



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, January 27, 2009**

### **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:**

Bob Wignot (At-Large Member), Chair

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Vice Chair

Scott Branch (Architect)

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member)

Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)

Carl Schneider (Architect)

---

#### **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 27, 2009

Page 2 of 15

## A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

## B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for January 13, 2009

### 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. 08-207-DRB

111 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-025)

This is a request for *Final* 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 romanzoffianum*, 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. (Continued from 01-13-09) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **01-13-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Recommended that the glass material for the canopy be frosted so that dust and dirt does not show up as much.
2. Member Messner commented: a) Requested the applicant provide clarification on the landscape plans as follows: 1) Seven *Jacaranda* trees are called out, but there are actually eight numbered on the icons; 2) There is a different icon calling out the Queen Palm species on the second page; and 3) Indicate if the

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

January 27, 2009

Page 3 of 15

*Salvia mexicana* (Mexican Sage) is a Dwarf Mexican Sage, which would be appropriate with regard to obstruction of vision because it is located on the corner.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-207-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The electrical transformer shall be screened; and to continue to January 27, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

### **F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-145-DRB**

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

This is a request for *Final* 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 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 01-13-09, 12-9-08, 10-28-08, 09-23-08\*, 08-26-08) (Scott Kolwitz)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

January 27, 2009

Page 4 of 15

### 01-13-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) The lighting plan is appreciated; and b) The shape of the lighting fixtures is fine, but a more rustic finish would be preferable rather than flashy copper which does not seem to fit with the farm atmosphere.
2. Member Messner commented: a) There is a spray that can be used on the lighting fixtures to enhance the patina effect and decrease the shininess.
3. Chair Wignot commented: a) Expressed concern whether the selection of the artichoke plants is the best solution for permanent, long-term screening because during the periods when the artichoke plantings need to be cut back, the vehicle parking will need to be screened.
4. Member Herrera commented: a) Suggested doubling the amount of artichoke plantings and staggering the process of cutting back the plantings.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 08-145-DRB, 598 North Fairview Avenue, Phase 4, as submitted, and continue to January 27, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

### H. SIGN CALENDAR

#### H-1. 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 27, 2009

Page 5 of 15

Price, property owner. Related cases: 79-V-037, 08-035-CUP, 08-214-LUP.  
(Continued from 01-13-09) (Alan Hanson)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **01-13-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

1. Member Brown commented: a) The design of the pole signs as presented are not appropriate; b) There is too much white space on the face of the "Zizzo's Coffee" pole sign; c) The applicant is requested to restudy the design of the pole signs, and consider some type of coloring; d) Consider using material other than plexiglass that would provide some sort of dimension and interest; e) The applicant is requested to provide samples that show the proposed signs with and without illumination, as well as provide information regarding the hours that the signs will be illuminated; and f) The menu board, to be located on the window, is acceptable.
2. Member Smith commented: a) Suggested removing the lettering "Zizzo's Coffee" and expanding the logo on the pole sign, if the size of the lettering on the expanded logo is adequate; and b) The menu board, to be located on the window, is fine.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION:** By consensus, the Sign Subcommittee (Absent: Schneider) continued Item H-2, No. 08-214-DRB, 370 Storke Road, to January 27, 2009, with comments.

## **I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR**

- NONE

## **J. FINAL CALENDAR**

### **J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-141-DRB**

6325 Lindmar Drive (APN 073-005-021)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 27,927-square foot industrial/manufacturing building, 20,276-square feet of courtyards, loading docks and parking, an as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage/water treatment enclosure/addition, and 23,535-square feet (32%) of landscaping on a 73,616-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a mechanical courtyard in the existing courtyard between buildings A and C, construct two new mechanical roof wells (one on building B and one on building C), permit the aforementioned as-built 1,964-square foot solvent storage area on the west side of building A, permit an as-built parking lot on the east side of buildings B and C (which requires the removal of 1,167-square feet of landscaping), alter the loading area on the west side of building A, abandon an existing driveway on the north side of the property, remove equipment from the front yard setback for re-location into the proposed mechanical courtyard, remove an unpermitted parking lot storage area on the southwest side of the property, and re-locate equipment from the side yard (along the south property line) setback. All materials used for this project are to match the existing buildings with the exception of new lighting, which will be Lamps Plus bronze, 9" high outdoor dark

## Design Review Board Agenda

January 27, 2009

Page 6 of 15

sky tube lights. The project was filed by agent Bruce Burke on behalf of James L. Bartlett, property owner. Related cases: 07-141-DP AM01; 07-141-LUP. (Continued from 11-25-08\*, 10-14-08\*, 08-26-08) (Laura Vlk)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **08-26-08 Meeting:**

