



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

Members:

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

April 8, 2008

Page 2 of 25

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for March 25, 2008

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

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

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

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-023-DRB

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

This is a request for *Final* 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. On the eastern parcel of the HBP the applicant proposes to augment the landscape and lighting plans, to construct a new park/seating area on a grassy area at the northeast corner of the eucalyptus barranca, to construct a new access ramp and door on the western elevation of Building 5, to convert the water treatment building into a fitness activity center, to construct a new basketball court next to the fitness activity center, and to convert existing water storage tanks into thermal storage tanks. No changes in building height, building coverage, or floor area are proposed. The materials for the revisions to the exterior elevations of Building 5 and the fitness activity center would match existing materials. 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: 08-023-SCD; -08-023-LUP. (Last heard on 03-11-08, 2-26-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-11-08 Meeting:

Comments:

1. The project is moving in a good direction.
2. The landscape plans and the changes that have been made are appreciated.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 3 of 25

3. The proposal for the artwork and painting on the water tanks is supported. The DRB looks forward to reviewing the artwork design plans.
4. Member Messner suggested blending one picture between two tanks, and that a homogeneous vision be considered for the artwork.
5. Member Schneider recommended using colors for the artwork which will offset the basic appearance of the building.
6. The applicant is requested to consider using bollards that provide downward lighting, not horizontal; for example, louvered bollards.
7. Member Smith commented that the proposed gray color for the fitness activity center building seems "colder" than the other buildings.
8. Vice Chair Wignot requested that staff update the project description to clarify that the access ramp is existing and that a new ramp will not be constructed.

MOTION: Chair Branch moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-3, No. 08-023-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, with the following conditions: 1) the bollards shall be louvered bollards; 2) a warmer gray color shall be used for the fitness activity center building; 3) the final plans shall include a note that all *vinca* species shall be removed; and 4) the applicant shall provide all plans required for Final review including irrigation and landscape plans; and to continue to continue to April 8, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-030-DRB

7357 Elmhurst Place (APN 073-224-002)

This is a request for *Final* 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. (Last heard on 3-25-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-25-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Comments:

1. Member Wignot expressed concerns that the proposed addition places the occupancy area closer to the adjacent neighbor, and requested that the applicant provide cut sheets showing that the doorway lamp and the interior lighting are downward-lit so there will not be light shining at night across the fence.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 08-030-DRB, 7357 Elmhurst Place, as submitted, with the condition that the applicant provide cut sheets showing

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 4 of 25

that the ceiling fan lights and the door light will be downward lit; and to continue to April 8, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

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 3-25-08, 3-11-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Staff recommendation to continue project to May 13, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-25-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Comments:

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended that Item H-1, No. 08-013-DRB, be continued to April 8, 2008, because the applicant did not incorporate the notes and conditions of Preliminary Approval into the plans, which need to be shown.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-1, No. 08-013-DRB, 6860 Cortona Drive, to April 8, 2008, for Final review, with the following conditions from Preliminary Approval to be incorporated into the plans: 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.

H-2. 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

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 5 of 25

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 3-11-08*, 2-26-08*, 2-12-08*, 1-23-08*, 1-08-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

Staff recommendation to continue project to April 22, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-08-08 Meeting:

Comments:

1. The preference for lighting is downward halo-lit illumination which is fully shielded. The applicant is requested to restudy and provide cut sheets that show lighting that is fully shielded. The illumination should be restricted to just lighting the sign. A suggestion was made that the applicant possibly consider two simple lights that can be fully shielded.
2. Possibly consider a pole light standard to provide lighting at the corner instead of a light for the sign. A pole light would also be a decorative feature for the landscaping.
3. The applicant is requested to address concerns with staff regarding the sight distance and placement of the sign, and to show that the placement of the sign is consistent with the site plan.
4. The applicant is requested to provide the landscape plan showing the new sign.
5. The design of the sign is fine.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION: By consensus (Recused: Schneider) the Sign Subcommittee continued Item H-3, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to January 23, 2008, with comments.

