



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, August 26, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

**GOLETA CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

Members:

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair	Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)
Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair	Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Scott Branch (Architect)	Carl Schneider (Architect)
Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)	

Notices:

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

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 2 of 15

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for August 12, 2008

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

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

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

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-082-DRB

7526 Calle Real (APN 079-121-005)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 5,300-square foot church on a 74,052-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 177-square foot covered entry and demolish an existing 247-square foot carport roof. The existing mansard roof parapet on the front facade will be replaced with a new sloped roof to tie in with the proposed covered entry. The existing windows will be replaced with new wood windows. A new colored concrete patio is proposed beneath the new covered entry, and minor repairs will be done to existing concrete walkways to improve accessibility. New lighting will consist of three (3) wall sconces along the front facade and two (2) hanging pendant lights beneath the proposed covered entry. There is no new habitable square footage proposed. The project was filed by agent Thomas Hashbarger on behalf of El Camino Presbyterian Church, property owner. Related cases: 68-CP-43; 08-082-LUP. (Continued from 8-12-08, 7-08-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

8-12-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Schneider commented that the project is a very nice addition and a relatively simple project, but there should be construction drawings provided by the applicant that show details for review.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, to grant Final Approval of Item J-1, No. 08-082-DRB, 7526 Calle Real, as submitted.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 3 of 15

AMENDED MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item J-1, No. 08-082-DRB, 7526 Calle Real, to August 26, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar with the following comments: 1) the applicant shall provide construction drawings showing details for Final review on the Consent Calendar; and 2) the applicant shall add a notation to the landscape plans that the existing landscaping will be removed and replaced.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-125-DRB

7020 Calle Real (APN 077-155-003)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 2,984-square foot 24'-6" high produce market currently under construction with an herb garden and associated landscaping on 0.53 acres in the CN zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 26.25-square foot halo light LED wall sign with 14" high pin mounted aluminum green lettering and a yellow background. The 2" deep lettering will be attached to a 4" deep metal box affixed to the produce market's front fascia above the entry. The project was filed by agent Hesh Ghorbanzadeh on behalf of Happy Harry's LLC, the property owner. Related cases: 46-SB-LUP; 08-125-SCC. (Continued from 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

8-12-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. The depth of the box shall not exceed four inches.
2. Member Brown commented that the design is nice and subtle.
3. The Sign Subcommittee recommended that Preliminary Approval be granted as submitted.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-1, No. 08-125-DRB, 7020 Calle Real, as submitted; and continue to August 26, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 4 of 15

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-141-DRB

6325 Lindmar Drive (APN 073-005-021)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 27,927-square foot industrial/manufacturing building, 20,276-square feet of courtyards, loading docks and parking, an as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage/water treatment enclosure/addition, and 23,535-square feet (32%) of landscaping on a 73,616-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a mechanical courtyard in the existing courtyard between buildings A and C, construct two new mechanical roof wells (one on building B and one on building C), permit the aforementioned as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage area on the west side of building A, permit an as-built parking lot on the east side of buildings B and C (which requires the removal of 1,167-square feet of landscaping), alter the loading area on the west side of building A, abandon an existing driveway on the north side of the property, remove equipment from the front yard setback for re-location into the proposed mechanical courtyard, remove an unpermitted parking lot storage area on the southwest side of the property, and re-locate equipment from the side yard (along the south property line) setback. All materials used for this project are to match the existing buildings with the exception of new lighting, which will be Lamps Plus bronze, 9" high outdoor dark sky tube lights. The project was filed by agent Bruce Burke on behalf of James L. Bartlett, property owner. Related cases: 07-141-DP AM01; 07-141-LUP. (Laura Vik)

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-059-DRB

55 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-007)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 37,721-square foot commercial building on an approximately 84,942-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to install a 1,500-gallon liquid nitrogen distribution tank at the southwest corner of the property. The project was filed by agent Dave Jones on behalf of Bermant Development Company, property owner. Related cases: 08-059-SCD, -LUP; 06-065-SCD, -LUP; 91-DPF-014; 79-DP-014. (Brian Hiefield)

