



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

TUESDAY, January 8, 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
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

Members:

Scott Branch (Architect), Chair

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

Thomas Smith (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

January 8, 2008

Page 2 of 13

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for December 18, 2007

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: 07-184-DRB

6740 Cortona Drive (APN 073-150-024)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes an approximately 55,302-square foot industrial building on a 3.14-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district (Industrial Research Park). The building is divided into two tenant spaces; tenant space A occupies 36,412-square feet, while tenant space B occupies 18,890-square feet. The proposed Overall Sign Plan (OSP) provides for one (1) type of sign: one wall sign for each tenant with a maximum sign area of 40-square feet.

Proposed Signage Allowances for Tenants

- Tenant Space A
 - One (1) 40-square foot wall sign
- Tenant Space B
 - One (1) 40-square foot wall sign

The project was filed by Dave Jones of Lenvik & Minor Architects, on behalf of Arnon Blau, property owner. Related cases: 07-184-OSP. (Last heard on 12-04-07) (Brian Hiefield)

Design Review Board Agenda

January 8, 2008

Page 3 of 13

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-04-07 Meeting:

1. The height of the logo should be limited to 36" maximum height.
2. The preference would be not to have ground mounted lighting fixtures because dark sky principles are preferred to be incorporated as much as possible. Any lighting should be top-mounted or halo-lit lighting. Recommend that Item 7 of III. Tenant Signage of the Overall Sign Program for 6740 Cortona Drive should be removed. (Remove: "7. Any ground mounted lighting fixtures shall be shielded with a housing or by landscaping so that the fixture can not be seen from the public right-of-way.").
3. Portable signs and banner signs should be added to the list of prohibited signs in the Overall Sign Program for 6740 Cortona Drive, Goleta.
4. The Sign Subcommittee recommended Preliminary Approval of Item H-3 with the above comments.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-3, No. 07-184-DRB, 6740 Cortona Drive, with the following conditions: 1) the height of the logo shall be limited to 36" maximum height; 2) Item 7 of III. Tenant Signage, of the Overall Signage Program for 6740 Cortona Drive shall be removed; 3) a condition shall be added to the Overall Sign Program that any lighting should be top-mounted or halo-lit lighting; 4) portable signs and banner signs shall be added to the list of prohibited signs in the Overall Sign Program; and continue Item H-3 to January 8, 2008, for Final review on the Sign Calendar.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-191-DRB

6860 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-015)

This is a request for *Final* 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 proposed Overall Sign Plan (OSP) provides for two different types of signs: Wall Signs (two per tenant), and one informational monument sign.

The project was filed by Rex Ruskauff of Studio R Architecture & Design, on behalf of Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 07-191-CUP, 07-191-DP AM02, 07-172-SCC. (Last heard on 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-18-07 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Design Review Board Agenda

January 8, 2008

Page 4 of 13

Comments from the Sign Subcommittee review on December 18, 2007:

The plans were presented by Rex Ruskauff of Studio R Architecture & Design on behalf of Dan Michealsen, property owner. Rex Ruskauff submitted the following revised figure sheets which are in addition to the current plans that were previously submitted: Revised Figure A-2, Revised Figure B-2 and Revised Figure C-2 showing the suite letter next to the man door for each of three tenants; and Revised Figure D (monument sign) showing a metal place with the suite letter for the associated company occupying that suite. Mr. Ruskauff stated that the plans address to all of the DRB comments.

Comments:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended Preliminary approval as submitted.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Herrera, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-3, No. 03-191-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, as submitted, and continue to January 8, 2008, for Final review.

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-211-DRB

120 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-050-030)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The applicant proposes to install a two sided freestanding entry sign for the Patterson Place Apartments measuring a maximum of 4-feet 4-inches tall by 8-feet wide. The sign area is proposed to be approximately 18 ½ -inches by 7-feet 4-inches for an aggregate of approximately 11 square feet on each side of the structure. The non-illuminated sign shall have aluminum pin mounted flat cut out (F.C.O.) "Burnt Crimson" lettering. The portion of the sign reading "Patterson Place" will have 6-inch high letters, the portion of the sign reading "APARTMENTS" will have 4-inch high letters, and the address portion of the sign will have 4 ½ -inch high letters. The sign would be located approximately 9-feet east of the edge of public right-of-way and approximately 36-feet north of the Patterson Place Apartments entrance. No logos are allowed as part of the sign. The application was filed by agent Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, property owner. Related case: 74-CP-39, 07-211-SCC. (Last heard on 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-18-07 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 3 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider; Absent: Brown, Herrera, Wignot) to continue Item No. H-4, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 S. Patterson, to January 8, 2008.

