



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, February 10, 2009

### CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

### SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 1:30 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

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

February 10, 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 27, 2009

### B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

- A. The Street Tree Subcommittee will present to the full Design Review Board its recommendations for the addition of trees to the Recommended Street Tree List as well as recommended guidelines for nursery plant standards.

### B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

- A. Update on Design Review Board recruitment

## 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. 08-214-DRB

370 Storke Road (APN 073-100-008)

This is a request for *Final* 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:

- 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.

## Design Review Board Agenda

February 10, 2009

Page 3 of 15

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

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item H-1, No. 08-214-DRB, 370 Storke Avenue, as submitted, with the following conditions: 1) the poll shall be painted with a "coconut brown" color; and 2) the wall sign shall have black trim around the letters; and to continue the item to February 10, 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 *Preliminary* 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 01-13-09, 12-9-08\*, 11-12-08). (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **01-13-09 Meeting:**

1. Member Brown commented: a) It seems redundant to have both the wall sign facing Calle Real and the monument sign; and it also seems redundant that both signs are the same size; and b) She does not support the wall sign that faces Calle Real.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The wall sign facing Calle Real is acceptable; and b) The wall sign facing Encina Road should be eliminated.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The wall sign facing Encina Road seems redundant, noting that there is a duplication of signs when coming down Calle Real from Fairview Avenue; b) It is appropriate for a wall sign to be located on the wall that faces Calle Real, but the design would be better if the wall sign is reduced in size or the design is changed to lettering and logo, without the red background; and c) The intent with regard to the wall sign facing Calle Real is to reduce the amount of red in the background.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) He agreed with the comments by Members Branch, Brown and Schneider; and b) The plans that have been changed by

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

February 10, 2009

Page 4 of 15

the applicant in response to the DRB comments provide a clearer understanding of the proposal, which is useful to continue the Conceptual review.

5. Member Messner commented: a) The wall sign facing Encina Road does not seem to be needed; and b) The monument sign is more visible than the wall sign when driving down the street; c) He supports reducing the size of the wall sign facing Calle Real, noting that it is too big for a one-story building, it is located too close to the street, and the size is the same as the monument sign.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) The applicant responded to all of the comments that were made at the last meeting; and, from a personal standpoint, it is somewhat troublesome that more changes are now requested.

### **STRAW VOTE:**

How many members support removing the proposed wall sign facing Encina Road?

Members voting in the affirmative: Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, Smith, and Wignot. (7).

Members not voting in the affirmative: None.

### **STRAW VOTE:**

How many members support further reducing the wall sign facing Calle Real?

(Note: A vote was not conducted in lieu of discussion).

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 1 vote (No: Brown) to continue Item H-1, No. 08-148- DRB, 5892 Calle Real, to February 10, 2009, for Conceptual/Preliminary review on the Sign Calendar, after review by the Zoning Administrator, with the following Conceptual comments: 1) The proposed wall sign that faces Encino Lane shall be omitted; 2) The wall sign that faces Calle Real shall be approved but the wall sign as proposed shall either be reduced in size or changed in design to some type of individual lettering and logo without the red background.**

## **H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-127-DRB**

840 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-070-027)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a total development of 3,884 square feet consisting of a 3,524-square foot Kingdom Hall and a 360-square foot covered entry on a 46,173-square foot lot in the 20-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a concrete block 15-square foot freestanding institutional monument sign with a redwood top piece. The two line sign will read "Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses" on the top line, and "Salon del Reino de los Testigos de Jehova" on the bottom line, both with 5.5 inch individually mounted PVC letters painted black. The site address will be located near the top of the monument sign using the same lettering. The sign will be illuminated from above with down-lights mounted under the fascia. The project was filed by agent Carlos Grano on behalf of Goleta Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, property owner. Related Cases: 08-127-LUP/SCC. (Brian Hiefield)

**H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-001-DRB**

820 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-070-028)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes a 1,512-square foot classroom building, a 1,384-square foot office and education area, a 360-square foot office, a 2,996-square foot sanctuary building with a separate 316-square foot restroom facility, and a 100-square foot play structure, all on a 1.28-acre site in the 20-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to relocate an existing 20-square foot wooden church sign and a 6.5-square foot wooden changeable copy sign to the western face of a trash enclosure located near the northern entrance to the property. Five (5) aluminum ground level signs are also proposed to be located at various entrance and exit driveways on the property. The ground level signs would read "ENTRANCE", "EXIT", "EXIT ONLY NO ENTRY", "RESIDENTS ONLY NO OUTLET", and "NO ENTRY TO Live Oak Unitarian Universalist Congregation." Each sign would have an area of two (2) square feet and be three (3) feet tall. The project was filed by Salvador Melendez, architect, on behalf of Michael Wittman of the Live Oak Unitarian Universalist Congregation, property owner. Related cases: 09-001-SCC; -CUP. (Shine Ling)

