



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, June 24, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 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

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Scott Branch (Architect)

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

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

June 24, 2008

Page 2 of 14

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

- A. Design Review Board Revised Minutes for May 28, 2008
- B. Design Review Board Minutes for June 10, 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. 05-059-DRB

5575 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-090-085)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes 14 Housing Authority apartments known as Grossman Homes, as well as management and maintenance offices on a 2.43 acre lot in the Design Residential (DR-20) zone district. The applicant requests a two lot subdivision to subdivide the parcel into two parcels of 2.19 acres (Parcel 1) and .24 acres (Parcel 2), and an amendment to a previously approved Development Plan which would allow the construction of a community center for the residents of the Grossman Homes on Parcel 1, the Miller Community Center, and an additional single-family dwelling, The Braddock House, on Parcel 2. The community center would be 16'3" tall and total 1,536 square feet. The Braddock House would be 16'5" tall and total 2,755 square feet and would be used as a Special Care Facility to provide semi-independent living for up to four (4) developmentally disabled adults. Access is provided via an existing 25' wide driveway from Armitos Avenue. The Goleta Water District and Goleta Sanitary District would continue to provide water and sewer service to the site. Modifications from the requirements of the zoning ordinance are being requested for the number of parking spaces, parking areas setbacks, and landscaping. The project was filed by the County of Santa Barbara Housing Authority, property owner. Related cases: 83-DP-014. (Continued from 4-22-08, 3-25-08, 2-26-08, 9-18-07, 08-21-07) (Cindy Moore)

Design Review Board Agenda

June 24, 2008

Page 3 of 14

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-22-08 Meeting:

Comments:

1. The applicant's time and work with the DRB on this project are appreciated.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-2, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to grant Preliminary Approval, as submitted, and continue to June 24, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-089-DRB

5801 Calle Real (APN 069-110-097)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 55,669-square foot shopping center on a 1.28-acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a new freestanding monument sign using elements from the existing monument sign. New façade elements of the sign would consist of new off-white stucco top cap, pole covers, and bases. The applicant proposes to re-use the existing 100-square foot sign panel. The sign would be an internally illuminated cabinet sign. The height of the sign structure would be 21'-6". The project was filed by Kelli Ingber of Lighting Contract Service, agent, on behalf of Jack Jakosky, property owner, and Albertsons, store owner. Related cases: 08-089-SCC. (Shine Ling)

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-045-DRB

7885 Langlo Ranch Road (APN 079-570-070)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 3,041-square foot two-story residence and an attached 390-square foot two-car garage on a 8,712-square foot lot in the DR-4 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 358 square feet in additions on the first floor. The resulting

Design Review Board Agenda

June 24, 2008

Page 4 of 14

two-story structure would be 3,789 square feet, consisting of a 3,399-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 390-square foot two-car garage. The proposal is not consistent with the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by Fred Gonzales, agent, on behalf of Roy Romp, property owner. Related cases: 05-045-LUP. (Shine Ling)

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-083-DRB

5980 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-051-024)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,260-square foot commercial building on an approximately 7,800-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to change the colors of the existing Taco Bell building to a new color palette, with a dark brown color as the dominant color for the exterior walls (Sherwin Williams SW2823 "Rockwood Clay"). No changes in building height, building coverage, signage, or floor area are proposed. A new landscape plan is also proposed, with new plantings consisting of *Phoenix robelinii*, *Arctostaphylos hookerii*, and other plant species. The project was filed by Tim Friedrich of T. L. Friedrich, Inc., agent, on behalf of Robert M. Coe, property owner, and Taco Bell of Lompoc, tenant. Related cases: 08-083-LUP. (Shine Ling)

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-088-DRB

6860 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-015)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes three buildings totaling approximately 31,800 square feet of industrial building, warehouse, and chemical storage space on a 4.4-acre parcel in the M-RP (Industrial Research Park) zone district. Tenant spaces A and B occupy the front industrial building, totaling approximately 25,000 square feet. Tenant space C occupies the warehouse building on the northern property line totaling approximately 5,000 square feet of warehouse space. A Chemical Storage Building in the rear of the property comprises the final 1,800 square feet of development.