H-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-216-DRB

55 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-007)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 32,800-square foot single-story commercial property on a 1.95-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to install a new sign on an existing

Design Review Board Agenda

January 8, 2008

Page 5 of 13

freestanding monument sign that would read "Castilian Research & Technology Center". There would be an approximately 2'-4" high logo associated with the sign. The dimensions of the sign would be 11'-9" long by 2'-4" tall, with an area of approximately 27-square feet. The monument dimensions are 17' long by 4'-10" tall, with an area of approximately 82-square feet. The non-illuminated sign would have pin-mounted PVC lettering finished with enamel. The permitted monument sign is located in the front yard setback along Castilian Drive and is not proposed to be moved. The project was filed by Ken Sorgman, sign contractor, on behalf of Sabine Freistuhler, property owner. Related cases: 07-216-SCC; 92-SCC-001; 91-BAR-390. (Brian Hiefield)

I. FINAL CALENDAR

- None

J. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-095-DRB

7121 Del Norte (APN 077-113-003)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage) and a 390-square foot 2-car carport on a 6,300-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to permit an existing approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, 120-square foot garden shed, 76-square foot fire pit and 50-square foot Jacuzzi, to construct a 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis, and to construct an approximately 440-square foot second story deck with an additional 8-foot tall trellis above the existing carport. Access to the deck would be provided by a bridge connecting to the existing second-story balcony. The resulting 2-story structure would be a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), and the site would also include a 390-square foot 2-car carport, an approximately 440-square foot second story deck with an additional 8-foot tall trellis above the existing carport, approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, 120-square foot garden shed, 76-square foot fire pit, 50-square foot Jacuzzi, and 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis. This existing permitted structure is above the maximum allowable floor area for this property, which is 1,984 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage; however, as the proposed project consists of non-habitable structures, the situation will not be exacerbated. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Victor Alvarez on behalf of Juan & Lola Zaragoza, property owners. Related cases: 05-095-LUP. (Continued from 12-18-05*, 10-16-07*, 09-05-07*, 08-21-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

8-21-07 Meeting:

1. The majority of the DRB would not support the deck on the carport.

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 8, 2008

Page 6 of 13

2. Photographs of the site and adjacent houses in relation to the project are needed, and also photographs of the exterior stairwell.
3. Vice Chair Wignot stated that there are no other structures on the street that are compatible with the proposed project and that a screened deck in front yard is not appropriate for the location and would not fit with the neighborhood. He suggested it may be better to convert the carport to something more substantial.
4. Member Smith expressed concern regarding the size of the deck with the additional trellis on top. He said that one possible solution may be extending the whole balcony part way over the carport so it extends approximately ten feet from the front wall of the second floor and roof over the rest of the carport to provide protection for vehicles. He noted that approximately eighty-five percent of the property appears to be covered by hardscape/paving and that details regarding landscape and stormwater runoff need to be provided.
5. Member Brown said that she could not support the project because it is out of character with the neighborhood, the deck is inappropriate for the site, and it brings mass, bulk and scale issues more to the front. She noted the large amount of hardscape in the back of the site.
6. Member Messner expressed concern regarding adequate drainage on the site because of large amount of hardscape/paving.
7. Member Schneider stated that he could not support the project because he believes the deck is an inappropriate use in an inappropriate location. He noted that if the deck is approved, the existing structure would need to be torn down and rebuilt for structural purposes. He said although he does not favor the exterior stairwell, he is not sure at this time regarding whether the exterior stairwell should be permitted, and that staff needs to first determine whether the stairwell is permitted. He agrees with DRB comments regarding the large amount of hardscape and paving on the property.
8. Chair Branch said he agrees with the DRB members comments that the deck is inappropriate. He expressed privacy concerns with the deck overlooking the neighbor's property. He can understand if the applicant wants to rebuild the carport because it is in need of repair. He has concerns regarding whether the existing exterior stairwell is necessary and will decide when staff determines whether the stairwell is permitted.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-3, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, to September 5, 2007, to provide the applicant time to consider the DRB comments knowing that the majority are not in favor of the deck; and for staff to research the issue regarding whether the existing exterior stairwell is permitted; and to provide photographs of the adjacent houses in relation to the project.

