



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, April 22, 2008**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.**

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### **SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.**

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

### **STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.**

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

### **ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.**

### **REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.**

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

#### **Members:**

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 22, 2008

Page 2 of 21

## A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

## B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for April 8, 2008

### B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

### B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

### B-4. CHAIR & VICE-CHAIR ELECTIONS

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. 07-206-DRB

163 Aero Camino (APN 073-070-004)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 16,450-square foot industrial/office building on a 43,560-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to install a liquid nitrogen distribution tank screened with pultruded I-bar cladding. The proposal includes a remodel of the exterior façade including new plaster screen walls, a new entry feature, and framing and plastering over existing vertical supports. The proposal includes replacing the existing onsite sidewalk in front of the building with pavers, and drought resistant planters. New parking striping and curbing are also proposed to improve circulation and access to parking. No additional floor area is proposed with this submittal. The project was filed by agent David Jones with Lenvik & Minor Architects on behalf of Marc Winnikoff, property owner. Related cases: 65-V-025, 65-V-008, 74-DP-024. (Continued from 3-11-08, 2-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **3-11-08 Meeting:**

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Wignot requested that the applicant provide information at Final review to confirm that the cladding material is UV-resistant and designed for exterior use so that it will not begin to disintegrate over time. He expressed concern that some compounds do not stand up to exposed sunlight over time.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 3 of 21

**MOTION:** Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-2, No. 07-206-DRB, 163 Aero Camino, with the following conditions: 1) the lighting fixtures shall be fully shielded and downward oriented; 2) the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets at Final review; and 3) the applicant shall provide cladding material spec sheets at Final review that confirm that the material is UV-resistant and designed for exterior use; and to continue to April 22, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

### H. SIGN CALENDAR

#### H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-211-DRB

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The applicant proposes to install a two sided freestanding entry sign for the Patterson Place Apartments measuring a maximum of 4-feet 4-inches tall by 8-feet wide. The sign area is proposed to be approximately 18 ½ -inches by 7-feet 4-inches for an aggregate of approximately 11 square feet on each side of the structure. The non-illuminated sign shall have aluminum pin mounted flat cut out (F.C.O.) "Burnt Crimson" lettering. The portion of the sign reading "Patterson Place" will have 6-inch high letters, the portion of the sign reading "APARTMENTS" will have 4-inch high letters, and the address portion of the sign will have 4 ½ -inch high letters. The sign would be located approximately 9-feet east of the edge of public right-of-way and approximately 36-feet north of the Patterson Place Apartments entrance. No logos are allowed as part of the sign. The application was filed by agent Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, property owner. Related case: 74-CP-39, 07-211-SCC. (Last heard on 4-8-08\*, 3-11-08\*, 2-26-08\*, 2-12-08\*, 1-23-08\*, 1-08-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

#### **Applicant request for continuance to May 13, 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.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 4 of 21

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-2. 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 4-08-08\*, 3-25-08\*, 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **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.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 5 of 21

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

- NONE

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

#### K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 37-SB-DRB

Cabrillo Business Park; 6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Preliminary review*. The property includes two screened storage areas and nine buildings totaling 326,490 square feet on a 92.25-acre lot in the Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Buildings 1, 2, 4 and associated improvements, improvements for the private internal drive, and street and frontage improvements to Hollister Avenue and Los Carneros Road as part of the phased build out of the previously approved Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 1 would be a two-story, 80,000-square foot structure and Buildings 2 and 4 would both be two-story, 60,000-square foot structures. Associated improvements for each building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, and parking. New materials consist of concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out, the Cabrillo Business Park would total 946,282 square feet, including 704,600 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. The project was filed by agent Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN. (Continued from 4-20-04, 3-16-04, 2-17-04\*, 1-6-04, 12-2-03) (Cindy Moore)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **4-20-04 Meeting**

Comments:

1. Plant the Arbutus Marina trees that are spaced very regularly along the curving walkway more informally or in groupings, because the regular planting placement