1. The addition of trees in the front would be nice and would soften the building.
2. The colors need to be called out on the plans.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 07-141-DRB, 6325 Lindmar Drive, with the following conditions: 1) the applicant shall provide a landscape plan that includes the addition of trees on the eastern elevation and northern elevation; and 2) the colors shall be called out on the plans; and to continue for Final review on the Final Calendar on October 14, 2008.**

### **J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-199-DRB**

454 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-090-013)

This is a request for *Final* review. This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes three commercial/industrial buildings totaling 49,756 square feet of floor area on a 7.95-acre site in the PI zone district. The applicant proposes a 550-square foot addition to the office building at the front of the property. Covered arcades are also proposed on the north, west, and east elevations, and a new plaster façade treatment is proposed on all elevations. A new trash enclosure would be located near the southeast corner of the building, and a new landscaping plan is proposed. New colors would consist of olive green, rose, and beige. The project was filed by Ed Lenvik of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Somera Patterson LLC, property owner. Related cases: 08-199-SCD; -LUP. (Continued from 12-9-08) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **12-9-08 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Overall, the project plans look good; b) The building architecture and the arcade work successfully; c) He would prefer that the colors are deeper and darker than what is shown on the plans; d) Requested that the applicant restudy the use of Wall Packs; e) Requested that up-lights be removed and lighting be provided in another method; f) Expressed concern that some lighting bollards may have too much of a flare that becomes glaring and bright; g) Consider adding permeable paving on the strip at the entry area; and h) The concept of adding a pavilion is workable, but he suggested consideration that the structure might be better if it were more lighter and open rather than having a solid roof.
2. Member Brown commented: a) Her comments are similar to Member Schneider's; b) The proposed plans are appreciated; c) Recommended adding some sort of public space, with benches, in the arcade area, noting that there are great views; d) Lighting fixtures that are truly downlit are preferred to be used for the lighting on the east side of the building and on the trash enclosure and

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

January 27, 2009

Page 7 of 15

- gate; e) Downlighting is preferred on the arcade; f) Requested that the applicant present for consideration other innovative ways to achieve downlighting to prevent glare rather than placing fixtures in the ground with spotlight type of lighting; g) The landscape plan is fine, noting that the refurbishment and retention of trees are appreciated; h) The cross-hatching feature shown on the elevations is appreciated but her concern is that it would not be seen during the day if painted a dark color; and i) Requested the applicant consider stormwater management opportunities on the site.
3. Member Branch commented: a) Overall, the plans are fine and handsome; b) The addition of the pavilion is a good idea to break up the long walkway area; c) Suggested the applicant restudy the pavilion structure which seems somewhat heavy and out of scale; d) Suggested using colors that are bolder than proposed; and e) Suggested placing the sign in front of the check valve may be a solution for the applicant to research.
  4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Overall, the design is fine; b) The darker color should be somewhat more darker which would provide some enhancement; c) The landscape plan is appreciated; d) Expressed concern regarding the lighting; e) The wall packs along the north side need to be fully shielded; f) Encouraged the applicant to find another way to accomplish the lighting plans without up-lighting; g) The concept of adding a pavilion is appreciated and the proposed pavilion structure design appears fine; and h) Recommended that some benches be included near the pavilion.
  5. Member Herrera commented: a) The landscape plan is fine and the plant selections are appreciated; b) He agreed with other members that downlighting is preferred; and c) He has mixed feeling with regard to the entry lighting because it can be possible to beautify the entrance with the use of lighting and plantings.
  6. Member Messner commented: a) Overall, the plans are fine; b) The landscape plan is appreciated; c) Recommended using flowers that are white for the *Agapanthus* species; d) If the *Clivia* species is planted, recommended mixing the colors, using yellow, red, and salmon, which would provide for variation because the species has a short flowering time and each color variety blooms a little off from the others; e) Expressed concern regarding drainage into the creek and requested consideration regarding some solution such as a filter; and f) Recommended that the applicant consider solar panels on the roof, as there are big rebates for solar panels.
  7. Chair Wignot commented: a) The project is moving in a good direction; b) The existing arched windows are attractive; c) The plans need to indicate that the south roadway will remain as exit-only, which he believes is a good feature; d) The use of green and energy efficient features would be appreciated, including items such as solar water heating, solar panels, and low-voltage lights; e) Agreed with other DRB members that up-lighting is not desired and requested that the applicant find some other method for lighting the exterior; f) The project is a good example of adaptive use of the building; and g) The applicant is requested to consider stormwater management opportunities on the site.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 08-199-DRB, 454 South Patterson Avenue, with comments, with the condition that the applicant shall provide the lighting cut sheets; and continue to January 27, 2009, for Final review.**

