



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**Tuesday, March 10, 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**

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 & 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

March 10, 2009

Page 2 of 16

### A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

### B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

#### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for February 24, 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. 08-213-DRB

425 Caseta Way (APN 077-412-030)

This is a request for *Final* 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-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. (Continued from 2-24-09) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **2-24-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

**MOTION:** Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 08-213-DRB, 425 Caseta Way, as submitted; and to continue the item to March 10, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 10, 2009

Page 3 of 16

### F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-011-DRB

6920 Marketplace Drive; APN 073-440-018

This is a request for *Final* review. The applicant proposes to remodel the exterior of the building, including the refurbishing of an existing storefront on the west elevation and the creation of a new storefront at the southwest corner. An 800-square foot trellis would be installed over the northern outdoor dining patio. A new landscape plan is also proposed. Materials would consist of sandstone, wrought iron, and dark wood trim. No new habitable floor area is proposed. (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### 2-24-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) The proposed colors are appreciated and will be more appropriate for the Camino Real Marketplace site than the previous colors; and b) The applicant needs to clarify whether the light source on the pilaster is gas or electric, expressing concern that the light bulb with an electric source would have the potential to project the light outward rather than downward if not shielded.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed plans are a great improvement for the site; and b) If the lighting on the pilaster is just for effect, the wattage needs to be extremely low.
3. Chair Wignot commented: a) The proposed project is very good and well thought out; b) The color scheme is nice; and c) The proposed plans with the glass to minimize the wind in the outside patio is a good idea, noting that this kind of feature has worked well in other locations.
5. Member Schneider commented: a) The existing awning where the door will be removed looks like it extends too far. He suggested the applicant consider cutting it off to make it look appropriate.
6. (The majority of members expressed appreciation that a Steak House type of restaurant is proposed for this area.)

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 09-011-DRB, 6920 Marketplace Drive, with the following condition: a) The lights on the pilaster shall be gas-lit, with the stipulation if the lights are electric the applicant shall provide details for review by the DRB; and to continue the item to March 10, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

## G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

## H. SIGN CALENDAR

### H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-001-DRB

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

This is a request for *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

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 10, 2009

Page 4 of 16

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. (Continued from 2-10-09) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **2-10-09 Meeting:**

1. The address numbers shall be painted a dark color to match the background of another portion of the sign.
2. The plans shall have a note indicating there will be no lighting involved with the sign.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to continue Item H-3, No. 09-001-DRB, 820 North Fairview Avenue, with comments, to March 10, 2009, for Preliminary/Final review.**

## **H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-002-DRB**

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

This is a request for *Preliminary/Final* 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. (Continued from 2-10-09) (Cindy Moore)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **2-10-09 Meeting:**

1. The horizontal sign format (Sign Type C-02) is more appropriate for the corner of Hollister Avenue and Patterson Avenue than the vertical format (Sign Type C-01).

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 10, 2009

Page 5 of 16

2. The height of the horizontal signs (Type C-02) should be lowered approximately 12 inches.
3. The "Exit to Patterson Ave." signs located at T02 and T03 do not seem necessary.

**SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:** Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to continue Item H-4, No. 09-002-DRB, 334 South Patterson Avenue, to March 10, 2009, for Preliminary/Final review, with the following comments: 1) Change the format of Sign Type C-01, located at T06 (corner of Hollister Avenue and Patterson Avenue) to a horizontal format, to match Sign Type C-02 (located at T01 and T04); 2) Lower the height of the Type C-02 Signs approximately 12" to a height of 5'6", and adjust the relationship of the font size between the text "Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital" and "Parking" so the font size for "Parking" reduces in scale; 3) Omit the Sign Type C-03 located at T02 ("Exit to Patterson Ave."); and 4) Omit the Sign Type C-03 located at T03 ("Exit to Patterson Ave.").

### I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

### 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.

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 10, 2009

Page 6 of 16

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 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. (Continued from 2-24-09\*, 1-27-09) (April Verbanac, David Stone)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### **1-27-09 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

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 10, 2009

Page 7 of 16

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.

The majority of members agreed that the applicant's presentation was excellent, and expressed appreciation for the amount of work and effort to provide the information.

Additional information requested by the DRB members, in general, included: a) a copy of the Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (05-034-TPM); b) copies of the various cross sections and photographs of the elevations; c) stormwater runoff, drainage, and water quality details; d) the total number of proposed bedrooms; e) details with regard to the retaining wall adjacent to the public access, including the height and its appearance along the path, f) a chart detailing building heights, and g) additional planting details for the landscape plan and information on how green roofs would be maintained.

