



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, January 13, 2009

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 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:

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair	Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)
Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair	Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Scott Branch (Architect)	Carl Schneider (Architect)
Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)	

Notices:

- Requests for review of project plans or change of scheduling should be made to the City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, 93117; Telephone (805) 961-7500.
 - In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City of Goleta at (805) 961-7500. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City staff to make reasonable arrangements.
 - Preliminary approval or denial of a project by the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Goleta Planning Commission within ten (10) calendar days following the action. Please contact the Planning and Environmental Services Department for more information.
 - Design Review Board approvals do not constitute Land Use Clearances.
 - The square footage figures on this agenda are subject to change during the review process.
 - The length of Agenda items is only an estimate. Applicants are responsible for being available when their item is to be heard. Any item for which the applicant is not immediately available may be continued to the next meeting.
-

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 2 of 15

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

- A. Planning Commission/Design Review Board Joint Workshop Minutes/Tables for October 20, 2008
- B. Design Review Board Minutes for December 9, 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. 08-186-DRB

6021 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-082-028)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes an approximately 28,000-square foot hotel on a 0.7-acre lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes a change to the faces of three existing signs: a 54-square foot freestanding pole sign, an approximately 109-square foot wall sign, and a 4.3-square foot freestanding directional sign. The signs will be constructed of yellow polycarbonate with a vinyl overlay for graphics. The two faces of the freestanding sign are 9 feet tall by 6 feet wide each, and the face of the wall sign is 33 feet wide by 3.3 feet tall. The two faces of the freestanding directional sign are 25 inches tall by 25 inches wide. An as-built Conditional Use Permit is also requested for the freestanding directional sign. The project was filed by Christian Muldoon of Vogue Signs, agent, on behalf of Van Bivens, secretary for the H. Oliver Dixon Trust, property owner. Related cases: 08-186-CUP, 08-186-SCC, 08-187-SCC, and 08-188-SCC. (Continued from 12-9-08, 11-12-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-9-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended that Preliminary Approval be granted as submitted, and that the project be continued to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.
2. The applicant responded to the DRB comments made on November 12, 2008.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 3 of 15

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-2, No. 08-186-DRB, 6021 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, and continue to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-194-DRB

5755 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-122-001)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes an approximately 1,000-square foot retail commercial building a 912-square foot gasoline fueling station canopy, three double-sided fueling dispensers, and a car storage lot on a 25,000-square foot commercial property in the C-2 and C-3 zone districts. The applicant proposes new blue and white aluminum fascia panels for the fueling station canopy and the service station façade. No new floor area or other structural development is proposed. The project was filed by Harwood White, agent, on behalf of John Price of Goleta Properties LLC, property owner. Related cases: 08-194-LUP. (Continued from 12-9-08, 11-25-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-9-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Branch commented: a) Scaling back the amount of the blue color by the applicant is appreciated and the project looks a lot better.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The reduction of the quantity of the blue color is an improvement.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 08-194-DRB, 5755 Hollister Avenue, as submitted; and continue to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-202-DRB

6991 Scripps Crescent (APN 073-181-008)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 1,230-square foot single-story residence, a 471-square foot 2-car garage, and a pool on an approximately 9,100-square foot lot in the DR-10 zone district. The applicant proposes a 90-square foot addition to the residence. An approximately 120-square foot as-built trellis would also be part of the scope of this permit. The resulting one-story structure would be 1,791 square feet, consisting of a 1,320-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 471-square foot two-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by David Varesio, property owner. Related cases: 08-202-LUP. (Continued from 12-9-08) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-9-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-4, No. 08-202-DRB, 6991 Scripps

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 4 of 15

Crescent, as submitted, including the as-built trellis; and continue to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-203-DRB

6780 Cortona Drive (APN 073-150-027)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 15,600-square foot commercial property on a 54,014-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to install a 12.8-square foot wall sign with red letters ranging in height from 16.8-inches to 23.3-inches. The registered trademark sign will read "DUPONT" surrounded by an oval seal. The non-illuminated sign will be $\frac{3}{4}$ -inches thick pin mounted $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch off the wall. The project was filed by agent Harry Vant-Erve with DuPont Displays, on behalf of Weatherby Enterprises, property owner. Related cases: 08-203-SCC. (Continued from 12-9-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-9-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. The Sign Subcommittee recommended that Preliminary Approval be granted as submitted, and that the project be continued to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Review of Item H-4, No. 08-203-DRB, 6780 Cortona Drive, as submitted, and to continue to January 13, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-148-DRB