H-3. 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

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 6 of 25

owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 08-024-OSP; -CUP. (Last heard on 3-25-08, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-25-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Comments:

1. There does not appear to be a need for two signs on the activity center building which is a small building. The sign on Page 9 of the plans seems redundant.
2. Member Schneider clarified that the Overall Sign Plan (OSP) should address signs for all tenants on this parcel as well as the signs for Citrix Online. He recommended that the language in the text of the OSP propose that the existing signs for the other existing tenants remain in place, and that there would be some criteria for signs should the other existing tenants change.
3. The Sign Subcommittee recommended that Item H-2, No-08-024-DRB, be continued to April 8, 2008, with the following conditions: a) one of the activity center signs shall be omitted which is the sign on Page 9; b) the text for the OSP shall be provided; c) the OSP text shall propose that the existing signs for the other existing tenants remain in place and include language with criteria for the signs should the tenants change; and d) the applicant shall provide additional pictures and mapping of existing signage, and calculations of the square footage of the signage area.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item H-2, No. 08-024-DRB, 7408-7412 Hollister Avenue, to April 8, 2008, with the following conditions: 1) one of the activity center signs on the building shall be omitted, which is the sign on Page 9; 2) the text for the Overall Sign Plan (OSP) shall be provided; 3) the OSP text shall propose that the existing signs for the other existing tenants on the parcel remain in place and include language with criteria for the signs should the tenants change; and 4) the applicant shall provide pictures and mapping of existing signage and also provide calculations of the areas of the signage.

H-4. 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 3-25-08*, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Applicant request to continue project to April 22, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 7 of 25

3-11-08 Meeting

Comments:

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.
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 3-25-08*, 2-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 8 of 25

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.
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

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-230-DRB

7154 Tuolumne Drive (APN 077-104-019)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,254-square foot residence with an attached 441-square foot 2-car garage on a

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 9 of 25

7,245-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 787-square feet in additions, consisting of a 664-square foot second-floor addition, and a 123-square foot interior stairwell leading up to the second-floor addition. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,482 square feet, consisting of a 2,041-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 441-square foot 2-car garage. This proposal is within the maximum floor area guidelines for this property, which is 2,241 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence; however the existing aluminum sliding windows will be replaced with vinyl. The project was filed by agent Fernando Vega on behalf of Maria Teresa and Jose Castillo, property owners. Related cases: 03-093-DRB, -LUP; 07-230-LUP. (Last heard on 2-26-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-26-08 Meeting:

Comments:

1. Member Brown stated that she is not supportive of the plans as submitted. She commented: a) the project seems too massive for the neighborhood; b) some of the mass should be scaled back; and c) there may be parking issues with the number of bedrooms.
2. Member Smith expressed concern that the wall on the east elevation seems like a huge blank wall, stating that it would be nice to have something to break it up, although windows should not be looking down into someone's yard.
3. Member Schneider suggested the applicant study removing the upstairs TV room which hangs over the porch and adds mass to the building. This would cut off some of the building and it would become less massive to the neighbor, and would also provide for more lighting below. The massing from the front elevation is fine.
4. Chair Branch commented: a) the project seems too massive and should be scaled back; b) the suggestion to remove the TV room would solve the concern that the massing should be scaled back; c) there are other two-story homes in the neighborhood; d) the mass from the front (street) elevation is fine; and e) the east elevation is somewhat stark.
5. Member Herrera recommended adding the detail to the front part because of the situation of the columns.
6. The elevations needs to be better delineated to make them read easier.
7. Chair Branch advised that if a second-story deck is proposed by the applicant, privacy concerns would probably need to be addressed.
8. Member Messner commented that if a deck is considered, from his observation the neighbor's backyard is situated somewhat above the site, and that the applicant may want to consider the relationship of the deck to the neighbors.
9. Vice Chair Wignot commented that he believes the DRB needs to be mindful when making a decision that the property owner and applicant have put some time and money into a previous project, in a slightly different style, that was approved by the DRB.
10. Staff is requested to contact the next-door neighbor, facing the east elevation mass, who submitted a speaker slip but was not present to speak, regarding the

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 10 of 25

continuation of the hearing. (Note: Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz encouraged the applicant to contact the neighbor directly to discuss the project prior to returning with plans.)

STRAW VOTES:

How many DRB members are in favor of keeping the floor plan mass as the project is currently proposed?