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 03-051-DRB

Northeast Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real (APN 077-160-035)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The project site is undeveloped. The applicant proposes a new 8,184-square foot, three-story Islamic Center. The proposed center would include a 3,468-square foot first floor, 3,792-square foot second floor, and 468-square foot third floor, and a 456-square foot mechanical dome. The first floor would include a 635-square foot prayer area, 646-square foot meeting room, 574-square foot restrooms, 433-square foot entry/foyer/vestibule, 192 square feet kitchen and 988-square foot of additional storage and circulation areas. Additionally, a 1,046-square foot entry court, 414 square foot loggia and 1,107 square foot play area would be available for non-

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 5 of 15

habitable exterior use. The second floor would include a 1,431-square foot dining room, 537-square foot lecture room, 303-square foot office, 270-square foot storage area, 393-square foot of circulation, and a 858-square foot residence. The third floor would include the final 468-square foot residence with 456-square foot of additional mechanical areas above.

A total of 42 parking spaces are proposed, although a parking modification to reduce this number to 38 may be required to extend the length of the site's driveway throats.

Frontage improvements, including sidewalk, curb, and gutter would be provided along Calle Real. In addition, two new street lights are proposed: one near the northwest corner of the site and one near the southwest corner of the site.

The parking area and project site would be landscaped, although landscape plans have not yet been submitted. A 6-foot tall plaster wall is proposed along the perimeter of the property, and an 8-foot tall plaster wall is proposed around the entry court and play area. Other minor structures include a mailbox at the Los Carneros Road driveway, bicycle racks, and a trash and recycling enclosure in the parking lot.

The property is zoned C-H (Highway Commercial), and the land use designation in the City's General Plan is Office & Institutional. The project was filed by the Islamic Society of Santa Barbara as the applicant and property owner with Md Wahiduzzaman, Mukhtar Khan and Ken Mineau as owner representatives. Related cases: 03-051-CUP, 03-051-DP. (Last heard on 7-22-08, 6-24-08*, 5-28-08, 4-8-08*, 2-12-08*, 01-23-08*, 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-22-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) the revised plans are an improvement; b) the idea of blending the project with the trees and the preserve is appreciated; c) a small percentage of square footage should be reduced; d) possibly consider consolidating some of the spaces in the building to reduce the size; e) the applicant is requested to provide elevations and show the view of the project when driving up Los Carneros; f) suggested planting grasses in the parking area; and g) conjunctive use parking may be required further in the review process by the decision-makers.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) the building has been reduced and lowered since the original review; b) the applicant needs to provide elevations for review; c) the one-story element and proposed massing seems to be workable and will help soften the project to the Calle Real side; d) the applicant's work with Fermina Murray and Ronald Nye has been positive; e) the proposed forms, including the expression of the octagon to the east, are good; f) the applicant should have the discretion with regard to proposed materials such as board and bat, or plaster; and g) conceptually, the project is moving in as best direction as possible for the site.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 6 of 15