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 6 of 21

- seems out of kilter with the random placement of trees in the parking lots and along Hollister Avenue.
2. The berming along Hollister Avenue is appreciated, as is anything that can be done to separate pedestrians and traffic.
  3. Instead of having a repetitive tree screen all along Los Carneros Drive, leave some space so people driving by will have a view of the open space.
  4. It is important for the community to have a visual connection to the open space from Los Carneros Drive.
  5. Appreciate the front area being more of an entryway rather than a monument.
  6. Suggest drawing and welcoming people into the site, such as with some plant or paving materials.
  7. Consider something such as a separate kind of paving that would designate special areas for the public to indicate the public is welcome.
  8. The plant palette is good and provides a great foundation. Given the size of the project, increasing the plant list will make it more interesting.
  9. Consider using more Mediterranean, domesticated exotics in the plant palettes.
  10. Santa Barbara County contains less than 10% of the total species of California native plants, and it would be appropriate to select a Mediterranean palette that includes California natives that are not necessarily endemic to southern Santa Barbara County.
  11. Restudy planting Alder trees on the berms with drought tolerant planting because Alders naturally occur in streambeds and are high water-users, which doesn't seem to be an appropriate ecological combination. There would be a need for extra water usage to make it work. Oaks would be more appropriate for those raised areas.
  12. The planting, which is primarily native and Mediterranean drought tolerant, should survive with little water once it is established.
  13. Recommend excluding plants that will require pruning unless there will be provisions for appropriate maintenance.
  14. Suggest checking the availability of the California Fan Palm on the commercial market because of the pink bud rot issues.
  15. Suggest considering installing pathways in the parking lots to help alleviate people trampling through landscaping.
  16. Suggest that large, native plants be included to screen storage buildings.
  17. There needs to be an assurance that there will be adequate screening of the outside storage space if future storage uses involve equipment that would not be covered by current screening.
  18. Providing an informal opening to the K-Mart area would encourage pedestrian use.
  19. At the entrance way where trucks will be entering, provide adequate screening with a combination of plantings and berms.
  20. Suggest naming the open space to provide it with an identity, as a place the community would like to visit.

**ACTION: Item #I-1, No. 37-SB-DRB, received the above conceptual comments.**

**Vice-Chair Brown stated that Item #I-1, No. 37-SB-DRB, will be taken off calendar while the discretionary planning process continues.**

### **K-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-059-DRB**

5575 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-090-085)

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 7 of 21

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 3-25-08, 2-26-08, 9-18-07, 08-21-07) (Cindy Moore)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **3-25-08 Meeting:**

Comments:

1. The plans do not document that the windows on the side of the building facing the Kellogg Ranch are fixed windows.
2. The proposed colors do not seem to match existing which is the intent.
3. There is concern that the bollard lighting is shining sideways.
4. Member Brown expressed concern that the lighting around the bollards is very uneven with some light trespass and recommended that the lighting be directed downward and that the foot-candle numbers be reevaluated in another lighting study.
5. Member Brown and Member Wignot expressed concern that there would be a glow above the fence on the southern side facing the Kellogg Ranch project with the proposed lighting plan and that it would not be fair to impose this additional type of lighting particularly with all-night lighting.
6. Member Schneider agreed with the concept of using bollards and keeping the level of the lighting low; however a different bollard fixture needs to be selected with the lighting shielded downward.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-1, No. 05-059-DRB, 5575 Armitos Avenue, to April 22, 2008, with the following comments: 1) the applicant shall provide a color chip for the doors that matches the color of the existing doors; 2) a notation shall be added to the plans to document that the two windows shall be fixed that are facing the adjacent Kellogg Ranch adjacent to the southern property line; and 3) a new bollard type light shall be selected that shields the light downward and the applicant shall provide an updated photometric plan showing the light dispersal.**

**L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR**

**L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-095-DRB**

7121 Del Norte Drive (APN 077-113-003)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an existing approximately 36-square foot balcony, an existing approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, and a 390-square foot 2-car carport on a 6,300-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to permit a 120-square foot garden shed, 76-square foot fire pit and 50-square foot Jacuzzi, to construct a 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis, and to expand the approximately 36-square foot balcony to an approximately 108-square foot balcony that would be partially supported by the existing carport. Access from the proposed second-story balcony extension to the top of the carport is not proposed. The resulting 2-story structure would be a 2,574-square foot residence (including a converted garage), an approximately 108-square foot balcony, an approximately 50-square foot exterior staircase, a 390-square foot 2-car carport, a 120-square foot garden shed, a 76-square foot fire pit, a 50-square foot Jacuzzi, and 208-square foot outdoor Bar-B-Que with work area with an 8-foot tall trellis. This existing permitted structure is above the recommended maximum allowable floor area for this property, which is 1,984 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage; however, as the proposed project consists of non-habitable structures, the situation will not be exacerbated. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Victor Alvarez on behalf of Juan & Lola Zaragoza, property owners. Related cases: 05-095-LUP. (Continued from 2-26-08, 2-12-08\*, 1-23-08\*, 1-08-08, 10-16-07\*, 09-05-07\*, 08-21-07, 12-18-05\*) (Scott Kolwitz)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

**2-26-08 Meeting**

Comments:

1. The plans need to accurately reflect the existing conditions and show the proposed plans including the dimensions and materials. Accurate plans at the carport level and the balcony level are needed to understand the sizes. The front elevation needs to be consistent with the side elevations. There is a railing detail on the last page that does not show the existing detail, which need to match.
2. Member Smith commented: a) he does not have a concern with the design but there is a problem with the way the plans are presented; and b) the proposed square columns would be better than having something spindly which currently exists.
3. Chair Branch commented: a) suggested the applicant may consider pitching the carport roof to match the pitch of the house's roof which would suggest that the carport roof would not be used as a habitable area or for storage.