Member Schneider commented:

- a. The work process was good but he has concerns regarding the result.
- b. The proposed design appears to be competing with the cliffs, which he believes will be unsuccessful.
- c. The proposed design is kind of an international style and he is not sure that this is the right site for the style. There needs to be some kind of way to break up the strong horizontality of the design. The proposed design may work if it was more softened.
- d. Expressed concern that there is no vertical movement in the proposed design. More stepping features might work although it may not fit with the style.
- e. The proposed grading has created two flat areas where the horizontal buildings are placed.
- f. The lighter color makes the architecture stand out too much. Suggest using the proposed darker color as the color for the upper portion of the buildings, then moving downward with deeper colors.
- g. When viewing the image from the ocean, the proposed project appears to "jump out" and does not appear soft. In comparison, the existing Bacara facilities appear to blend in as a village, and are softened by trees. (The proposed architecture does not need to match the existing Bacara facilities.)
- h. The proposed vegetation on the roof would be good, but it may not be a realistic solution when considering the limited rainfall in the area and finding appropriate low-maintenance plantings. This feature would seem more relevant if there were more people who would be looking down on the vegetation. Photovoltaic cells would seem to be more successful on the roofs.
- i. He would probably support the front yard setback modification along Hollister Avenue at a distance to be determined, as long as it is below grade and does not become a visual issue.
- j. His concern with regard to the building height modification is that there is sloping, particularly on the ocean side of the upper row, that would add to the apparent height of the building. He noted that he would prefer more architectural variation with regard to heights.
- k. The image at the entry drive works particularly well, with the view of the ocean and the architectural layers. It would be nice if there was room to spread the buildings more for a wider view of the ocean. He encouraged more similar designs.

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 10, 2009

Page 8 of 16

- i. The architecture when viewed from the south, on Page 21 of the plan, appears to be a cubic structure and creates a kind of wall that does not provide the sense that the ocean is on the other side of the units.

Member Brown commented:

- m. The proposed buildings appear too formal and rigid for the informality of the beach and need to be more fluid and playful.
- n. The square footage of the individual condominium units seems large.
- o. The landscaping needs to be considered along with the buildings on the site.
- p. There may be issues that come forward with regard to the amount of parking.
- q. The crescent design is an interesting connotation for the site.
- r. The concept of vegetation on the roofs will not be successful considering the amount of rainfall in the area unless there are plans for watering in the summer. Photovoltaic cells or some other feature would be more appropriate.
- s. Suggested consideration that the proposed location for the pool is in an area open to the ocean that can be very cold, which does not seem very practical.
- t. There needs to be a better understanding provided by the applicant with regard to stormwater runoff and landscaping.
- u. Consideration of Dark Sky principles with regard to exterior lighting will be an important consideration for the site.

Member Branch commented:

- v. It appears that great length was taken by the applicant to make the site work and to accommodate views. The grading is well thought-out, particularly for a project this size.
- w. The proposed architectural style is somewhat too rigid and the effect is too polished, although he is not against the style. The architecture needs different articulation and possibly more breaks in planes.
- x. Expressed concern regarding the view of the long horizontal planes of glass.
- y. Suggested that the architecture may need to undulate vertically along the horizontal path. Suggested the buildings may need to step within themselves down the site.
- z. From his standpoint, overall the concept is good and is moving towards where it needs to be.
- aa. The proposed development should be the most logical design and as appropriate to the site as possible.
- bb. The current beach access is great. Conceptually his preference would be that Buildings 6, 9 and 10 do not exist which would provide the same open feeling currently from the path to the beach at its existing location.
- cc. Encouraged more parking for the public, if possible.
- dd. Regarding vegetation on the roofs, the change of colors with the seasons would be organic to the site, if the landscaping could be maintained.
- ee. Potentially he could support the modification with regard to the front yard setbacks.
- ff. The modification for the 35' height limit needed for the proposed design to exceed 35 feet would not be appropriate.

Vice Chair Smith commented:

- gg. The proposed architectural design does not seem appropriate for this site and the overall concept needs more work. (He is not suggesting that the existing Bacara facilities be imitated.)
- hh. The horizontal lines are too strong and the design needs to be broken up.



## Design Review Board Agenda

March 10, 2009

Page 9 of 16

- ii. More consideration should be given to maintaining the building height at 35 feet. The effect when people are looking at the architecture from the beach will be much higher than the view from the ocean.
- jj. The quality of the proposed materials is appreciated.
- kk. The concept of public access to the beach needs to be respected.
- ll. He would support the modification for the front yard setback.