Members voting in the affirmative: Herrera, Smith, Wignot. (3).

How many DRB members are in favor of reducing the floor plan mass?

Members voting in the affirmative: Branch, Brown, Messner, Schneider. (4).

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-2, No. 07-230-DRB, 7154 Tuolumne Drive, to April 8, 2008, with the comment that the applicant shall study the removal of the TV room upstairs and also the covered portion of the downstairs patio area to reduce the mass of the second-floor addition, and discuss the plans with the property owners.

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 further *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

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 11 of 25

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 2-12-08*, 01-23-08*, 12-18-07, 12-04-07, 11-06-07) (Scott Kolwitz)

Applicant request to continue project to May 28, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-18-07 Meeting:

1. The environmental buffers need to be shown on the site plans to help understand the constraints and potential impacts on the site, during the conceptual review.
2. The applicant is requested to provide all information required for conceptual review including photographs and site statistics, and to delineate the materials in the parking lot to understand the concept for the pavers and the drainage.
3. Generally, the mass, bulk, scale, and height of the project are fine, except for concerns regarding the tower massing and design which need further study. The ridge of the building is fairly close to the height of the buildings across the street.
4. Comments Regarding the Tower/Dome: The tower location has changed which minimizes the impact to the view sheds at the intersection, but there are concerns that impacts to the views from the park may be increased. Chair Branch has no concerns regarding the shape of the dome but he is concerned that the base that the dome rests upon seems massive. He would prefer the tower to be more of an architectural element rather than a wing on its own. Member Schneider has concerns regarding the massing of the tower. Member Messner suggested that the dome radius be more rounded with the massing reduced, and meshing the dome with the building rather than standing alone. Member Smith expressed concerns regarding the proportion of the dome to the building and also regarding the scale of the base that the dome rests upon. He suggested exploring the idea of a reasonable dome size which was proposed in the e-mail from Gary Vandeman.
5. The public has expressed concerns regarding the impact of the project on the view from the Lake Los Carneros preserve. Consider a method to require that the applicant plant some trees on the park property within approximately five to fifteen feet of the property line to help screen the property, possibly as an off-site mitigation. Suggest planting a few trees now to serve as future replacement trees.
6. Member Schneider suggested that the applicant consider negotiating for an agreement with the commercial site located across Calle Real for conjunctive use parking. He commented that one of the factors related to this review is that the entire block is open space property. He stated that the following items that

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 12 of 25

- have been reviewed previously are fine: lighting and landscaping plans, color scheme for the buildings, and the architectural style, except for the dome.
7. Member Messner stated that he has concerns about parking and requested information regarding the Fire department comments regarding maximum occupancy. Member Messner stated that fruit bearing olive trees should not be planted on the front area of the property as the droppings will cause a safety issue for pedestrians and will also increase street maintenance for the City. If fruit bearing olive trees are desired, they should be planted on the back area of the property to ensure that the property owner is responsible for the maintenance. Member Messner recommended that the trees in front should be substantial in size. He also recommended considering steel tree wells for the trees in the parking lot as this will allow for more room for the tree roots and parking. The steel tree wells will be level to the ground and cars will be able to drive over it. He suggested the applicant review the City's planting and street tree guidelines.
 8. Chair Branch commented that the proposed use for the project is less intense than what is currently allowed per the zoning designation for the site.
 9. Member Smith stated that the view from the Highway 101 overpass at Los Carneros is one of the most outstanding views in the area.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Herrera, Wignot) to continue to January 23, 2008, Item K-2, No. 03-051-DRB, located at the northeast corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, with comments and for plans to be provided that define the environmental buffers to better understand the constraints.