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.



## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 9 of 21

4. Member Brown requested that staff provide a condition of approval that would restrict access and use of the carport roof unless for temporary repair and maintenance, and possibly prohibit storage.
5. Member Schneider commented: a) accurate plans are needed; and b) the proposed blue color does not seem to fit with the rest of the color scheme.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-1, No. 05-095-DRB, 7121 Del Norte Drive, to April 22, 2008, with the following comments: 1) the applicant needs to provide clear and accurate architectural drawings that reflect both the existing conditions and the proposed plans, including the columns, and the balcony and its relationship to the carport; 2) the trellis and all other items not being proposed should be removed from the project plans; 3) the applicant shall provide clarity regarding what color will be painted on the structures; and 4) staff is requested to provide a condition of approval that would restrict access and use of the carport roof and not allow use for habitable purposes.**

### **L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-026-DRB**

7859 Rio Vista Drive (APN 079-600-034)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,180-square foot residence and an attached 462-square foot two-car garage (with a permitted partial garage conversion of 168 square feet) on a 6,534-square foot lot in the DR-4 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 623 square feet in additions (114 square feet on the first-floor and 509 square feet on a new second-floor). The resulting two-story structure would be 2,265 square feet, consisting of a 1,803-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 462-square foot two-car garage (with a permitted partial garage conversion of 168 square feet). This proposal is consistent with the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by Tony Xiques of Dexign Systems, agent, on behalf of Robert Andre, property owner. Related cases: 08-026-LUP. (Last heard on 3-11-08) (Shine Ling)

### **Applicant request for continuance to May 13, 2008**

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **3-11-08 Meeting:**

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Wignot stated that he cannot support the addition where it is proposed: He commented: a) the proposed addition in front would be too much mass located too close to the street and it is unappealing visually from the street; b) the design does not fit with the configuration of the existing house; c) the views from the second story may not necessarily impact the adjacent neighbors because the view would be onto their roofs and not their backyard; d) a second-story addition set further back on the property may work because the property is elevated immediately in the back; e) he drove around the entire San Miguel tract today and observed approximately six or eight two-story homes located

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 10 of 21

- intermittently within the tract; and f) most of the better designed two-story residences in the neighborhood are set back from the street.
2. Member Brown commented that the addition needs to be better integrated with the house and expressed concern that the proposed design appears to be a box on top of the garage.
  3. Member Smith stated that the two-story addition needs to be pushed back from the garage, brought off the street, and possibly centered above near the living room and garage mass.
  4. Member Schneider agreed with the previous comments from DRB members.
  5. Chair Branch agreed with the previous comments from DRB members. He noted that the hill to the back of the property would be advantageous with regard to pushing back the second-story addition. Window issues can be addressed regarding privacy concerns.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item K-4, No. 08-026-DRB, 7859 Rio Vista Drive, with comments, to April 22, 2008.**

### **L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-043-DRB**

Cambridge Drive Community Church; 550 Cambridge Drive (APN 069-560-030)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes an existing 2,640-square foot church sanctuary, an existing 1,450-square foot classroom building, and an existing 2,200-square foot office/classroom building on a 2.4-acre lot in the DR-3.3 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 449-square foot office addition to the education/classroom building. The resulting one-story structure would be 1,899 square feet. A 345-square foot as-built storage shed near the education/classroom building is also part of the scope of the project. No changes to the other buildings are proposed. All materials used for this project are to match the existing building. The project was filed by Donald Sharpe, architect, on behalf of Cambridge Drive Community Church, property owner. Related cases: 08-043-SCD; 08-043-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)

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.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 11 of 21

### 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
Townhouse (One-Bedroom)	6	774
Studio	6	566

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

<b>Unit Type</b>	<b>Number of Buildings</b>
Single-Family Residence	47
Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	4
(1) Townhouse (Three-Bedroom) and (2) Townhouse (Two-Bedroom)	9

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

# Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 12 of 21

(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-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

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 13 of 21

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. (Last heard on 3-25-08) (Cindy Moore & David Stone)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **3-25-08 Meeting:**

