet in height, with two stories and softened lines. She also expressed concern that the driveway appears to be too narrow and the landscaping provides little screening of the parking, especially for the car wash area.

Annette Winter expressed concerns regarding the parking and traffic generated and commented that the three stories seem a bit garish. Ms. Winter questioned the need for more hotels in the area.

Penny Concurous spoke in opposition to the project and requested consideration of the public comments. Ms. Concurous expressed concerns that include parking, traffic, and the number of hotels already in the area.

ACTION: The Design Review Board conducted Conceptual review of Item C.3, Calle Real Hotel Project, 5955 Calle Real (APN 069-110-018), Case No. 16-097-DRB, with the following comments:

Architecture:

1. The massing in general is too large and not compatible with the neighborhood in terms of size, bulk and scale, especially with the design that is monolithic with no varying roof heights. Consider a Mid-Century design for compatibility. A third story element could be supported for example behind the pool to have some increase in height.
2. Having a 2-story building would be better although not against a 3-story building with a style that would make the bulk and scale interesting and the 3-stories not dominating the entire structure. Consider Mid-century architecture that gives clean, thin lines both vertically and horizontally.
3. Possibly the height could be reduced a little lower and still achieve a 3-story building. Study adding more stepping to reduce the impact of the 3-story building.
4. The stepping back from 1-story to 3-story was minimal and needs to be stepping back from 1-story to 2 stories.
5. The calculation that the new building heights are now 29.8 feet is misleading as to what will be seen on the ground.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

November 13, 2018

Page 9 of 11

6. A higher level of architecture is encouraged.
7. More details including parapets and fenestration are needed as well as a cross-section for review.
8. The entrance is interesting.
9. The element with the blue cross seems "hospital-like".
10. Re-explore subterranean parking to minimize the loss of rooms.
11. Explore the possibility of photovoltaics if not required.
12. Consider on-site laundry with the ability to use recycled water for landscape irrigation.
13. An opinion was expressed that the previous proposal was preferred with more clean, sophisticated and timeless architecture, but not necessarily the height of the building.

Landscaping:

14. The setbacks are working and allow for two layers of trees between the adjacent properties and streets.
15. If a new tree will be added, consider visibility to the entrance and signage.
16. Consider a tree species which will stay lower over time rather than the *Washingtonia* species that will grow tall.
17. Submit a planting plan including details for shrubs and groundcovers, as well as trees.
18. Restudy the tree planting spaces with regard to staggering, especially at the driveway entrance.
19. Consider a bigger canopy tree species that would cover and shade more of the parking lot.
20. Add more landscape at the easement.
21. Consider adding a garden for hotel guests as an amenity.
22. The green roof is nice at the entrance.
23. Both permeable pavers and channeling infiltration into planters are encouraged with regard to stormwater management.
24. Submit plans showing stormwater capture as well as daily use of water for plantings and where the water comes from.
25. Consider a landscape buffer for cars along Calle Real.

Site Plan:

26. Consider adding a dog-walk area on the southwest corner by the car wash.
27. A shade study is recommended where the pool is located on the northeast side of the building.
28. Story poles are strongly recommended to be required by the Planning Commission.
29. Explore the large amount of paving on the east side of the project.
30. Submit a lighting plan. The lighting should be kept on site with no spillage. Locating bollards close to turn radiuses may not be best.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

November 13, 2018

Page 10 of 11

C.2 22 S. Fairview (APN 071-021-001 and -044) Development Plan Amendment for Cox Communications Case 18-093-DRB

[Development Plan Amendment for Cox Communications - Staff Report](#)

[Development Plan Amendment for Cox Communications - Project Plans](#)

Site visits and ex-parte conversations: Site visits reported by Members Branch, Clinton, and Shallenberger. Chair Branch reported he viewed the site with Google Street View today. No ex-parte conversations reported.

Staff Speaker:
Chris Noddings, Assistant Planner

The plans were presented by agent Greg Seitz, and Kirsten McLaughlin, Marketing Vice President, on behalf of Cox Communications.

ACTION: The Design Review Board conducted Conceptual review of Item C.2, Development Plan Amendment for Cox Communications, 22 S. Fairview (APN 071-021-001 and -044), Case No. 18-093-DRB, with the following comments:

Architecture:

1. The masonry building architecture is too simple, boxy, and needs some interest. There needs to be some articulation, undulation, or relief in the wall spaces.
2. The building faces a residential area and will be seen from the street. Do something to make the building more attractive to the residents.
3. Possibly make some changes at the top 8 feet of the building, such as playing with the pattern or with different thicknesses or positions of masonry to get shadow lines, or stagger things with the parapet.
4. The building is clearly a utilitarian structure for a specific purpose.
5. The project and design are supportable, commendable, well thought-out and well-executed.
6. A cross-section will be useful for review.

Landscaping:

7. Add a few trees to limit the view of the building and parking from the street and at the back of the property.
8. Add one or two more Sycamore trees in the bioswale.
9. Add 2 trees on the south property to soften the view of the building for the residential area.
10. Consider the applicant's plans to add some screening elements intermittent with the landscape to add interest around the perimeter of the site.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

November 13, 2018

Page 11 of 11

11. Leaving the open fence in front would be acceptable with the addition of vegetation, about 3 to 4 feet high, to screen some of the cars, rather than adding a solid visual block of the parking area.

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

E. ADJOURNMENT: 5:57 P.M.