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-180-DRB

5737 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-033-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property consists of an existing single family dwelling and detached garage on a 6,227-square foot lot in the R-2 zone district. The existing single family home and garage will be demolished, to be followed by the construction of a two-story duplex. The proposed project is a one-lot subdivision of a 0.14-acre lot for condominium purposes to create a duplex structure, consisting of two (2) attached residential airspace units. Unit #1 (front unit) will be 3 bedrooms, 2.75 baths and would total 1,999 square feet, while Unit #2 (rear unit) will be 3 bedrooms, 2.5 baths and would total 1,735 square feet. The proposed building coverage on site will be 2,077 square feet or 33% of the 6,227 square foot lot. Landscaping will consist of 2,495 square feet or 40% of the existing lot; paved areas consist of 1,665 square feet or 27% of the existing lot. The proposed Floor-to-Area ratio (FAR), including garage areas, is 0.60. The maximum height of the structure is 25'-7". Discretionary approval for a Modification to required front and rear yard setbacks is also requested. The project was filed by Troy White of Dudek Engineering and Environmental, agent, for Eva and Silvino Guerrero, property owners. Related cases: 07-180-TPM; -M; -LUP. (Last heard on 03-11-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-11-08 Meeting:

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 13 of 25

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the size of the project cannot be supported in this neighborhood of smaller houses; b) the project is rather ambitious and the square footages are generous; c) no modifications are supported particularly when large structures and sidewalks are added which affect the proportionality of the scale of the neighborhood; d) a bigger single-family home would be preferred; e) concern that there would be a lot of hardscape, therefore, not be much room for landscaping; f) the architecture is nice; and g) the addition of bioswales is appreciated; and h) condominiums are a new concept in the neighborhood.
2. Vice Chair Wignot agreed with the comments made by Member Brown regarding the ambitiousness of the project. He commented; a) the lower entry layout to Unit #2 does not appear very attractive; b) the projects seems to give more attention to the garages and cars than to Unit #2; c) concern that the turning area for the cars seems to be very difficult; d) suggested a way to address the turning issue would be to eliminate the garage to the west of Unit #2 and provide four parallel parking spaces underneath the building; and e) there is too much floor space and the parking is problematic.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) the modifications and setbacks are acceptable; b) overall, the design is pleasant including the character and some detailing although he has suggestions regarding some architectural details; c) some potential privacy problems could be resolved by addressing the windows; d) with regard to the neighborhood, consider reducing the project, possibly decreasing the number of bedrooms in one or both units; e) staff is requested to research possibilities for modifications to parking design that could improve the appearance of the entry to Unit #2; and f) the neighbor's concerns regarding utilization of the property are somewhat beyond the purview of the DRB and may need to be addressed at the Zoning Administrator level.
4. Member Smith concurred with Member Schneider's comments. He commented: a) the turning room and accessibility to the garages seem problematic; b) there needs to be consideration with regard to providing room on the site for trash purposes; c) he supports the modifications; and d) the style of the massing is fine.
5. Member Messner commented: a) he has concerns regarding safety and Fire Department accessibility with the ten-foot wide driveway and a long, narrow way to the back unit; b) the bioswale solution does not seem to serve the purpose; c) the turn-around area for cars in the driveway does not seem to have enough room; and d) the project needs to be scaled back to fit in the neighborhood.
6. Member Herrera commented: a) suggested locating the parking to the west side of the property underneath Unit #2 with all four cars parked in a row underneath the structure where there would be enough room to turn around; b) consider removing one bedroom, and possibly one bathroom, from Unit #2; and c) consider permeable pavers in the driveway or split concrete to allow drainage.
7. Chair Branch commented: a) agreed with comments from Members Schneider and Smith, and with Member Brown that the project is too big; b) the project appears to be an improvement from the previous proposed project on the site and well thought-out; c) the entry area to Unit #2 needs some reconfiguration; d) the modifications seem appropriate; and e) the drainage concerns will need to be mitigated; and f) the lot is small for an R-2 zone.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 14 of 25

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 07-180-DRB, 5737 Armitos Avenue, to April 8, 2008, with comments.

M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-208-DRB

401 Storke Road (APN 073-440-019)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is a vacant 3.02 acres (131,551 square feet) commercial property in the Retail Commercial (C-2) zone district with an Airport Approach Zone F(APR) overlay. The applicant proposes to construct a 73,828-square foot two-story 99-room service hotel. The hotel is proposed to have a Spanish architectural design to compliment the Camino Real Marketplace.

The first-floor is proposed as 42,480 habitable square feet with 7,043 square feet of decks, and the second-floor is proposed as 31,348 habitable square feet with 2,705 square feet of balconies. The proposed building coverage is 32.3%, and the proposed Floor-Area-Ratio is 56.1%. The proposed mean height of the structure is 32 feet, proposed second-story peak roof heights range from 25 to 35 feet, and proposed tower peaks are 38 and 48 feet.