#### **Overall General Comments of DRB Members:**

1. The 60 percent open space area is appreciated.
2. The project seems dense and the site plan is too tight. Suggestions to address the density concerns included: consider deleting one or more units on the west end; consider different groupings of units; consider integrating single-family units with multi-family units; and consider more clusters of multi-family units rather than single-family homes.
3. Concerns were expressed with regard to the homes with east-west orientation that included solar access and landscaping issues. The western edge of the project seems tight on the site plan.
4. A pedestrian path is needed to provide access through the meadow area.
5. Other considerations included drainage, parking, landscaping, pedestrian paths, possible bike paths, circulation regarding trash pick-up, and how to address architecturally the impacts from Highway 101 and passing trains.
6. The architecture can be reviewed after further review of the site plan.
7. The applicant was requested to provide the following items: acoustic study, bio-study, drainage plan, locations of permeable pavers, updated landscape plan, designation of pedestrian paths, irrigation plan, placement and screening plan for check valves, streetscape showing the relationship of buildings to each other, a lighting plan showing street lights along the interior of the project and Hollister Avenue, and solar studies.

#### **Comments of Individual DRB Members:**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) the 60 percent open space area needs to be understood and appreciated but some areas in the project seem too tight; b) he has some concerns regarding the orientation of the east-west homes; c) the western edge of the project seems tight with regard to the front of the units and the wall; d) consider pushing back the row of houses along Hollister Avenue, increasing the setback, perhaps removing one or more units (noting that Hollister Avenue is not particularly pedestrian-friendly); e) the northwestern edge seems tight but this may be an issue with the plans; f) consider tree pockets, or other landscape solutions, in addition to the vines that cover the sound wall; g) the conceptual plans to soften the connection with the open space is appreciated but from a functional standpoint consider an option to add a raised walkway through the center of the meadow; h) on the east side, the individual parking spaces do not seem like they are available for general public parking and additional parking needs to be considered, possibly in some groupings; i) the applicant is requested to consider whether bike paths can be accommodated along Hollister Avenue,

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 14 of 21

- for example with regard to the highway overpass project; j) reconsider the meandering walkway with regard to the feeling that it is jammed against the curb and provide a feeling of safety for the pedestrians, possibly adding trees or moving the path a few feet away from the curb; k) conceptually, the intent and function of the drainage plan seem appropriate; l) the focus should continue on the site plan at this point; however, the architecture detailing will need to be addressed; m) it would seem logical to create a crosswalk to allow pedestrians to walk to the trail at the Sperling Preserve; n) the applicant is requested to study the circulation regarding trash pick-up.
2. Chair Branch commented: a) overall, the project seems dense; b) the cluster units, particularly against the back of the site, do not seem to have much space and there may be parking problems; c) the design concept of placing the parking strips on the side of the buildings is creative but will probably not be perceived as a place to park for the general public; d) the site density seems tight for the units with the east-west orientation and he has concerns whether landscaping can grow in the east-west side yards; e) the open space area is appreciated; f) a pedestrian path across the meadow would be a key design feature now, otherwise a path will be created by residents; g) the architectural detailing which can be reviewed later should include concerns that some of the balconies seem to be too close and are facing neighbors; and h) in his opinion, it seems like there would be more room on the site for parking and things would not have to be so close together if there were more clusters of multi-family units rather than single-family homes.
  3. Member Messner commented: a) the applicant is requested to provide a lighting plan showing the street lights on the interior of the project and along Hollister Avenue; b) a path for access through the meadow needs to be provided; c) expressed concern that there are so few public parking spots available, and those that are available are in isolated areas, that homeowners close by who need more parking will be using these spaces for their own personal use; d) a drip irrigation system is preferred, rather than spray, because the landscaped areas are more narrow, so there won't be too much overflow; e) the applicant is requested to provide an irrigation plan; f) the applicant is requested to consider the creative placement of check valves and provide the plans showing the locations; g) recommended deleting the Creeping Fig vine because it is very invasive and requires a lot of maintenance; deleting the Blue Cape Plumbago because in a small area it would need to be trimmed more which would result in a large thick plant without seeing the flowers; deleting the Melaleuca tree species because of water usage concerns, deleting the Ceanothus Yankee Point species because it does not live very long, deleting the Dwarf Coyote Brush groundcover because it is prone to rot and mildew, and deleting the Eucalyptus tree species; h) agreed with the recommendation to delete the London Plane Tree; i) the Brisbane Box species is fine but I highly recommend the Monterey Cypress tree species. The Monterey Cypress tree flows well with the trees at the golf course across the street. The Monterey Cypress trees will do well in our coastal environment; j) recommended using those species of plants whose roots will act as filters in the drainage areas; k) the City's current Recommended Street Tree Planting List and planting standards will need to be consulted regarding street trees and planting guidelines along Hollister and Las Armas roads; l) the plans will need to reflect root barriers for street trees and sizes for the plantings in new developments. The plans and drawings will need to reflect the current approved planting guidelines for root barriers, street trees, and planting guidelines for new developments; and m) suggested consideration, with