**H-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-002-DRB**

334 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-090-028)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property known as the Hollipat site includes the approved temporary parking lot associated with the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital replacement project. The lot is under construction and will contain 376 parking spaces on approximately four acres in the PI and DR-20 zone districts. The applicant requests new signage for this temporary lot identifying it as the location for hospital parking. All 17 signs would be temporary post and panel with a painted finish on all sides including weather sealed edges secured to painted wood posts. The posts would be installed in the ground with concrete. Three types of temporary signage are proposed: an identification sign, directional and informational signs, and parking signs. The colors of the signs would be Dunn-Edwards "Before the Storm" Green and white reflective vinyl. No lighting is proposed. The project was filed by agent Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services Inc. on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 09-002-CUP, 08-218-LUP, 07-171-OA, 07-171-DP. (Cindy Moore)

**H-5. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-008-DRB**

100-148 Sumida Gardens Lane & 5410 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-331-011 & 012)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes the approved Sumida Gardens Apartments development, which is under construction and will contain 9 buildings totaling 194,448 square feet on approximately 10.26 acres in the DR-20 zone district. The applicant requests revised final review of temporary signage for the development, which will be incorporated into the development's approved Overall Sign Plan. Two types of temporary signage are proposed: ground level directional signs (2); and flags (5). One ground level sign would be located at the center of the horseshoe in front of the clubhouse on Sumida Gardens Lane, and the other ground level sign would be located near the northern driveway to the development. Each ground level sign would be 36 inches tall and would have a sign area that is a maximum of 24 inches wide by 19 inches tall and read "RENTAL OFFICE" with a directional arrow. The flags would be 3 feet wide by 5 feet tall and be mounted on flag poles that are 20 feet tall. Three types of

## Design Review Board Agenda

February 10, 2009

Page 6 of 15

flags are proposed: one would read "Sumida Gardens" and display the Sumida Gardens Logo; one would read "NOW RENTING"; and one would have no copy. The colors of the flag would be Dartmouth Green, white, and gold. No lighting is proposed. The project was filed by Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, agent for Sumida Family Limited Partnership, property owner. Related cases: 08-131-OSP; -CUP; 09-008-SCC. (Shine Ling)

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

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

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Final 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 Engineering & Environmental on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN (Continued from 11-12-08\*, 9-23-08\*, 7-22-08, 6-10-08\*, 4-22-08, 4-20-04, 3-16-04, 2-17-04\*, 1-6-04, 12-2-03). (Cindy Moore)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **7-22-08 Meeting:**

1. Member Brown commented: a) the current proposed location for the Goleta Water District backflow preventer is the preferred location, noting that the equipment would be pushed back as far from the curb as possible, and that the current location shown is in the realm of forty feet; b) the backflow preventer equipment should be landscaped; c) requested that the applicant provide more details regarding the lighting plan, including cut sheets and lighting elements; and d) requested a better understanding with regard to the poles with the lighting standards.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) suggested that the water feature be pulled back and not so far into the parking lot; b) expressed support for the proposed

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

February 10, 2009

Page 7 of 15

- location for the backflow preventer equipment; and c) the changes are fine and the project is looking very nice.
3. Member Branch commented: a) the boldness of the cobalt blue color is appreciated and the muted blue color is not attractive; b) agreed with Member Schneider's recommendation to move the water feature into the center of the landscape element; c) agreed with the DRB members' suggestion to move the water backflow preventer equipment as far off from the street as possible.
  4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) agreed with previous comments from members with regard to the location of the backflow preventer and moving the water feature; b) expressed appreciation for the changes on the Hollister Street frontage on Building 1, stating that the building is very nice and pays some homage to the original Delco Building located up the street by having the building step, and with the glass wrapping the corners.
  5. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with DRB comments recommending moving the backflow preventer from the sidewalk and relocating the water feature; and b) the building design is appreciated.
  6. Member Messner commented: a) noted that he believes that the water fountain does not necessarily need to be brought into the center, stating that he would prefer off-center; and b) the bus stop needs to have a pull-out for the bus to facilitate traffic flow.
  7. Chair Wignot commented: a) the project continues to move in a very good direction; b) the changes respond to the DRB comments from the previous meeting; c) recommended that the applicant refer to the City's current Recommended Street Tree List with regard to planting trees in the right-of-way; d) the suggestion that some of the existing palm trees be re-located to the median on Hollister Avenue would not comply with the City's recommended list; e) expressed support for the public comment suggestion removal of the pampas grass; e) agreed with the DRB comments supporting the location shown for the backflow preventer; and f) the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-1, No. 37-SB-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, with comments; and to continue to September 23, 2008, for Final review on the Final Calendar by the full DRB.**

### **J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-169-DRB & 08-170-DRB**

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual/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 M-RP and M-S-GOL zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Buildings 12A and 12B and associated improvements as part of the phased build out of the Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 12A would be a one-story, 10,000-square foot structure and Building 12B would be a one-story, 7,500-square foot structure. Associated improvements for each building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, and parking. New materials consist of metal, concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out the Cabrillo Business Park as proposed to be amended would total 948,782