3. Member Branch commented: a) the reduction of the building from a three-story structure to two-stories addressed his initial concern regarding the overall massing of the project; b) the revised site plan with the one-story element to the street, and the building tucked into the trees and away from the kite flight path is the best solution; and c) the parking issue will need to be resolved by staff - for example, there has been public input with regard to the criteria, and the DRB should base its review on staff's recommendation.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) the reduction in height of the building is appreciated; b) the revised site plan seems to work; c) the changes in the style with the gable end at one side, which still incorporate the octagonal shape in the rear; are fine; d) expressed some concern regarding the discrepancies with regard to parking criteria and methodology; and e) the building itself is moving in a good direction but the applicant needs to provide elevations and more details.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) the two-story structure is appreciated rather than the three-story design; b) he appreciates that the building is now moved closer to the trees and suggested selecting a color that would blend in better with the trees and landscaping; and c) recommended a bioswale to filter the water coming from the parking lot before it enters the preserve area.
6. Member Messner commented: a) he has concerns about parking problems with regard to Finding 20; b) he believes that an updated, not outdated, traffic study is needed; c) he also has some concern with regard to Finding 18 because of safety issues that relate to parking and busy traffic; and d) the reduction in height of the building is appreciated.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) agreed with DRB comments in favor of the reduction of the building's size, bulk and scale; b) moving the mass from the southwest corner to the southeast corner is a better position for the building; c) the schoolhouse vernacular style is more compatible with the neighborhood; d) suggested selecting colors that are similar to the existing adjacent commercial building that are more earth-tone and would help the building blend with the neighborhood; e) the location of the trash and recycling receptacles, and utilities, need to be provided by the applicant; f) the traffic study needs to be updated along with review of the parking situation, which is very important; g) if parking is adequate now, it seems like some sort of reciprocal agreement will be needed in the future if the number of members increases; h) suggested consideration with regard to whether the businesses on adjacent properties have parking needs until the end of the day on Fridays; and i) there seems to be a tight situation for motorists to move in and out of the parking spaces at the southwest corner in front of the building.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, to August 26, 2008, with the applicant to provide elevations and respond to comments.

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-102-DRB

Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road (APN 079-210-049)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is a vacant 14.46-acre property in the DR-8 zone district, located in western Goleta on a parcel extending west of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection.

Proposed structural development includes 102 single family residences and townhouses, including 20 affordable units. Individual units would range in size

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 7 of 15

between 566 and 2,872 square feet. The single-family residences would have a maximum height of 24 feet. The townhouses would have a maximum height of 22 feet. The proposed architecture proposed for both detached and attached units is described as a mix of Spanish, Ranch, and Monterey styles. All units would have private outdoor areas. A total of 258 parking spaces would be provided.

Common open space would total approximately 302,282 square feet (48%) exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated to the City of Goleta, and includes a children's play area and trail, with benches throughout the proposed Devereux Creek restoration area. A conceptual landscape plan includes restoration of the Devereux Creek corridor. The 87 eucalyptus and 8 cypress trees to be removed would be replaced with a total of 282 drought tolerant Mediterranean and native tree species, both ornamental (e.g., Melaluca, London Plane Tree, etc.) and indigenous to the area (e.g., coast live oak and sycamore).

Access to and from the condominiums would be provided from Hollister Avenue and Las Armas Road. A minimum 28-foot wide interior loop is provided on each side of Devereux Creek.

The site would require approximately 105,610-cubic yards of cut and 75,126-cubic yards of fill. A retaining wall on the northern project boundary would have a maximum 6-foot height.

The applicant seeks General Plan amendments to development setbacks from top of bank and visual resource view corridor policies.

The project was submitted on May 8, 2007 by agent Mary Meaney Reichel, Lucon Inc., on behalf of the Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership, property owner. Related cases: 07-102-GP, 07-102-DP, 07-102-VTM. (Last heard on 7-22-08, 6-10-08, 4-22-08, 3-25-08) (David Stone)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-22-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Herrera commented: a) the plans for the permeable pavers throughout the property is a big improvement since there are no bioswales for drainage; and b) the plans to combine the paths throughout the open space area is appreciated.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) the site plan is fine with the improvements; b) the continuous drive on the eastern loop should visually fit in with the open space landscaping by using similar or appropriate landscape materials, as opposed to the landscaping near the homes; c) the addition of landscaping at the western entrance, replacing two parking spaces, is more attractive; d) the pedestrian path and bridge connection is much appreciated; e) the Las Armas Road issue will need to be resolved by Community Services staff which will hopefully address grade problems and provide some form of on-street parking; f) the ribbon driveways that are long enough to allow parking, and the courtyards, will work well; g) the motor court design might function as parking from a short-term standpoint; h) the architecture for Building 2-C front is a Tuscan style which