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 15 of 21

- regard to vehicular circulation, of a possibly raised low wood bridge above the wetlands and grasslands to allow wildlife and water to move freely below.
4. Member Brown commented: a) agreed with the comments from the DRB members; b) pedestrian paths should be established to direct people and protect landscaping and open space; c) the applicant is requested to provide a streetscape to help understand the relationship of houses to the street and the relationship of each house to one another; d) the project density seems very tight; e) suggested that there may be a way to integrate some of the multi-family units with some of the single-family units to make better use of the space; f) expressed concerns regarding the garage doors opening to the front of the street and the front doors that are located against the fence; g) the front patios facing the street seem awkward; h) expressed concern that there will be noise from the railroad; i) there needs to be a better understanding regarding whether there is personal space for the multi-family units and how it can be accessed; j) there needs to be trees along the back fence and more trees on the site, particularly at the entrance way off of Hollister Avenue; k) the applicant is requested to provide the bio-study and acoustic study; l) the plant list needs to identify the plant species in the native meadow area; m) requested that the centralized mail area be beautified because typically centralized mail delivery points appear too industrial; n) she noted, from her experience living near developments with short driveways, that cars tend to hang off into the street because the driveway lengths are not long enough; o) the applicant is requested to delineate and articulate the pedestrian paths more clearly; p) requested that the applicant provide solar access studies for some of the multi-family homes and for the side yards of some single-family homes; q) suggested that carports might be a solution to some of the car issues which would encourage people to park their cars rather than use the space for storage; r) the landscape plan should include landscaping to screen utilities and address potential uses such as trash containers and "Mutt Mit" containers for dogs; and s) the architecture is fine but some of the massing will need to be addressed because some of the two-story dwellings are fairly massive and concentrated.
  5. Member Herrera commented: a) there needs to be a pedestrian path to connect the east and west which would protect the new plants; b) consider expanding the pedestrian area on the west end, possibly removing one or two units; c) suggested adding a couple of trash cans in the meadows area; d) requested that the applicant show where the permeable pavers will be located; e) anything that can be done to decrease the run-off levels, such as catch basins or pavers, would be helpful because historically there has been flooding from the creek downstream from the site; and e) with regard to drainage, filtering and cleaning the water will be appreciated.
  6. Member Smith commented: a) the concept of separating the front door entry and the vehicle entry is appreciated; b) the architecture is appreciated; c) the density, or scale, seems too tight, as though there is a lot trying to be done; d) the project would feel more comfortable if there were less units; and e) suggested that grouping the units together as duplexes instead of triplexes, particularly for the east-west oriented homes, would allow for sunlight to be reflected into yards and would also create a smoother transition from the multi-family units to the multi-family homes.
  7. Vice Chair Wignot commented: a) it would be useful to know the comments from the previous proposal for the site and what has changed; b) it is important that the drainage not generate any more run-off from the site than what is existing now because it would exacerbate the current situation downstream; c) the site plan seems very tight; d) expressed concern that the architectural plans show

## Design Review Board Agenda

April 22, 2008

Page 16 of 21

windows looking across into a neighbor's window; e) fewer units would alleviate some of the architectural constraints; f) the units that provide parking space for only one car may not work well and could increase the burden on parking allocated for visitors; g) the path across the open space is a good addition; for an example, consider the boardwalk at the Lake Los Carneros Preserve across an area of wetlands; h) the other paths should remain for public use; i) expressed support for leaving the Eucalyptus trees in the open space; j) agreed with Member Messner that the Melaleuca species is not appropriate for this site; k) expressed concern that there will be impacts on the site from noise and pollutants generated by Highway 101 and the passing trains; l) suggested that that the homes would need to be well engineered to address the potential for a vibration problem from the trains; and m) suggested consideration of design elements that would tie the project with the Ellwood School and with the Barnsdall gas station, which is part of the gateway to Goleta concept and may be restored.

**MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 07-102-DRB, Northwest corner of Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road, to April 22, 2008, with comments.**

### **N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- NONE

### **O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

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

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

### **P. ADJOURNMENT**



# Design Review Board Agenda

April 8, 2008

Page 17 of 21

## 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 18 of 21

- 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 19 of 21

## 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 20 of 21

## 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 21 of 21

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.