The applicant proposes to construct a new façade around the existing entry. The 18'-6" high by 19'-9" wide curved plaster façade will be painted Frazee color "Wise Crack" green to contrast the color on the remaining front façade. The existing accent lighting adjacent to the entry will be reused on the new façade, and there will be new down lighting added to the overhang above the entry. The existing steel sculpture and storefront doors are to remain. There will be pathway lighting added adjacent to the existing steel sculpture. There is no new square footage proposed. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 04-229-LUP, -DRB; 03-073-DP, -DRB. (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-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 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:

5-28-08 Meeting

1. The applicant's flexibility is appreciated. The site constraints have been changing which is challenging for site planning and prolongs the review process.
2. Member Brown commented: a) expressed concern that over half of the site will be used for parking; b) the use of permeable materials to help soften the

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 24, 2008

Page 6 of 14

- proposed hardscape is appreciated; c) she hopes that the reciprocal parking arrangements will work out; d) more information with regard to the buffer setbacks will be useful; e) expressed concern that the perimeter fence will extend the built environment around the building when it is moved towards Calle Real; f) the fence materials should be more permeable so there is not a visual barrier as the building is viewed from Calle Real and Los Carneros; g) requested some reduction in the square footage of the building since it will be moved closer to Calle Real and the square footage has increased; h) stormwater and flooding information are land use issues but it would be helpful to have some information available for site planning; i) if street lights are required, suggest lighting that incorporates dark sky standards; and j) recommended no lights on the northern part of the building.
3. Member Branch commented: a) the use of permeable paving materials is appreciated from a runoff standpoint especially along the back against the preserve; b) the bulk and scale of the building feels large as it is moved up to the corner; c) the massing of the building in itself has some nice proportions and nice elements but would probably fit better if it were reduced to about eighty-five percent of the size; d) expressed concern regarding the eight-foot wall which seems out of scale with regard to how the project integrates with the neighborhood; e) it would be better not to have exterior lighting unless required; and f) suggested that perhaps bollards at the driveway entry would have less impact in the area as a whole than street lights.
 4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) suggested that shifting the building more to the east as far as possible from the standpoint of visibility for traffic; b) moving the building to the center would be awkward with parking on both sides; c) the building would fit with existing buildings on either side of Calle Real by being pulled back farther; d) permeable pavement materials are appreciated; e) he would prefer not having street lights; and f) story poles and more project details are needed .
 5. Member Messner commented: a) he is still concerned regarding parking and would like information regarding flood zones; b) larger trees are needed in front, not palm trees, but substantial size trees; c) larger trees in larger boxes are available which can be inspected to make sure the trees are not root-bound; d) the trees planted in right-of-ways will need to conform to the City's Recommended Street Tree List and planting guidelines; e) permeable paving is good; f) suggested steel grate tree wells in the parking lot; g) he is not in favor of the perimeter wall; and h) expressed reservations regarding the height of the project.
 6. Member Herrera commented: a) although there are permeable pavers, a bioswale would be beneficial to filter and retain water before it drains into the wetlands towards the east; and b) suggested reducing the height of the project if the size is reduced with consideration for the wildlife flight path.
 7. Chair Wignot commented: a) he agreed with the above DRB comments; b) expressed concern that moving the building to the southwest corner brings up the issue of size, bulk and scale because there will be too much mass at the corner; c) the adjacent properties are located back from Calle Real with parking in front of the buildings; spaces in pulled there should be consideration regarding whether traffic mitigation would be required with to what is happening in the area; d) he believes there will be a need for a traffic signal; e) expressed concern that it would be difficult to exit and turn left on Calle Real; and f) the project would benefit by the willingness of the applicant to plant trees on the northern and eastern property line so over time the trees will mature and screen the building from people walking along the public preserve and Lake Los Carneros.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 24, 2008

Page 7 of 14

MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to continue Item M-1, No. 03-051-DRB, Northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, with comments, to June 24, 2008.

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-171-DRB

351 S. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue (APNs 065-090-022, -023, -028)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review of a new application for the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital which proposes to improve its existing facilities in order to comply with State Senate Bill 1953, a law requiring the seismic retrofit and/or upgrading of all acute care facilities. Existing development consists of a 93,090-square foot hospital and a 41,224-square foot Medical Office Building (MOB).

The applicant proposes to replace the hospital with an entirely new facility and demolishing the old hospital building, resulting in a total of 152,658 square feet, a net increase of approximately 59,568 square feet. The existing MOB located north of the hospital is also proposed to be replaced and will be demolished, resulting in a total of 55,668 square feet, a net increase of approximately 14,444 square feet.