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 8 of 15

- seems too formal; i) with regard to the overall architectural style, suggested moving away from the red roof tile architectural style to a style that is more agrarian which would fit more with Goleta and be somewhat different from The Bluffs project across the street; and m) recommended accepting the St. Augustine style, changing the Monterey style roof to a shake style roof, changing the Rustic Farm House style roof to a flat tile roof; and eliminating the Spanish style red-tile roof altogether, changing the style to something that is more agrarian with a shake roof or board and bat style.
3. Member Branch commented: a) the site plan is improved and works relatively well; b) the extension of Las Armas Road, which would allow the street to be usable, would be good for the project; c) suggested that there are some two-story planes in the architecture that should be broken up; d) recommended changing the roof materials for the Monterey style from the red tile to something more agrarian which would be different from The Bluffs project across the street; and e) the St. Augustine style is fine.
 4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) concurred with the comments from Members Branch and Schneider with regard to the Monterey style architecture; b) changing the roof material to shingle on the Monterey style would tie more with the St. Augustine style; c) suggested varying the roof materials; d) architecturally, the two-story vertical areas are not a concern because there are some designs with articulation; e) the revised plans showing the units combined together is helpful; and f) the pedestrian pathway through the center open space area and the changes with regard to parking are appreciated.
 5. Member Messner commented: a) recommended that the openings at the entryways be widened on both ends to accommodate traffic entering and exiting; particularly with the center divider; b) the color tones of St. Augustine blends well with the landscaping; and c) expressed concern that the red roof tiles seem to pop-out, and suggested flat tiles and colors that blend.
 6. Chair Wignot commented: a) the applicant has provided a great amount of information for review; b) he pointed out that there is a potential need for some sort of sound wall along Hollister Avenue, particularly for the homes along the western end of the complex, with regard to the proposed new Highway 101 crossing and on-ramp, and proposed projects in the area; c) in his opinion, the roof elevation that is projecting out appears odd with regard to the Monterey style; and d) requested the applicant provide an aerial photograph showing a simulation of the revised project with the roads and buildings to compare with adjacent project; and e) requested staff report back on: a) potential plans to relocate the Venoco monitoring station with regard to the project; and b) if the proposed Las Armas frontage improvements would provide for public parking opportunities.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown) that Item M-2, No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road (APN 079-210-049), shall move forward to the Planning Commission with Conceptual comments, and that Item M-2, No. 07-102-DRB, shall be continued to August 26, 2008, for an in-progress DRB review with regard to the architectural styles, and for the applicant to provide an aerial photograph showing a simulation of the proposed project with the roads and building to compare the layout with the existing adjacent projects.

M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-145-DRB

598 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-090-052)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The subject property consists of 12.29 net acres and includes agricultural operations, an existing farmhouse, a produce stand, and a bathhouse/restroom in the AG-I-5 zone district. Vehicular ingress/egress is provided by a 16-foot (to be upgraded to 20-foot) wide gravel driveway from Stow Canyon Road, and through the City's adjacent library parking lot. A modification was granted to require a total of 19 designated parking spaces on the property. Minor amounts of grading would be required to facilitate building pads and the installation of utilities.

To be in compliance with 08-111-CUP, the applicant proposes to move the existing farm labor camp from its present location near the avocado orchard to a development envelope along the existing driveway near the farmhouse in Phases 4 & 5 as follows:

Phase 4 – (To be completed by July 1, 2009):

- Terminate use of existing farm labor camp site and remove all structures; relocate occupants to temporary or permanent residential units in approved building envelope.
 - Temporary units would consist of up to five (5) yurts meeting code requirements and Design Review Board review for precise location and landscaping, with an option to substitute mobile homes. Cooking and sanitary facilities would consist of a mobile kitchen, restroom, and shower units and/or individual built-in kitchens and bathrooms, all connected to the Goleta Sanitary District system.
 - Permanent housing would consist of up to five (5) modular, stick-built, relocated houses or other City-approved permanent housing as approved by the Design Review Board.
- Construct access improvements as required by the Fire Department.
- Provide additional on-site parking.
- Construct the sewer line.