Member Messner commented:

- mm. Expressed concern regarding the drainage concept, stating that he would like something done to address the runoff.
- nn. Expressed concern that there will be issues that will need to be addressed with regard to maintenance of the DG pathway.
- oo. Suggested widening Hollister Avenue, on the beach access side, to provide for more public overflow parking, instead of people having to park towards the golf course and walk.

Member Herrera commented:

- pp. Agreed with Member Messner's concerns regarding the drainage concept, and requested further details with regard to the bioswale plans.
- qq. The proposed vegetated rooftops with grass plantings do not seem attractive.
- rr. He appreciates the appearance of the existing Bacara facilities and noted that if the proposed design was somewhat similar the project would look better.

Chair Wignot commented:

- ss. Encouraged the applicant to consider an architectural design that is less horizontal and less of a visual impact, and that would be unique to Goleta.
- tt. He does not believe that the proposed project meets the applicant's approach identified on Page 8 of the plans to address the challenge to marry the need rigorously to control the visual and ecological impact of the development with the desire to enhance the environment of great natural beauty with architecture of real aesthetic quality.
- uu. The proposed square footage for the individual condominium units is too large and makes the whole project overly large.
- vv. The orientation and layout of the architecture is appreciated because it allows for some views for ground floor units, but he is concerned that the terraced effect increases the height of the buildings over 35 feet, which is higher than he believes is necessary.
- ww. The concept of vegetated roofs is appreciated and also the fact that units in the rear would look out over this organic feature. Periodic use of reclaimed water during the dry season would probably be needed to maintain the plantings.
- xx. Suggested planting another row of trees along the line between the western part of the public access parking lot and the entrance motorcourt. The proposed landscaping between the public access parking and the entrance motorcourt area seems to be somewhat sparse.
- yy. Adding more public parking spaces along the Lot 1 portion of Hollister Avenue would be useful (within the Bacara development), noting that the parking spaces will fill up very quickly in the summer.
- zz. He requested that the applicant review and provide information with regard to the Can and Will Serve letter from the Goleta Water District, noting that water is becoming more of an issue in the community.
- aaa. In his opinion, the concept of this kind of condominium use does not fit in Goleta, stating that he believes a general hotel use would be more appropriate.

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 10, 2009

Page 10 of 16

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item M-1, No. 05-034-DRB, 8301 Hollister Avenue, to February 24, 2009, with comments.**

### **M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 06-180-DRB**

SE Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real (APN 077-160-040)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is a vacant 23,020-square foot commercial property in the CN (Neighborhood Commercial) zone district. The applicant proposes to construct an 8,753-square foot commercial building, consisting of a 5,032-square foot retail first-floor retail space and a 3,721-square foot general office space on the second-floor. The resulting 2-story structure would be 8,753-square feet with 24 proposed parking spaces, and associated landscaping. New materials are not defined for this conceptual review, other than a non-color specific stucco covering. The project was filed by Doug Reeves of D. W. Reeves & Associates A.I.A., Architects, on behalf of Dr. James Sturgeon, property owner. Related cases: 06-180-DP. (Scott Kolwitz)

### **N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- NONE

### **O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

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

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

### **P. ADJOURNMENT**

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

March 10, 2009

Page 11 of 16

### **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, 07-22 & 09-04. The DRB currently operates under Bylaws from Resolution 09-04

### **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 (e.g. General Plan, Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architectural and Design Guidelines, Design Standards for Commercial Projects);
- 2) promote high standards in architectural design and the construction of aesthetically pleasing, architecturally correct, 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.

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

March 10, 2009

Page 12 of 16

### **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.
- 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 the 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.

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 10, 2009

Page 13 of 16

- 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.

### 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 shall 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. Perspective sketches of the project may also be required. 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.

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 10, 2009

Page 14 of 16

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 (1/8" scale minimum).
- c. All elevations (1/8" scale minimum) 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.

### 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 architectural details, 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 shall 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 drawings 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.

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

March 10, 2009

Page 15 of 16

### **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 signs 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 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)**

#### **Sign Appeal Periods**

The **Final** or **Revised Final** approval or **denial** of a sign project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person withstanding may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. An appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within the ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed or closed early (such as on Fridays which close at 1:00 p.m.), the appeal period is extended until 5:30 p.m. on the following

## Design Review Board Agenda

March 10, 2009

Page 16 of 16

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.

### All Other Appeal Periods

The **Preliminary** or **Revised Final** approval or **denial** of a non-sign project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person withstanding may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. An appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within the ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed or closed early (such as on Fridays which close at 1:00 p.m.), the appeal period is extended until 5:30 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.