



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, March 25, 2008**

### CONSENT CALENDAR

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 1:30 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:

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

March 25, 2008

Page 2 of 15

## A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

## B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for March 11, 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. 08-013-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. The applicant proposes to install a monument sign at the front of the building. The dimensions of the monument structure would be 8' long by 4'-6" tall with an area of approximately 36-square feet. The sign attached to each side of the monument would be approximately 6'-2" long by 2'-11" tall, with an area of approximately 18-square feet. The non-illuminated signs would have pin-mounted bronze color letters for the building address, pin-mounted bronze colored suite numbers, and pin-mounted aluminum plates with bronze colored vinyl for the tenant names. The CMU monument structure will have 8" by 8" patterns cut into it, and paint to match the building. The project was filed by Dan Michealsen, property owner. Related cases: 07-191-OSP, -DRB, -CUP, -DPAM. (Last heard on 3-11-08) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 3 of 15

### 3-11-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown expressed concern regarding the potential for light trespass problems with up-light fixtures, stating that the lighting fixtures need to be installed correctly to prevent light spillage.
2. The pampas grass should be removed as a condition of approval.
3. The Sign Subcommittee recommends Preliminary Approval with the above comments.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-4, No. 08-013-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, with the following conditions: 1) the lamp should be mounted so there is no light spillage above or beyond the sides of the monument sign; and 2) the applicant shall add appropriate groundcover area to soften the sign; and to continue to March 25, 2008, for Final review.**

### H-2 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-024-DRB

7408-7412 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-064)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Hollister Business Park. The proposed OSP provides for two (2) different types of signs: wall signs and directional/informational signs. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by Steve Rice of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park LTD, property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 08-024-OSP; -CUP. (Last heard on 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### 3-11-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Monument Signs: a) the monument sign is fine; b) the stone base shall be added on the second monument sign; c) only the tenant's business name should be listed on the monument sign for identification purposes, not descriptors or details which add clutter; and d) the maximum height of the Citrix letters needs to be defined, with the recommended height of approximately twelve (12) inches, which may be further considered when the applicant provides information verifying calculations of the dimensions.
2. Directory Signs: a) the size of the sign seems too big and tall relative to driving through the project; b) the sign appears too busy although the arrows are appreciated; c) only the tenant's business name should be on the sign, not logos or descriptors; d) the applicant is requested to study lowering the height of the sign, downsizing the scale and making it not appear so busy; e) the addresses should remain but the text regarding building numbers, for example "BUILDING 5" should be eliminated; f) some of the negative space at the top should be removed; g) usually the letter heights are uniform on signs internal to a complex; h) for consideration, one of the Directional Signs may not be needed; i) Member Schneider commented that the previous surfboard design

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 4 of 15

seemed interesting although it was too big and, being vertical, it would be difficult to lower the height.

3. Building Identification Signs: a) there is concern that the Citrix Online sign does not need to be so big because it is located internal to the complex; b) consider whether the signage on the building needs to be seen from Hollister Avenue; c) the applicant is requested to study reducing the maximum height of the address lettering to a height between ten (10) inches and twelve (12) inches, with the emphasis on the lower height; d) consider the proportionate relationship of the address lettering with the Citrix Online sign; e) Member Schneider commented that a problem with designing signage to be in scale with a building is that the signage becomes too big.
4. Staff is requested to research and report back regarding the separate ownerships of the two parcels in the Hollister Business Park and how this relationship would be addressed in an Overall Sign Plan.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-5, No. 08-024-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, to March 25, 2008, with comments.**

### **H-3 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-028-DRB**

5730 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property consists of a commercial property for multiple retail tenants on an approximately 8,500-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district (Retail Commercial). The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan for the building. The proposed Overall Sign Plan (OSP) provides for wall signs for individual tenants and for the shopping center. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by David Lemmons of Central Coast Signs, agent, on behalf of Jerry Anderson, property owner. Related cases: 08-028-OSP. (Last heard on 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

**Applicant request to be continued to April 8, 2008**

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **3-11-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

1. The applicant shall define in the Overall Sign Plan the locations in the building of the major tenants and the minor tenants; and also define the type of sign materials for the major tenants and the minor tenants.
2. Member Schneider recommended a maximum height of ten (10) inches for the letters on the signs for the major tenants facing Hollister Avenue, stating that the Goleta Heritage District Architecture & Design Guidelines suggests that letter heights shall be limited to a maximum of ten (10) inches.
3. The height of the letters for the tenant signs located inside the courtyard, which includes the minor tenants, shall be a maximum height of eight (8) inches.
4. The applicant shall study the "LA PLACITA DE GOLETA" sign in the courtyard on the Inner North View elevation to understand the best relationship with regard to the letter size and location of the sign on the building, possibly making it larger.

\* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 5 of 15

5. The maximum height shall be ten (10) inches for the "5730" address in the courtyard on the Inner North View which would match the other ten-inch letter heights.
6. The applicant shall study possibly omitting the "LA PLACITA DE GOLETA" signs on the east facing and west facing sides of the building.
7. The tenant signs shall not contain descriptors.
8. The applicant shall provide more details regarding the proposal for a tenant directory on the east side and the west side of the building, including text size and materials.
9. The Overall Sign Plan will need to address all signs including standards for the use of temporary signs, such as banners, at certain times.
10. A condition of approval should be added that the applicant shall remove all unpermitted signs before the Overall Sign Plan is approved.
11. Member Brown expressed concern that many of the unpermitted signs have been allowed to proliferate by owners in Old Town, stating that on this particular building there are banner and window signs that detract from the building's appearance.
12. The applicant's efforts to clean up the building with regard to signs are appreciated.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-6, No. 08-028-DRB, 5730 Hollister Avenue, to March 25, 2008, with comments.**

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

#### I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-018-DRB RV

6056 Berkeley Road (APN 077-510-040 & 077-500-056)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a 112-unit Planned Unit Development in the DR-4.6 zone district. The applicant proposes to revise their lighting plan on the HOA owned grounds of the subdivision. The project was filed by Robert Young on behalf of The Meadows HOA, property owner. (Last heard on 2-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

**Applicant request to be continued to April 8, 2008**

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **2-12-08 Meeting:**

Comments:

1. The goals and intent of the project are good.
2. Member Schneider commented that to prevent glare, the light source needs to be shielded or the lighting fixtures need to be lowered, or a combination. Member Smith commented that generally the higher the pole, the broader the light emission, and the shorter the pole the narrower light emission.
3. By consensus, the members agreed that there does not need to be consistency regarding the heights of the poles at the different residences. It was suggested that the applicant analyze the physical characteristics of each site to determine what height is needed to perform the desired function of the lighting.

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 6 of 15

4. Member Messner stated that from his experience regarding low voltage lighting, the use of certain wattages and color tones can change the effects of lighting at night, and that some types of lighting can be just as effective on a lower pole like a full moon.
5. The applicant is requested to restudy and work with a lighting consultant or manufacturing representative who is knowledgeable regarding lighting issues and dark sky lighting. Consider dark sky practices particularly when the lighting is close to residences.
6. The applicant is requested to provide information regarding the existing lighting for reference when reviewing the project
7. The style of the fixture is acceptable but the applicant needs to provide cut sheets from the manufacturer showing that the lighting is shielded.
8. Member Brown commented she believes that all of the goals will be achieved with the appropriate selection of lighting that will light the pathway without the problem of light shining into homes.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Wignot) to continue Item F-1, No. 08-018-DRB-RV, 6056 Berkeley Road, to March 25, 2008, with comments.**

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

- None

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

#### K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-059-DRB

5575 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-090-085)

This is a request for *Preliminary* 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 2-26-08, 9-18-07, 08-21-07) (Cindy Moore)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 7 of 15

### 2-12-08 Meeting:

#### Comments:

1. Chair Branch stated that the applicant did a fine job matching the new architecture with the existing architecture.
2. Member Schneider commented that the colors are fine except the teal seems too bright.
3. The applicant has addressed all of the comments from the DRB review on September 18, 2007, with the following exceptions: a) Comment #2 {note: the project civil engineer explained that the concrete was needed due to the flatness of the slope and the landscape architect recommended against relocating the swale or changing the swale material from concrete}; and b) the applicant will respond at the next DRB hearing to Comment #5 {that the applicant shall show fixed windows on the side of the building facing Kellogg Ranch}, and to Comment #9 {that the applicant shall provide plant counts and ground cover information}.
4. The lighting plan for the site needs to be provided by the applicant for review before Preliminary Approval can be granted.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item J-1, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to March 25, 2008, with the following comments: 1) the windows on the side of the building facing Kellogg Ranch shall be fixed windows and shall be documented on the building plans; 2) the landscape plan shall include plant counts and ground cover information; 3) the applicant shall provide a lighting study and plan that includes the types of fixtures and light distribution; and 4) the applicant is requested to consider changing the teal color, which seems too bright, to a color that is slightly more deeper and richer, however, the other colors are fine.**

## L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

### L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-030-DRB

7357 Elmhurst Place (APN 073-224-002)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,080-square foot residence and an attached 480-square foot two-car garage on a 5,775-square foot lot in the DR-10 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 100-square foot sunroom addition to the rear of the building. The resulting one-story structure would be 1,660 square feet, consisting of a 1,180-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 480-square foot two-car garage. The project was filed by Ed Martin of Ace Awning, agent, on behalf of Mary Medberry, property owner. Related cases: 08-030-DPAM and 08-030-LUP. (Shine Ling)

## M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

### M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-102-DRB

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

# Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 8 of 15

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is currently vacant. The approximately 14.46-acre property is located in western Goleta extending west of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection. The property has a land use designation of Planned Residential, 8 units per acre, and is in the DR-8 zone district.

The applicant is requesting approval of a vesting tentative tract map, general plan amendments, and final development plan as described below.