J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-219-DRB

370 Storke Road (APN 073-100-008)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,230-square foot restaurant, 1,998-square foot car wash, and 20,000-square foot outdoor storage area on a 1.0-acre parcel zoned C-3 in the Inland Area of the City. The applicant proposes to renovate the exterior of the existing restaurant, replacing wood siding with stucco, changing out doors and windows, replacing the existing mansard roof with a 4-foot high parapet, adding a continuous covered eave with a copper colored standing seam roof around the west, north, and south elevations of the building, a copper colored standing seam roofed eave above the

Design Review Board Agenda

January 8, 2008

Page 7 of 13

mechanical/electrical cabinet and utility door on the east elevation, and replacing the existing roof-mounted HVAC equipment with new HVAC equipment that would also be mounted on the roof. In addition, exterior lighting along the north and south property lines and new landscaping is proposed along with two additional planter areas on the south and east sides of the building. The existing parking area would be re-striped and one new handicapped parking space would be added. A new 36" high masonry wall around the existing outdoor dining area in the front of the restaurant is also proposed. No expansion of any aspect of the existing structure is proposed as part of this project. The new stucco would be painted "coconut." New flashing would use copper colored aluminum. The project application was filed by Harwood White, agent, on behalf of John Price, property owner. Related cases: 06-185-LUP, 06-185-DRB, 07-095-APP, 07-183-LUP, 07-183-DRB, & 07-219-LUP. (Alan Hanson)

K. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-103-DRB

26 Coromar Drive (APN 073-150-013)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 33,600-square foot manufacturing building, a 360-square foot compressor room, a 400-square foot storage garage, a 1,000-square foot hazardous materials building, and a 2,160-square foot covered storage area on a 155,580-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct additions on site in three phases. Phase I, a 1,000-square foot hazardous materials building, was previously constructed under case number 06-093-SCD & 06-093-LUP. Phase II consists of a new 8,800-square foot clean room addition to the main manufacturing building, two 400-square foot outbuildings, and the demolition of 1,760-square feet of the covered storage area. A landscape plan is also a part of this proposal, and all materials used for this phase are to match the existing commercial property. Phase III proposes a 10,400-square foot office addition to the existing manufacturing building. This phase also includes its own landscape plan, and all materials used for this phase are to match the existing commercial property. The project was filed by agent David L. Burke on behalf of Renco Encoders, property owner. Related cases: 06-093-SCD, 06-093-LUP, & 07-103-DP. (Laura Vlk)

L. DISCUSSION ITEMS

L-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

L-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

M. DISCUSSION ITEMS

M-1. LIGHTING SITE VISIT SCHEDULE:

1. Hollister Center: 6300 Hollister Avenue;
2. Fairview Corporate Center: 420 South Fairview Avenue;
3. Hampton Inn: 5565 Hollister Avenue;

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 8, 2008

Page 8 of 13

4. Willow Creek: 345 Kellogg Way;
5. Car Dealership lights: 495 South Kellogg Avenue;
6. Patterson Packing: 98 North Patterson Avenue;
7. Calle Real street lights;
8. Maravilla: 5400 Calle Real;
9. Fairview Shopping Center 299 North Fairview Avenue;
10. Gas Station lights at Fairview/Calle Real

N. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

December 18, 2007

Page 9 of 13

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

December 18, 2007

Page 10 of 13

- 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

December 18, 2007

Page 11 of 13

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

December 18, 2007

Page 12 of 13

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

December 18, 2007

Page 13 of 13

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.