## Design Review Board Agenda

February 10, 2009

Page 8 of 15

square feet, including 707,100 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: 08-107-DP AM, 08-039-LUP, 08-040-LUP, 08-041-LUP, 08-042-LUP, 08-160-LUP, 08-119-LUP, 08-025-LUP, 07-144-MC, 07-236-MC, 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN (Continued from 11-12-08, 10-14-08). (Cindy Moore)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **11-12-08 Meeting:**

1. Member Branch commented: a) The plans are a good improvement; b) The project seems pretty balanced; and c) The green screen element is a better solution for the utilitarian side of the buildings.
2. Member Herrera commented: a) The landscape plans are good; and b) The concrete patterns are beautiful.
3. Member Messner commented: a) The choice of plants is appreciated; b) The Cypress tree planted off to the side balances the site very well; c) Actual plant sizes, quantities and groundcovers on centers will need to be shown on the plans for Final review; and d) It is important that the bus stop has a pull out area.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) The response to the DRB comments, particularly with regard to the architecture on the buildings, is appreciated.
5. Member Schneider commented: a) In the future when buildings are reviewed, the applicant is requested to bring information showing the other buildings in the project site for reference; b) Overall, the plans are good; c) The green screen is a better solution than something architectural; and d) The changes on the south elevation help create a sense of entry and draws people into the plaza.

**MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 08-169-DRB, and 08-170-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, and continue to February 10, 2009, for Final review.**

## **K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR**

- NONE

## **L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR**

### **L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-213-DRB**

425 Caseta Way (APN 077-412-030)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,904-square foot residence and an attached 460-square foot, two-car garage on a 10,041-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 586 square feet in additions, consisting of a 294-square foot addition on the first-floor and a 292-square foot addition on the second-floor. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,950 square feet, consisting of a 2,490-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 460-

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.



## Design Review Board Agenda

February 10, 2009

Page 9 of 15

square foot two-car garage. This proposal is within the maximum allowable floor area for this property, which is 2,835 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a two-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Mary Chang on behalf of Richard and Marylou Eckert, property owners. Related cases: 08-213-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

### **L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-005-DRB**

55 North Fairview Avenue (APN 077-170-025)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,674-square foot commercial building, two canopy structures (1,248 square feet and 576 square feet) and related gasoline pumps, parking, landscaping, and signage on a 19,811-square foot parcel in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to install a new above-ground Healy clean air separator tank for the gasoline fueling station facility behind the service building. The tank would be placed within a new 57-square foot metal enclosure painted to match the service building. The enclosure and concrete pad would be 11.5 feet tall. Air breather piping would extend from the top of the tank to a height of 12 feet above grade to match the existing vent risers located behind the building. No habitable floor area or other exterior changes to existing development are proposed. The project was filed by Ahmad Ghaderi of A&S Engineering, agent, on behalf of Francisco Bernal of Equilon Enterprises, tenant, and Fairview Center LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-005-LUP. (Shine Ling)

### **L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-006-DRB**

5661 Calle Real (APN 069-160-056)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 480-square foot commercial building and an existing 1,703-square foot canopy structure as well as related gasoline pumps, parking, landscaping, and signage on a 10,513-square foot parcel in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to install a new, above-ground Healy clean air separator tank for the gasoline fueling station facility. The tank would be placed within a new 84-square foot metal enclosure painted brown to match an adjacent trash enclosure. The enclosure would be six (6) feet tall. Air breather piping would extend from the top of the tank to a *minimum* height of 12 feet above grade. No habitable floor area or other exterior changes to existing development are proposed. The project was filed by Ahmad Ghaderi of A&S Engineering, agent, on behalf of Amber Jones of Valero California Retail Co., property owner. Related cases: 09-006-LUP. (Shine Ling)

## **M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR**

- NONE

## **N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

### **N-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 06-127-DRB**

San Jose Creek/Fish Passage (APNs 071-190-017; 071-170-036; 071-140-060 & 040; 071-090-036, 037, & 078; 071-260-001 thru 008; 071-140-046 & 056)

This is a request for continued *Advisory* review. The San Jose Creek Capacity Improvement project has been a part of the City's Capital Improvement Program

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

February 10, 2009

Page 10 of 15

since its inception, and is needed to address flood breakout in the Old Town area. An earlier version of the project was reviewed by the DRB on September 6, 2006. This project was later approved by the City Council on June 4, 2007. Between July and December 2007, the City has worked to revise the project to accommodate a fish passage element. (Laura Bridley, Rosemarie Gaglione)

### **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

February 10, 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.
- 2) Colors and types of building materials and application.

## Design Review Board Agenda

February 10, 2009

Page 12 of 15

- 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 & 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

February 10, 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

February 10, 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 & 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 ½" 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

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

February 10, 2009

Page 15 of 15

decision. An interested party who cannot appear at a hearing may write a letter to the DRB indicating their 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 & Environmental Services within ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning & Environmental Services offices are closed, the appeal period is extended until 5:00 p.m. on the following business day. Planning & 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.