Parking to serve both the hospital and MOB uses will be redeveloped on both sites and a temporary construction parking area including 377 spaces is proposed across South Patterson Avenue in the northwestern portion of the parcel known as the "Hollipat" site.

Phased construction is planned through 2011 in a manner that will continue to provide all existing medical services to the community.

The hospital, MOB, and a portion of the Hollipat parcels have a General Plan Land Use Designation of Office & Institutional. The hospital parcel has a Hospital Overlay. The remaining portion of the Hollipat parcel has split land use designations of medium and high density residential. The zoning for the hospital, MOB, and a portion of the Hollipat parcel is Professional & Institutional (PI). The remaining portion of the Hollipat parcel has split zoning of Design Residential, 20 and 25 units per acre. The MOB parcel and a portion of the Hollipat parcel have a Design Control Overlay and the southern portion of the hospital parcel has the Approach Zone Overlay. The project was filed by agent Suzanne Elledge on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 07-171-OA, 07-171-DP. (Continued from 5-28-08, 5-13-08*, 2-12-08, 01-23-08, 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

5-28-08 Meeting

General Summary of the DRB Comments:

1. There is a consensus of the DRB that the current proposed architecture design of the MOB needs to have some of the playful articulation that was the result of the last ad hoc subcommittee meeting, which seems to be missing in the current

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 24, 2008

Page 8 of 14

- plans. Some kind of round, curved, element at the corner of Hollister/Patterson is preferred. The south elevation, and the portion of the east elevation wrapping around to the south elevation, both appear too linear and institutional.
2. The plans for the MOB and the hospital should be shown together in order to facilitate the next review of the project. The previous DRB comments show that the hospital design is appreciated for the most part.
 3. An ad-hoc subcommittee meeting shall be held, to include Member Schneider who is absent from today's meeting, prior to the next DRB review on June 24, 2008.
 4. A placeholder will be held for the DRB meeting on July 8, 2008, to review together the landscaping, the temporary parking lot and preliminary signage.
 5. The willingness of the applicant to work with the DRB is appreciated. This is an important building and the visual qualities of the corner of the building at the Hollister/Patterson intersection are important.

Additional Individual DRB Comments:

1. Member Branch commented: a) overall, there are many elements of the new design that are appreciated; b) the forms are starting to come together fairly well and it is appreciated that progress has been made; c) the inset courtyard is appreciated; and d) the corner of the building at the Hollister/Patterson intersection still needs some attention to design, noting that there was a softness with the original round element that played off the chapel in the hospital, although the large original round design is not recommended.
2. Member Brown commented: a) expressed concern that the linear design of the building is plain and needs to be more interesting; b) the architecture at the corner of Hollister/Patterson needs to have more interest and a round element will be helpful; and c) the elevations with more 'playfulness' may be due to the use of color.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) expressed concern that the new design is more toned down and appears very linear, and not like a place of healing, on the west and east elevations and particularly on the south elevation; and b) he really appreciates the hospital's architecture and would prefer that the building speaks closer to the hospital's design.
4. Member Messner commented: a) he believes it would be good for the design of the MOB to render some closeness to the hospital but would prefer it be kept separate and apart; b) recommended that stone work be added on the north elevation which would blend with the landscape and also draw attention to the entrance, as well as blend with the hospital without seeming connected like the drawing above; c) the stone work on the south elevation is appreciated, and suggested rotating the columns half a turn diamond shaped; and d) there needs to be adequate signage with directions to facilitate navigation throughout the site.
5. Member Herrera commented that he appreciated the original design with the glass in the corner and suggested that a similar design would be attractive.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) expressed appreciation that the building was reduced from three stories to two stories; b) the new design appears more institutional in the sense of being bland, in particular the south elevation and the east elevation as it wraps into the south elevation; c) the previous design had more character and interest; and d) the north elevation along Hollister Avenue with the inset courtyard is interesting.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 24, 2008

Page 9 of 14

MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to continue Item M-2, No. 07-171-DRB, 351 So. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue, with comments, to June 24, 2008.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- **NONE**

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. SEPARATE SIGN COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

June 24, 2008

Page 10 of 14

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

June 24, 2008

Page 11 of 14

- 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

June 24, 2008

Page 12 of 14

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

June 24, 2008

Page 13 of 14

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

June 24, 2008

Page 14 of 14

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.