A total of 99 rooms would be constructed, of which 47 rooms would be located on the first-floor and 52 rooms would be located on the second-floor. The majority of rooms would be 464 square feet in size with some larger rooms of 639 square feet, and a large 1,445-square foot two-bedroom suite would be provided. A porte cochere is proposed at the front lobby. No restaurant is proposed within the service hotel, but a service area to prepare continental breakfasts and afternoon snacks would be available for guests. Additionally, a meeting room, small board room, fitness room, business center, lounge, pool, spa, fire pits, fountains and patios are proposed as guest amenities. Noise attenuation measures, which include insulation in the exterior walls and roof and insulated glass, are proposed. The applicant anticipates the hotel to be LEED certified. New materials consist of the following:

- A plaster (smooth trowel) finish with the following colors:
 - Wall: White (Frazee #001)
 - Trim, Surround & Cornice: Staghorn (Frazee #8731W)
 - Wainscot: Walnut Wash (Frazee #8733M)
 - Windows, Doors & Railing: Peppercorn (Frazee #8615D)
- Roof Tile
 - Clay Mission Tiles (Two-piece blended clay barrel tiles)
- Wood Trellis
 - Taupe – Olympic Stain
- Stone
 - Cantera Stone

Vehicular ingress and egress is proposed from Storke Road and Phelps Road. A 40-foot wide driveway apron would front on Storke Road, and a 30-foot wide

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 15 of 25

driveway apron would front on Phelps Road. A landscaped buffer along Storke Road and Phelps Road would be expanded and replace landscaping currently installed. A bus stop would be improved as required by MTD. No additional frontage improvements are proposed to Storke Road or Phelps Road as frontage improvements, which included street lights, utilities, and meandering sidewalks, were installed during construction of the Camino Real Project in the late 1990s.

Onsite vehicular circulation would be provided by a 24-foot wide drive aisle with a minimum of a 14-foot height clearance. A total of 112 parking spaces, of which 5 parking spaces would be ADA compliant, are proposed. An additional storage area has been proposed for a total of 14 bicycles. Pedestrian circulation would be provided through 4-foot wide sidewalk segments, and would connect the hotel entrances and exits to Storke Road, Phelps Road, and the adjacent park.

An architecturally screened trash/recycling and an electrical transformer area is proposed near the northwest corner of the parcel.

Additional proposed grading would consist of 2,500-cubic yards of cut and 2,500-cubic yards of fill. The applicant proposes stormwater catch basins/drains and pollution prevention interceptors onsite and bioswales both onsite and within the right-of-way to avoid cross lot drainage.

A Mediterranean landscape palette is proposed and was in part design to compliment landscaping at the Camino Real Marketplace. The proposed landscape coverage is 24.5%, which is not inclusive of the 16,000 square feet of landscaping located within the right-of-way.

The applicant is requesting a modification under Article III, Section 35-317.8.1 to allow 28 parking spaces to encroach into the southern front yard setback and to allow 30 parking spaces to encroach into the rear yard setback.

The project was filed by Kimberly A. Schizas on behalf of Camino Real III, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 95-SP-001, 96-EIR-3, 07-208-GP, 07-208-SP, 07-208-DP, 07-208-LUP. (Scott Kolwitz)

M-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-229-DRB

10 South Kellogg Avenue (APN 071-090-082)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 4,400-square foot, two-story warehouse/office, an 875-square foot garage, and a 1,750-square foot carport for a total of floor area of 7,025-square feet on an 89,628-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes the demolition of all existing structures and grading involving approximately 610-cubic yards of cut and 1,950-cubic yards of fill to prep the site for the construction of a 3-story self-storage facility comprised of 3 separate, 3-story buildings with both drive-up and interior storage units. The project also includes an office/sales space and an onsite manager's apartment.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 16 of 25

Building A would be 36,055 square feet with 1,025 square feet devoted to office/sales use and include a 2-story manager's apartment of 1,428 square feet. Building B would be 37,890 square feet, all of which would be devoted to storage. Building C would be 37,785 square feet, all of which would be devoted to storage space. A total of 48 parking spaces would be provided and the property's perimeter would be fenced and gated.