5892 Calle Real (APN 069-110-061)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a commercial building occupied by Bank of America. The applicant proposes to install new signage associated with Bank of America, including a new freestanding pole sign (Sign 1), two wall signs (Signs 14, & 15), and two directional signs (Signs 11, & 13). Signage proposed that will not require permits are a sign for disabled parking (Sign 3), glass door signage (Signs 9, & 10), and a Do Not Enter sign to replace the existing sign (Sign 12). The project was filed by agent Steve Stallone on behalf of Bank of America, property owner. Related cases: N/A. (Continued from 12-9-08*, 11-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

11-12-08 Meeting:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The existing monument sign works well; b) He suggested that the new corporate colors be applied to the existing monument sign instead of adding a pole sign; c) He is not in favor of the proposed pole sign;

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 5 of 15

- d) Reducing the size of the wall signs by fifty percent would be adequate, particularly with the red background; e) Signs #9, 10, 11 and 13 are fine; and f) The recent removal of banner signs on the site is appreciated.
2. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) He agreed with Member Schneider that the new corporate colors should be applied to the existing monument sign instead of adding a pole sign.
 3. Member Branch commented: a) If the existing monument sign remains, the size of the wall signs could each be reduced by fifty percent; b) The existing monument sign and the proposed wall sign are at the same eye level, and approximately the same size; and c) Pole signs are not favored.
 4. Member Messner commented: a) The red background on the signs seems to be overbearing on the bank wall corners and too repetitious.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to continue Item H-4, No. 08-148-DRB, 5892 Calle Real, to December 9, 2008, with the following Conceptual comments: 1) Sign #1 Pylon Sign: apply the new corporate colors to the existing monument sign instead of adding a pole sign which is not favored; 2) Wall Signs #14 and 15: reduce the wall signs by fifty percent; 3) The monument and wall signs shall have an opaque background with push-through letters, and only illuminate the copy and logo at night; 4) Signs #9 and 10: the door vinyl signs are fine as submitted; 5) Sign #11: the directional ATM sign at the canopy is fine as submitted; and 6) Sign #13: the directional exit sign is fine as submitted.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-214-DRB

370 Storke Road (APN 073-100-008)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,230-square foot restaurant, 1,978-square foot coin-operated, commercial car wash, and a 40-square foot watchman's trailer within a 10,000-square foot contractor's storage yard, on a 1.00-acre parcel zoned C-3 in the Inland Area of the City. The applicant proposes to install four new signs onsite consisting of the following:

- A 17.75-square foot externally illuminated restaurant menu board on the south side of the existing restaurant. The menu board would measure 39.5-inches tall by 63.5-inches long. External illumination would be provided by a fully shielded, overhanging gooseneck lamp;
- An 18.3-square foot internally illuminated wall sign stating "Zizzo's Coffee" mounted above the existing awning on the west (front) elevation of the restaurant. The wall sign would measure 18-inches tall by 146-inches long;
- A 72-square foot internally illuminated pole sign stating "Zizzo's Coffee Drive Thru" mounted on an existing sign pole advertising the restaurant. The pole sign would measure 72-inches tall by 144-inches long; and
- A second 21-square foot internally illuminated pole sign stating "Self-Serve Car Wash" located below the restaurant pole sign on the existing sign pole at the front of the property bordering Storke Road. The pole sign would measure 36-inches tall by 84-inches long.

All internally illuminated signs would have acrylic faces and internally illuminated channel lettering. The pole signs would have acrylic faces and vinyl graphics. The menu board would consist of three panels with a dark background and light colored lettering. The project was filed by agent Harwood White on behalf of John

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 6 of 15

Price, property owner. Related cases: 79-V-037, 08-035-CUP, 08-214-LUP.
(Alan Hanson)

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-219-DRB

420 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-130-061)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The project site is located within the Fairview Business Center (FBC), which includes 17.31 acres gross (16.67 acres net) and contains three buildings: 420 South Fairview Avenue, a 73,203-square foot structure; 430 South Fairview Avenue, a 60,797-square foot structure; and 500 South Fairview Avenue, a 108,000-square foot structure (APNs 071-130-057, 071-130-061 & 071-130-062). The site also includes associated parking, landscaping, hardscape, and accessory structures such as refuse and recycling areas.

The applicant proposes to revise the approved western façade of 420 South Fairview Avenue:

- A storefront improvement to allow a 1,160-square foot restaurant;
- Addition of an ADA compliant walkway and patio and new stairs and handrails;
- Addition of a second outdoor seating area with pergola;
- A revised planting plan.

