



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, August 12, 2008**

### CONSENT CALENDAR

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

### STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

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 12, 2008

Page 2 of 12

## A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

## B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for July 22, 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

- NONE

## 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 *Conceptual/Preliminary* 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. (Brian Hiefield)

### H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-131-DRB

5505-5585 Overpass Road & 5410 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-330-011 & 071-330-012)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes the approved Sumida Gardens Apartments development, which will contain 9 buildings totaling 194,448 square feet on approximately 10.26 acres in the DR-20 zone district. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Sumida Gardens Apartments development. The proposed OSP provides for five (5) different types of signs: monument and identification signs; directional signs; pool signage;

## Design Review Board Agenda

August 12, 2008

Page 3 of 12

parking signage; and miscellaneous signage. The OSP would specify the design and maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign. A total of 20 sign types are proposed. Sign materials generally consist of wood, aluminum, and acrylic. Sign colors are generally ivory, gold, beige, brown, red, and green. Some signs are proposed to be internally illuminated. The project was filed by Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, agent for Sumida Family Limited Partnership, property owner. Related cases: 08-131-OSP; -CUP. (Shine Ling)

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

#### J-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 façade 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 7-08-08) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **7-08-08 Meeting:**

1. Member Brown commented: a) requested the applicant restudy the lighting issues; b) consider using solar powered lights if sufficient to meet the lighting needs, and if not, restudy the wall lighting; c) suggested that bollards would be more appropriate if the intent is to provide lighting for the walkway; and d) the proposed placement of the lighting does not appear to effectively illuminate the pathway and would light the shrubbery because it is not very directional and is diffused.
2. Chair Wignot commented: a) the proposed lighting plan needs clarification with regard to the placement of the wall sconces, for example, there are existing shrubs along the walkway; and b) the plans need to be show that the colors, finishes and roof materials shall match existing.
3. Member Branch commented: a) the plans need to show how the roof resolves and ties into the existing building; and b) requested that the applicant provide details with regard to the kind of tile that will be applied to the concrete piers.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

August 12, 2008

Page 4 of 12

4. Vice Chair Smith commented that overall the project is an improvement for the front of the building and will provide an entry that announces itself.
5. Member Schneider commented: a) agreed with Member Brown's comments requesting that the applicant restudy the lighting; b) agreed with Member Branch's request that the applicant provide tile details; and c) the project will be a nice addition to the building.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 08-082-DRB, 7526 Calle Real, with the following conditions: 1) the plans shall show that the exterior colors, finishes, and the roofing materials shall match existing; 2) the applicant shall restudy the lighting issues; 3) the plans shall show the details for the kind of tiles to be applied to the concrete piers; and 4) the plans shall show the resolution of the main roof; and to continue to August 12, 2008, for Final review by the full DRB on the Final Calendar.**

### **J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-108-DRB**

475 Camino Laguna Vista (APN 077-422-006)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 2,576-square foot residence and an attached 423-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,250-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 179.5 square feet in additions on the first-floor as well as to permit an as-built 205-square foot patio cover. The resulting 2-story structure would be 3,383.5 square feet, consisting of a 2755.5-square foot single-family dwelling with an attached 205-square foot patio cover, and an attached 423-square foot 2-car garage. All materials used for this project aside from the doors, windows, and exterior lighting are to match the existing residence. Details of new doors and new exterior lighting can be found within the plan set. The project was filed by agent Martha Gray on behalf of Stacey & Alex Matson, property owners. Related cases: 08-108-LUP. (Continued from 7-22-08) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **7-22-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

1. Chair Wignot commented: a) the scale on the east elevation needs to be checked because there is a possible error; b) some of the elevations were difficult to discern because some features were not shown, for example the chimney and bay window are not shown on the west elevation; c) the arched window on the east elevation seems out of proportion and too big for the space; for example, possibly the gable peak should be higher so there is more space.
2. Member Branch commented: a) overall, this is a nice project, it is not ostentatious and will fit with the neighborhood; b) suggested studying the arched windows on the east elevation which seem out of proportion with the mass; and c) the roof of the bay window appears odd with no eaves.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) agreed with comments made by Members Branch and Wignot; b) the palladium window on the east elevation should be restudied, for example, consider two bays for the window underneath the arch with a wider window, with some kind of thicker separation, so the arch looks like it is coming down on something that supports it, which would be more in

## Design Review Board Agenda

August 12, 2008

Page 5 of 12

proportion (raising the plate higher than ten feet would seem odd); and c) the project is tucked within the footprint.

4. Member Schneider commented: a) agreed with comments by Members Branch, Smith and Wignot; b) the drawings need to show the patio cover in the rear; c) he does not have a concern regarding the square footage.

**MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 08-108-DRB, 475 Camino Laguna Vista, as submitted with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall restudy the proportions of the new front windows; 2) the applicant shall potentially study the roof over the bay window of the dining room; 3) the patio cover in the rear shall be added to the elevations; and 4) the applicant shall provide landscape plans for Final review; and to continue to August 12, 2008, for Final review on the Final Calendar by the full DRB.**

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

### L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

#### L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-087-DRB

266 Spruce Drive (APN 079-530-027)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,061-square foot residence and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,968-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 1,734 square feet in additions, consisting of a 159-square foot first floor addition, a 325-square foot new second story, and a 1,250-square foot basement. The resulting 2-story structure with basement would be 4,245 square feet, consisting of a 3,795-square foot single-family dwelling with basement and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage. As the proposed project exceeds 3,000 square feet of habitable square footage, a third enclosed parking space would be required per Ordinance No. 03-05. When the basement is included, the proposed habitable square footage would be 3,795 square feet which exceeds the maximum allowable floor area (FAR) guidelines for this property, which is 2,642 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. When the basement square footage is removed, the proposed habitable square footage would be 2,545 square feet, which is within the maximum allowable FAR guidelines for this property. A total of 629 cubic yards of cut for grading is proposed for construction of the basement. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence aside from new doors, windows, and exterior lighting as shown on plans. The project was filed by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. Related cases: 08-087-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

#### L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-090-DRB

7837 Langlo Ranch Road (APN 079-600-030)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 3,086-square foot two-story residence and an attached 446-square foot 2-car garage on a 7,533-square foot lot in the DR-4 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 174-square feet in additions on the first-floor, consisting of a

## Design Review Board Agenda

August 12, 2008

Page 6 of 12

44-square foot bathroom, a 24-square foot living room, 53-square foot garage, and a 53-square foot attached utility shed. The applicant also proposes to convert 133 square feet of the existing garage into habitable square footage for a bathroom and laundry room. The resulting 2-story structure would be 3,260 square feet, consisting of a 2,814-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 446-square foot 2-car garage. This proposed project exceeds the maximum allowable Floor Area Ratio Guidelines (FAR) for this property, which is 2,313.25 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Lawrence Thompson on behalf of James Kirwan III, property owner. Related cases: 89-V-028 J; 90-LUS-136; 08-090-LUP.

(Brian Hiefield)

### **L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-147-DRB**

111 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-025)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 21,800-square foot commercial building on a 3.6-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to remodel the façade of the building, but no changes in building height, building coverage, signage, or floor area are proposed. Features of the remodel include a new aluminum and glass storefront system on the north, south, and west elevations of the building, and an upgrade of existing aluminum glass and doors on the north, east, and south elevations. A new landscape plan is also proposed, with new plantings consisting of *Prunus cerassifera*, *Miscanthus sinensis*, *Syagrus romanzoffianum*, and other plant species. The project was filed by Dave Jones of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Mark Winnikoff of Frieslander Holdings LLC and Nederlander Holdings, LLC, property owners. Related cases: 08-147-LUP. (Shine Ling)

## **M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR**

### **M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-075-DRB**

7090 Marketplace Drive (APN 073-440-013)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The development includes 475,487 square feet of commercial development with 2,490 parking spaces on approximately 49 acres over 7 parcels in the SC (Shopping Center) zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 7,770-square foot addition to an existing 24,017-square foot building previously occupied by CompUSA and to eliminate 31 parking spaces. The entry would be relocated from the east elevations' northern end to the center of the building, and a car stereo installation bay would be created on the southern elevation. The resulting total onsite development would include 483,257 square feet, and the 1-story structure would be 31,787 square feet. Available parking throughout the entire shopping center would be reduced from 2,490 to 2,459 parking spaces with a reduction from 177 to 146 parking spaces located on this parcel. Parking stall sizes are proposed to remain in their current modified configuration. A total of 12 Bradford Pear trees, 3 Brisbane Box trees, and 1 Tipu tree are proposed to be removed, but 17 comparable trees are proposed to be planted. Minor alterations to drive aisles and lighting are also proposed. New materials include a storefront/entry with a kynar finish/clear

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

August 12, 2008

Page 7 of 12

anodized aluminum, "Solar Gray" glazing, new metal doors to be painted to match the adjacent surfaces and new bollards with either an unspecified finish or to be painted Ben Morre #343 "Bright Yellow." All other materials (including lighting and landscaping) for this project are to match the existing commercial property. The project was filed by Kimberly A. Schizas on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 95-SP-001, 95-DP-026, 96-EIR-3, & 08-075-DP AM. (Natasha Heifetz Campbell & Scott Kolwitz)

### **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 12, 2008

Page 8 of 12

## 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 12, 2008

Page 9 of 12

- 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 12, 2008

Page 10 of 12

## 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 12, 2008

Page 11 of 12

## 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 12, 2008

Page 12 of 12

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.