The project also includes upgraded water service from the Goleta Water District, connection to the Goleta Sanitary District sewer system, electrical upgrades, grading and installation of drainage structures on the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way to improve drainage from Highway 101 and the railroad in the vicinity of the project site.

Landscaping for the project will include landscape improvements in the parking areas and around the perimeter of the property, as well as in the area adjacent to San Jose Creek. No native or specimen trees will be removed for project construction.

New materials consist of metal building panels and related trim pieces with "signature 200" siliconized polyester finishes. New colors/other materials consist of the following:

- Primary wall color: Light stone
 - Window and door trim: Colony green
- Primary Accent wall color: Desert Sand
 - Window and door trim: Colony green
- Secondary accent wall color: Colony green
 - Wall coping: To match wall color
- Window and door awnings: Colony green
- Windows and doors: Dark ionized aluminum
- Roll up doors: Desert sand
- Gutters: Colony green
- Down spouts: To match wall color
- Trash Enclosures: CMU block walls with low sloping roofs to match the storage buildings.

The project was filed by agent Gregory C. Rech of Architects West on behalf of Schwan Brothers, South Kellogg Properties (Tom Schwan), property owner. Related cases: 07-229-GPAM, 07-229-DP, 07-229-CUP. (Last heard on 3-11-08, 2-26-08) (Laura Vlk)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-11-08 Meeting:

Comments:

1. Member Brown commented:

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 17 of 25

- a. This project will be an improvement to what exists; however, the massing of the building is an issue. Suggest adding more architectural interest in the roofline to soften the big line of buildings seen when driving east on Highway 101.
 - b. Lighting on the north side is not appropriate and would draw prominence to the building.
 - c. All lighting fixtures, including bollards, need to be fully shielded, with downward facing light, with no glare or light trespass. The bollards at the Best Western Inn on Calle Real are an example of bollards with downward facing light.
 - d. The lighting in the parking lot should be more evenly lighted. The lighting plan appears to have some hot and dark spots.
 - e. Native plantings such as honeysuckle are encouraged.
 - f. Planting canopy trees in the areas between the buildings to keep the pavement cool is encouraged.
 - g. The landscape plans at the San Jose Creek area are appreciated including the canopy over the creek.
 - h. The darker colors in the renderings are preferred rather than the color board.
2. Member Schneider commented:
- a. The massing of the building on the north side is his main concern because it is visible when seen from the freeway, particularly after the removal of the existing vegetation which will take some time to grow back up.
 - b. Recommended some more architectural play of the massing on the north side, more than the proposed five feet, to soften the massing that would result in a perceived two-story element which steps up to the three-story element when viewed from the freeway.
 - c. Agreed with Member Brown's comments regarding lighting.
 - d. The lights on the north side are not needed.
 - e. Canopy trees in the parking lot are appropriate and recommended.
 - f. This site is very difficult because it is narrow and long, being "sandwiched" between the train tracks and Highway 101, however, the site plan is fine.
 - g. Consider switching the color of the major mass of the building from the proposed lighter color, noting that the proposed plans also call for the darker colors on the recessed elements and the lighter colors on the forward elements.
 - h. The proposed materials are appropriate.
3. Vice Chair Wignot commented:
- a. Agreed with the comments that there should be more effort to screen and soften the massing of the building on the north side with landscaping and architectural features.
 - b. The Lash property to the west of the site provides some initial screening of the massing of the building when driving eastbound on Highway 101.
 - c. The project is moving in a good direction.
4. Member Smith commented:
- a. The massing of the building is appreciated. He does not have a problem with it.
 - b. Overall, he appreciates that this is an industrial building in an industrial area.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 18 of 25