The project was filed by The Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 98-DP-024, 99-OA-024, 02-083-LLA, 02-088-OSP, 02-088-DP AM01, 03-166-PM (TPM 32,016), 02-088-DP AM02, 04-070-LUP, 04-110-LUP, 05-078-SCD, 05-075-MC, 06-122-DRB, 06-122-SCD, 06-122-LUP, 07-123-DRB RV01, 07-123-LUP RV01, 07-148-DRB RV02, & 07-219-LUP. (Scott Kolwitz)

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-045-DRB

5484 Overpass Road (APN 071-220-033)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 5,780-square foot shop building, a 1,362-square foot office building, a 18,835-square feet of unenclosed materials storage (a portion of which – in the southwest corner of the property – is as-built), an as-built 640-square foot storage unit, and two unused fuel pumps and associated underground fuel tanks on a 84,070-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 2,961-square foot, two story office addition, and a new trash enclosure. This

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 7 of 15

application also includes a proposal to permit the aforementioned as-built outdoor material storage area and storage unit, and to re-configure the site's parking areas. All materials used for this addition are to match the existing office building with the exception of the proposed lighting, which would be the Capri Mini by The Plaza Family. The project was filed by agent Joseph H. Moticha on behalf of Randy Douglas, Tierra Contracting, Inc., property owner. Related cases: 07-045-DP AM01, 07-045-LUP. (Continued from 11-12-08*, 10-14-08*, 09-23-08*, 09-09-08) (Laura Vlk)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

9-09-08 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) suggested the applicant consider replacing, at some location on the site, the two avocado trees that will be removed.
2. Member Branch commented: a) the transition of the board and bat materials to a stucco façade at the corner of the building seems odd; b) the stucco appears as a wainscot; and c) as an example for consideration, on some buildings on other sites, stucco is used up to the floor height, with board and bat materials used above the stucco.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) the overall design of the building is good; b) there needs to be a better resolution of materials, for example, using a little more board and bat materials on the new addition (he noted that the existing building style seems to be board and bat); c) requested that the applicant document the existing trees located along the eastern property line; and d) requested the applicant consider the possibility of adding one or two trees that would help fill in the area along the eastern property line where the avocado trees will be removed, planting a tree species that grows upright such as the Sycamore species.
4. Member Messner commented: a) recommended that the tree species that would be added to the landscape plan should be evergreen rather than a Sycamore species which is deciduous for continual privacy.
5. Chair Wignot commented: a) the applicant's use of double pane windows and additional insulation along the eastern property line will be helpful to address the noise from the adjacent animal control use; and b) suggested that the applicant consider using solar panels for hot water and/or electricity, if feasible.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith) to continue Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, to September 23, 2008, with the following comments: a) the applicant is requested to restudy the resolution of materials on the building; b) the applicant is requested to provide a landscape plan showing all approved landscaping and what is being removed; and c) the applicant is requested to study the potential addition of a couple of trees along the eastern property line.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-145-DRB

598 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-090-052)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The subject property consists of 12.29 net acres and includes agricultural operations, an existing farmhouse, a produce stand, and a bathhouse/restroom in the AG-I-5 zone district. Vehicular

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 8 of 15

ingress/egress is provided by a 16-foot (to be upgraded to 20-foot) wide gravel driveway from Stow Canyon Road, and through the City's adjacent library parking lot. A modification was granted to require a total of 19 designated parking spaces on the property. Minor amounts of grading would be required to facilitate building pads and the installation of utilities.

To be in compliance with 08-111-CUP, the applicant proposes to move the existing farm labor camp from its present location near the avocado orchard to a development envelope along the existing driveway near the farmhouse in Phase 4 as follows:

Phase 4 – (To be completed by July 1, 2009):

- Terminate use of existing farm labor camp site and remove all structures; relocate occupants to temporary or permanent residential units in approved building envelope.
 - Temporary units would consist of up to five (5) yurts meeting code requirements and Design Review Board review for precise location and landscaping, with an option to substitute mobile homes. Cooking and sanitary facilities would consist of a mobile kitchen, restroom, and shower units and/or individual built-in kitchens and bathrooms, all connected to the Goleta Sanitary District system.
 - Permanent housing would consist of up to five (5) modular, stick-built, relocated houses or other City-approved permanent housing as approved by the Design Review Board.
- Construct access improvements as required by the Fire Department.
- Provide additional on-site parking.
- Construct the sewer line.