### Vesting Tentative Tract Map (32,032; 07-102-VTM)

The applicant requests a one lot subdivision of the 14.46-acre parcel for airspace condominium purposes to provide for 102 residential units, associated infrastructure, and common open space.

### Final Development Plan (07-102-DP)

The Final Development Plan is a request to allow the construction of a 102-unit residential condominium project totaling 126,376 square feet of building coverage.

### General Plan Amendments (07-102-GP)

The project proposes amendments to 10 Goleta General Plan policies and tables. These amendments address issues including: facilitating construction of a new fire station; allowing for a 50-foot development setback from Devereux Creek top of bank; visual resource view corridors; timing implementation of regional traffic mitigations; residential exterior development within areas subject to noise levels of 65 dBA CNEL on Hollister Avenue; and affordable housing inclusionary standards.

### *Unit and Building Design*

Seven residential two-story building types are proposed, arranged around two loop road configurations, accessed from Hollister Avenue on the west, and Las Armas Road on the east. Single family residence (SFR detached) units would have a maximum height from finished floor to roof ridgeline of 24 feet, and Townhouse (T.H., attached) units would have a maximum height of 22 feet. The 2- and 3-bedroom T.H. floor plan to be offered at the market sales category provides for an extra optional bedroom. Building sizes would vary as follows:

<b>Unit Type</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Area (square feet)</b>
Single-Family Residence (Three-Bedroom)	47	2,466 - 2,872
Townhouse (Three-Bedroom/Option for Four)	15	2,324
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom/Option for Three)	14	1,492-1,820
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	14	1,364

\* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.



## Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 9 of 15

Townhouse (One-Bedroom)	6	774
Studio	6	566

A total of 66 buildings would be constructed in the following configuration:

Unit Type	Number of Buildings
Single-Family Residence	47
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	4
(1) Townhouse (Three-Bedroom) and (2) Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	9
(1) Townhouse (Three-Bedroom) (1) Townhouse (Two-Bedroom) (1) Townhouse (One-Bedroom) and (1) Studio	6

### *Architecture and Landscaping*

The proposed architecture proposed for both detached and attached units is described as a mix of Spanish, Ranch, and Monterey styles.

Perimeter units would be oriented toward Hollister Avenue; no sound wall along the roadway is proposed. Units adjacent to Devereux Creek will be oriented to take advantage or proposed restoration of this biologically sensitive area. All units would have private outdoor areas. Private open space would equal 74,402 square feet (12%), such that total project open space would be 60% of all the project area. Common open space would total approximately 302,282 square feet (48%) exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated to the City of Goleta, and includes a children's play area, and trail, with benches throughout the proposed Devereux Creek restoration area.

A conceptual landscape plan includes restoration of the Devereux Creek corridor and a pesticide- and herbicide-free maintenance program. The 87 eucalyptus and 8 cypress trees over 6-inches in diameter measured at breast height would be replaced with a total of 282 drought tolerant Mediterranean and native tree species, both ornamental (e.g., Melaluca, London Plane Tree, etc.) and indigenous to the area (e.g., coast live oak and sycamore).

### *Access and Parking*

Access to and from the condominiums would be provided from Hollister Avenue and Las Armas Road. A minimum 28-foot wide interior loop is provided on each side of Devereux Creek. Decorative paving (2-feet wide on each side) would provide a visual sense of narrowing of paving width to 24-feet, intended to provide a traffic calming effect. A portion of the eastern interior loop adjacent to the proposed open space landscape restoration area would incorporate a "grass-

\* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 10 of 15

crete” type substructure material that would allow for natural dispersal of native grass seed. This paving material, in addition to interior road width and turning radius, was determined in consultation with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department.

A total of 258 parking spaces would be provided, exceeding the 228 spaces required. All market-rate units would include a private 2-car garage, while affordable-rate units would include a private 1-car garage. Additional uncovered parking would be provided within 200-feet of the affordable units as required by ordinance.

### *Site Preparation*

The site would require approximately 105,610-cubic yards of cut and 75,126-cubic yards of fill. Maximum vertical height of cut and fill slopes would be 4 feet. A retaining wall on the northern project boundary would have a maximum 6-foot height.

### *Utilities*

The Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District would provide water and sewer service to the site. (Cindy Moore & David Stone)

## **N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- None

## **O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

### **O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

### **O-3. PROJECT APPROVAL v. BUILT SLIDESHOW**

## **P. ADJOURNMENT**

# Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 11 of 15

## Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines

### Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)

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

### Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)

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

## Design Review Board Procedures

### Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)

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

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

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

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

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

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 12 of 15

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

### Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)

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

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

# Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 13 of 15

## Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

### Conceptual Review

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

Information required for conceptual review includes:

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

### Preliminary Review

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

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

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

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

# Design Review Board Agenda

March 25, 2008

Page 14 of 15

## Final Review

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

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

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

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

## Revised Final

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

## Multiple Levels of Approval at a Single Meeting

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

## Presentation of Projects (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.3)

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

## Public Testimony (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.4)

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

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

March 25, 2008

Page 15 of 15

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

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

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

### **Appeals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.8)**

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