- c. Agreed with comments from Members Brown and Schneider regarding the lighting items and expressed concern regarding the accent lights shining on the north side facing the freeway.
 - d. Planting canopy trees in the parking area is recommended to provide shade.
5. Member Messner commented:
- a. The colors on the building are fine, with some earthy tones, and blend well.
 - b. Suggest the incorporation of permeable paving; however, the existing plan to catch runoff is appreciated.
 - c. Recommended using plantings that act as a filter for the runoff into the creek.
 - d. Consider using solar energy as an option, noting that rebates may be available.
 - e. Requested another species be selected to replace the Eucalyptus plantings.
 - f. The proposed plantings are appreciated except the Eucalyptus species.
 - g. Planting number counts need to be included on the final drawings.
6. Member Herrera commented:
- a. Recommended using plantings that act as a filter for the runoff into the creek.
 - b. The proposed plans for the building and the colors are appreciated.
 - c. The landscape plans are fine.
7. Chair Branch commented:
- a. Overall, the project is very nice and a welcomed improvement for the site.
 - b. Agreed with Member Brown that the darker colors in the renderings are preferred to the color board, stating that the earth tones come out more.
 - c. Agreed with the DRB members' comments regarding lighting.
 - d. It would be worthy for the applicant to study the massing on the north side stating that the interplay of two-stories with the three-story elements could potentially change the roofline which would be helpful; hopefully without reducing square footage.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-2, No. 07-229-DRB, 10 South Kellogg Avenue, to April 8, 2008, with comments.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

N-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-037-DRB

Cathedral Oaks/Highway 101 Interchange

This is a request for further *Advisory* review. The proposed project includes the removal of the existing Cathedral Oaks Road/Hollister Avenue/US Highway 101 bridge over U.S. Highway 101 and bridge over Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and the construction of new bridges to align with the existing terminus of Cathedral Oaks Road. The proposed overcrossing (US Highway 101) and overhead (UPRR) bridges would accommodate a 12-foot vehicle lane in each direction, one 12-foot center left turn pocket lane/median, 5-foot shoulders/bike lanes in each direction, and a 6-foot sidewalk located on the west side. The project was filed by Caltrans, in association with the City of Goleta. (Last heard on 01-23-08*, 11-06-07*, 10-16-

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 19 of 25

07*, 08-21-07, 07-17-07; 05-02-06) Related case: 05-037-DP. (Rosemarie Gaglione; Laura Bridley)

Applicant request to continue project to May 13, 2008

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

08-21-07 Meeting:

1. Member Brown requested that the project landscape architect consider substituting the *Rhamnus* species for the *Toyon* (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) species which is a nice, colorful, larger shrub and is good for the habitat because birds are attracted to its red berries. She said that there are existing *Toyon* plantings at the Patterson area offramp.
2. Member Messner said the *Toyon* species has different size and growth habits, such as low-growth, medium and high, and suggested that some variances be considered. He agreed with Member Brown that *Toyon* is a better choice.
3. Member Messner requested that the landscape architect consider adding some *Matilija poppies* to the planting mix.
4. Member Messner expressed concern that the *Ceanothus* species, cultivar *Yankee Point*, does not have a very long life and may not last longer than a few years.
5. Member Messner said he appreciates the *Sycamore* and *Live Oak* species but would prefer another species rather than the *Eucalyptus* trees, such as the *Cork Oak*, if possible. Member Brown agreed with Member Messner and noted that *Eucalyptus* trees are existing on the plans. Staff will check with Caltrans regarding how other tree species would fare at this location.
6. The DRB requests that Caltrans consider the comments regarding changes in the planting palette and that staff report back.
7. Vice Chair Wignot requested that staff report back regarding whether the City is developing a landscape plan for the Hollister/Cathedral Oaks intersection. He suggested using similar plant material selections that are elsewhere.
8. Member Schneider requested that staff report back regarding Caltrans' plans for landscape repair work that is needed at the area where the removed bridge was located near the Hollister/Cathedral Oaks intersection.
9. The DRB appreciates that the recessed treatment will be on both the inside and outside of the bridge.
10. The DRB requests that staff provide exhibits of the architectural treatments for the paved slopes when received from Caltrans for DRB review.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 7 to 0 vote that further Advisory review was conducted for Item L-1, No. 05-037-DRB, Cathedral Oaks Interchanges, and to continue to October 16, 2007, with comments.

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 20 of 25

P. ADJOURNMENT

* Indicates applicant request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 21 of 25

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

April 8, 2008

Page 22 of 25

- 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

April 8, 2008

Page 23 of 25

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

April 8, 2008

Page 24 of 25

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

April 8, 2008

Page 25 of 25

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.