The project was filed by agent Steve Welton of Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services on behalf of Center for Urban Agriculture at Fairview Gardens, property owner. Related cases: 08-111-CUP; 08-145-LUP. (Continued from 12-9-08, 10-28-08, 09-23-08*, 08-26-08) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-9-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Branch commented: a) The yurts would be located approximately 500 feet away from the residents to the east, which does not seem to impact privacy greatly for the property owners to the east; b) The applicant has studied additional plantings to try to accommodate screening; c) Based on the photographs, he tends to agree with the neighbors that planting the *Ironwood* species may or may not be sufficient for screening, and the money could possibly be used by the applicant for other treatments; and d) There does not seem to be much more screening needed than what has been proposed.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The yurts are approximately 600 feet away from the residents, which is a fairly long distance with regard to privacy concerns; b) Agreed with Member Branch that planting the *Ironwood* trees may not be successful for screening purposes, and may be more detrimental than

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 9 of 15

- beneficial to the neighbors when the yurts are removed; c) The proposed plans seem fine; d) He pointed out that the neighbors do not particularly mind looking out at the farm but are more concerned with regard to the view of the vehicles in the distance; d) The proposed plans seem fine; e) Suggested that it would be beneficial to plant some type of low landscape planting, approximately 3' to 5' in height, in the parking area to screen the vehicles; f) The applicant needs to provide lighting cut sheets.
3. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The photographs portray that the yurts are located quite a distance from the houses to the east; b) The plans proposed by the applicant seem fine; c) If the *Ironwood* trees will be planted to provide screening, it would seem more beneficial to plant the trees closer to the house; d) There needs to be some type of screening around the permanent parking area; and e) Lighting cut sheets need to be provided by the applicant.
 4. Member Messner commented: a) Suggested changing the color of the yurts to green, or using camouflage netting, which would help the yurts blend in when viewed from a distance.
 5. Member Herrera commented: a) The parking lot, which is permanent, will need to be screened with plantings and/or trellises.
 6. Chair Wignot commented: a) Agreed with comments from the DRB members; b) He pointed out that the neighbors do not particularly mind looking out at the farm but are more concerned with regard to the view of the vehicles in the distance; c) He believes that planting the *Ironwood* trees should be at the discretion of the applicant, as is it not known whether the trees would be very effective for screening; d) Suggested the applicant might consider some type of temporary screening in front of the yurts, for example, planters that could be relocated when the temporary yurts are removed, for the benefit of the neighbors; and e) The applicant needs to provide the lighting plans and cut sheets.
 7. Member Brown commented: a) With regard to temporary screening of the yurts, there is a concern that it will take a long time for plantings to grow enough to screen before the yurts are removed; and b) The neighbors to the east have also expressed concern with regard to viewing the vehicles in the parking lot.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item L-1, No. 08-145-DRB, 598 North. Fairview Avenue, to January 13, 2009, with the following comments: a) The applicant shall provide cut sheets for the lighting fixture and a lighting plan with sketches showing the proposed location of the lighting; and b) The applicant shall provide a landscape plan showing landscaping planted along the eastern edge of the parking lot.

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-207-DRB

111 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-025)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 21,800-square foot commercial building on a 3.6-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to remodel the façade of the building and construct a new 1,800-square foot outdoor mechanical equipment yard. No changes in building height, building coverage, signage, or floor area are proposed. Features of the remodel include a new aluminum and glass storefront system on the north, south, and west elevations of the building, new roll-up doors on the south and west elevations, and an upgrade of existing aluminum glass and doors on the north, east, and south elevations. A new landscape plan is also proposed, with new plantings consisting of *Prunus cerassifera*, *Miscanthus sinensis*, *Syagrus*

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 10 of 15

romanzofflanum, and other plant species. The project was filed by Dave Jones of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Mark Winnikoff of Frieslander Holdings LLC and Nederlander Holdings, LLC, property owners. Related cases: 08-207-SCD; -LUP. (Shine Ling)

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

- NONE

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. BUILDING INTENSITY STANDARDS

O-2. DRB BYLAWS DISCUSSION

O-3. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-4. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 11 of 15

Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines

Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)

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

Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)

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

Design Review Board Procedures

Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)

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

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

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

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 12 of 15

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

Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 13 of 15

Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

Conceptual Review

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

Information required for conceptual review includes:

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

Preliminary Review

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

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

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

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

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 14 of 15

Final Review

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

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

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

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

Revised Final

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

Multiple Levels of Approval at a Single Meeting

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

Presentation of Projects (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.3)

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

Public Testimony (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.4)

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

Design Review Board Agenda

January 13, 2009

Page 15 of 15

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

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

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

Appeals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.8)

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