## Design Review Board Agenda

January 27, 2009

Page 8 of 15

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

### L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

### M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

#### **M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-034-DRB TIME CERTAIN 4:00-6:00**

8301 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-200-012 & 079-200-013)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The proposed project site is within a portion of the 72.73-acre (gross and net) Bacara Resort and Spa located in western Goleta, it is south of the Union Pacific Railroad and US 101, west of the Venoco Oil and Gas Processing Facility, north of Haskell's Beach and the Pacific Ocean, and east of existing Resort and Spa facilities. Proposed development would occur within a 12.66-acre (gross and net) area called Lot 2, and would also include widening of the existing Hollister Avenue roadway site located within a portion of Lot 1 immediately north of Lot 2. The project site has a Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan designation of Visitor-serving Commercial (C-V), and has an Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance designation of C-V, Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial.

The applicant is requesting approval of General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendments, a vesting tentative tract map, and a final development plan as described below.

#### General Plan Amendments (05-034-GP)

The project proposes amendments to ten Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies and tables as initiated by the City Council on May 20, 2008. These amendments address issues including: Open Space Element preservation and management of public lateral and vertical access areas, and open space area maps; Conservation Element special status species and environmentally sensitive habitat; and Safety Element seismic hazards map.

#### Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (05-034-TPM)

The applicant requests a two-lot subdivision of the 72.73-acre Bacara Resort and Spa project area that is comprised of APNs 079-200-012 & -013. Lot 1, totaling 60.07 acres (gross and net), would include the existing Bacara Resort and Spa, existing and proposed Hollister Avenue widening corridor, and an open space eastern terrace area. Lot 2, totaling 12.66 acres, would include all other proposed project site improvements.

#### Final Development Plan (05-DP-034)

The Final Development Plan would provide for construction of a 56-unit condominium hotel development and ancillary facilities. The proposed 56-unit condominium hotel development would be located within the Lot 2 12.66-acre area



## Design Review Board Agenda

January 27, 2009

Page 9 of 15

commonly referred to as the “Valley Floor” of the Bacara property, located directly southeast of the existing Bacara Resort and Spa facilities. Widening of Hollister Avenue would occur from the proposed improvements east to the Bacara Resort and Spa property boundary. Proposed improvements include a pool, cabana pool decks (e.g., shade structures), resort support facilities and guest parking. To accommodate the proposed improvements, the existing tennis club house and maintenance building, four (4) tennis courts, a 50-space public parking lot, and a vertical beach access trail would be relocated. An existing beach house and public restrooms located adjacent to the beach on the southern slope of the Valley Floor would remain. Please see the staff report for additional information.

The project was submitted on November 24, 2008 by agent Mary Meaney Reichel, Lucon Inc., on behalf of Bacara Resort and Spa, HT Santa Barbara property owner. Related cases: 05-034-GP, -TM, -DP. (April Verbanac, David Stone)

### **M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-168-DRB**

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

This is a request for *Conceptual* 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 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 5 as follows:

#### **Phase 5 – (To be completed by July 1, 2013):**

- Final permitting and construction of permanent housing. Permanent housing would consist of modular, stick-built, relocated homes or other permanent housing, as approved by the Design Board Review, for up to five (5) units of farm worker housing.
- The farm labor camp would include restroom and kitchen facilities within each of the housing units fully connected to public water and sewer line systems.
- Remove and replace all interim housing units with permanent housing. Use of kitchen and restroom/shower trailers (if any) is discontinued.
- Retain the bathhouse/restroom as a demonstration facility.

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-DRB. (Continued from 12-23-08\*, 09-23-08\*, 08-26-08 - see case 08-145-DRB) (Scott Kolwitz)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

# Design Review Board Agenda

January 27, 2009

Page 10 of 15

## 8-26-08 Meeting:

1. Member Branch commented: a) recommended incorporating sustainability elements into the project, for example, solar, photovoltaic, wind, and water reclamation elements.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) the concept and the intent of the grouping plans are fine; b) his concerns at this point would be lighting and screening which will be considered further along in the process; and c) spoke in support of incorporating sustainability elements and alternative building materials into the project, which would be useful and educational, if within the budget constraints.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to continue Phase 4 of Item M-3, No. 08-045-DRB, 598 North Fairview Avenue, to September 23, 2008, for Conceptual/Preliminary review; and to continue Phase 5 of Item M-3, No. 08-045-DRB, to September 23, 2008, for Conceptual review; and that Phase 5 be assigned a separate planning permit number.**

## N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

## O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. BUILDING INTENSITY STANDARDS

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

## P. ADJOURNMENT

# Design Review Board Agenda

January 27, 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 27, 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 27, 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 27, 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 27, 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.