Phase 5 – (To be completed by July 1, 2013):

- Final permitting and construction of permanent housing. Permanent housing would consist of modular, stick-built, relocated homes or other permanent housing, as approved by the Design Board Review, for up to five (5) units of farm worker housing.
- The farm labor camp would include restroom and kitchen facilities within each of the housing units fully connected to public water and sewer line systems.
- Remove and replace all interim housing units with permanent housing. Use of kitchen and restroom/shower trailers (if any) is discontinued.
- Retain the bathhouse/restroom as a demonstration facility.

The project was filed by agent Steve Welton of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services on behalf of Center for Urban Agriculture at Fairview Gardens, property owner. Related cases: 08-111-CUP; 08-145-LUP. (Scott Kolwitz)

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 10 of 15

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- **NONE**

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. SIGN COMPLIANCE DISCUSSION

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 11 of 15

Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines

Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)

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

Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)

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

Design Review Board Procedures

Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)

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

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

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

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

- 1) Height, bulk, scale and area coverage of buildings and structures and other site improvements.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 12 of 15

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

Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)

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

- 1) The development will be compatible with the neighborhood, and its size, bulk and scale will be appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.
- 2) Site layout, orientation, and location of structures, buildings, and signs are in an appropriate and well-designated relationship to one another, and to the environmental qualities, open spaces and topography of the property.
- 3) The project demonstrates a harmonious relationship with existing and proposed adjoining developments, avoiding excessive variety and monotonous repetition, but allowing similarity of style, if warranted.
- 4) There is harmony of material, color, and composition of all sides of a structure or buildings.
- 5) A limited number of materials will be on the exterior face of the building or structure.
- 6) There is consistency and unity of composition and treatment of exterior elevation.
- 7) Mechanical and electrical equipment is well integrated in the total design concept and screened from public view to the maximum extent practicable.
- 8) All visible onsite utility services are appropriate in size and location.
- 9) The grading will be appropriate to the site.
- 10) Adequate landscaping is provided in proportion to the project and the site with due regard to preservation of specimen and landmark trees, and existing native vegetation.
- 11) The selection of plant materials is appropriate to the project and its environment, and adequate provision will be made for the long-term maintenance of such plant materials.
- 12) The project will preserve and protect, to the maximum extent practicable, any mature, specimen or skyline tree, or appropriately mitigate the loss.
- 13) The development will not adversely affect significant public scenic views.
- 14) Signs, including their lighting, are well designed and are appropriate in size and location.
- 15) All exterior site, structure and building lighting is well designed and appropriate in size and location.
- 16) The proposed development is consistent with any additional design standards as expressly adopted by the City Council.
- 17) The development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.
- 18) The public health, safety and welfare will be protected.
- 19) The project architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access.
- 20) The project will provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 13 of 15

Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

Conceptual Review

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

Information required for conceptual review includes:

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

Preliminary Review

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

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

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 14 of 15

Final Review

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

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

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

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

Revised Final

Revised final review occurs when a substantial revision (e.g., grading, orientation, materials, height) to a project is proposed after final DRB approval has been granted. Plans submitted shall include all information on drawings that reflect the proposed revisions. If the revisions are not clearly delineated, they cannot be construed as approved.

Multiple Levels of Approval at a Single Meeting

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

Presentation of Projects (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.3)

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

Public Testimony (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.4)

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

Design Review Board Agenda

August 26, 2008

Page 15 of 15

support of or opposition to the project, including their reasoning and concerns. The letter will be included as a part of the public record.

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

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

Appeals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.8)

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