



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, April 14, 2009

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:15 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 & Environmental Services Department for more information.
 - Design Review Board approvals do not constitute Land Use Clearances.
 - The square footage figures on this agenda are subject to change during the review process.
 - The length of Agenda items is only an estimate. Applicants are responsible for being available when their item is to be heard. Any item for which the applicant is not immediately available may be continued to the next meeting.
-

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 2 of 21

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for March 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. 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 Building 2 and associated improvements, improvements for the entry and private internal drive, and street and frontage improvements to Hollister Avenue as part of the phased build out of the previously approved Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 2 would be a two-story, 40,000-square foot structure. Associated improvements for the 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 948,782 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, 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN. (Continued from 3-24-09, 2-10-09*, 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:

3-24-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) the proposed landscape palette is appreciated; b) requested cut sheets showing light standards that are dark sky compliant; and

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 3 of 21

- c) requested details regarding the light pole standards, stating that the single pole style is preferred, and that there needs to be consistency.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) the proposed design for the bus shelter is preferred; b) the transformers should be screened from the west; and c) requested the applicant show details regarding the lighting standard single pole style that would be similar to the double pole style.
3. Chair Wignot commented: a) the items that remain for review with regard to Building 2 are the cut sheets for the lighting fixtures and the single pole standard.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Smith) to continue Item J-1, No. 37-SB-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to April 14, 2009, (regarding construction of Building 2 and associated improvements) with the following comments for Final review on the Consent Calendar: 1) the applicant is requested to provide cut sheets showing that the light fixtures are dark sky compliant; 2) the applicant is requested to provide details regarding the light pole style, which should be consistent, with regard to single pole (which is preferred) or double pole, for both the parking lot and street lights; 3) the two transformers shall be screened to the west side to provide screening for motorists driving east on Hollister Avenue; 4) relocate the pedestrian path slightly away from the two transformers; and 5) the design submitted by the applicant for the bus stop shelter is the preferred design.

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-045-DRB

5484 Overpass Road (APN 071-220-033)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 5,780-square foot shop building, a 1,362-square foot office building, a 18,835-square feet of unenclosed materials storage (a portion of which – in the southwest corner of the property – is as-built), an as-built 640-square foot storage unit, and two unused fuel pumps and associated underground fuel tanks on a 84,070-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 2,961-square foot, two story office addition, and a new trash enclosure. This application also includes a proposal to permit the aforementioned as-built outdoor material storage area and storage unit, and to re-configure the site's parking areas. All materials used for this addition are to match the existing office building with the exception of the proposed lighting, which would be the Capri Mini by The Plaza Family. The project was filed by agent Joseph H. Moticha on behalf of Randy Douglas, Tierra Contracting, Inc., property owner. Related cases: 07-045-DP AM01, 07-045-LUP. (Continued from 3-24-09, 1-13-09*, 11-12-08*, 10-14-08*, 9-23-08*, 9-09-08) (Laura Vlk)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-24-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Schneider commented: a) he is somewhat disappointed that the board and bat materials were removed, but the stucco material is acceptable; and b) flat tile roof material would seem more appropriate than barrel tile, considering that the building is located in an area with buildings that are somewhat agrarian, such as the animal shelter and the new Sumida Gardens apartment building; c) flat tile would probably work better with the solar panels; and d) the beam style is fine and should be retained.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 4 of 21

2. Chair Wignot commented: a) the change from board and bat materials to stucco is fine.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) the roof materials shall be changed to a flat concrete tile that is the same color as the proposed color; and continue Item L-1, No. 07-045-DRB, to April 14, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-016-DRB

75 Coromar Drive (APN 073-150-014)

This is a request for *Final* review. The applicant proposes to install a soil and groundwater remediation system at the southeast corner of the property in the front yard setback. The equipment would be approximately 10 feet tall, with vent piping extending an additional 5 feet. The work area would be screened within an existing 6-foot wooden fence. No habitable floor area or other exterior changes to existing development are proposed. (Continued from 3-24-09, 2-24-09) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-24-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) at the previous review, Vice Chair Smith commented that the cut sheets will need to be provided showing that the lighting will be directed downward and will be dark sky compliant; b) she requested that a condition of approval be added that the lights would be removed at the end of the project.
2. Member Branch commented: a) it may be appropriate to consider that the applicant has indicated that the lights will be used only for intermittent maintenance and will be removed at the end of the project.
3. Chair Wignot commented: a) when he visited the site, it did not seem that the existing fence at the location presented a significant issue regarding visual clearance; and b) he supports the condition of approval that the fence and remediation equipment will be removed at the end of the project.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that staff will work with the applicant and Community Services staff prior to the next review regarding the location of the fence on the corner to address setbacks and visual clearance.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-1, No. 09-016-DRB, 75 Coromar Drive, with the following conditions: 1) upon the completion of remediation activities and removal of the remediation equipment, replacement landscaping shall be installed per the landscape plan approved by the DRB; 2) the replacement landscaping shall be installed no later than three years after the date of the issuance of the land use permit unless Planning staff approves an extension with a revised land use permit; 3) the lighting fixtures shall be removed at the end of the project; and 4) the applicant shall work with staff prior to the next review with regard to setback requirements at the corner area and address visual clearance issues; and to

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 5 of 21

continue Item K-1, No. 09-016-DRB, to April 14, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-017-DRB

286 Magnolia Avenue (APN 071-114-013)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 1,526-square foot self-serve car wash with related landscaping and a pole sign on a 7,200-square foot parcel in the C-3 zone district. The applicant proposes to remodel the façade of the existing car wash bays and to construct an 84-square foot addition to a storage room. All materials are proposed to match the existing structures. The project was filed by Dawn Sherry, architect, on behalf of John Price, property owner. Related cases: 09-017-LUP. (Continued from 3-24-09) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-24-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Chair Wignot commented: a) the applicant's proposal to underground the electrical utilities will be an improvement; b) the replacement of the existing round tank on the roof with a rectangular flat tank, and the removal of the existing screening, will be a big improvement; and c) suggested the applicant consider planting a street tree in an area that is now gravel, almost in line with the new extension, particularly if the overhead utility lines are removed.
2. Member Branch commented: a) there needs to be some type of trim piece on top of the new addition so it ties in.
3. Member Brown commented: a) requested that the applicant restudy the color scheme.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider; Absent: Messner, Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 09-017-DRB, 286 Magnolia Avenue, with the following conditions 1) the applicant shall explore and provide a couple of options for the treatment of the fascia trim; and 2) the applicant shall restudy the color scheme; and to continue Item L-2, No. 09-017-DRB, to April 14, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

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

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

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The applicant proposes to install a two sided freestanding entry sign for the Patterson Place Apartments measuring a maximum of 4-feet 4-inches tall by 8-feet wide. The sign area is proposed to be approximately 18 ½ -inches by 7-feet 4-inches for an aggregate of approximately 11 square feet on each side of the structure. The non-illuminated sign shall have aluminum pin mounted flat cut out (F.C.O.) "Burnt Crimson" lettering. The portion of the sign reading "Patterson Place" will have 6-inch high letters, the portion of the sign reading "APARTMENTS" will have 4-inch high

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 6 of 21

letters, and the address portion of the sign will have 4 ½ -inch high letters. The sign would be located approximately 9-feet east of the edge of public right-of-way and approximately 36-feet north of the Patterson Place Apartments entrance. No logos are allowed as part of the sign. The application was filed by agent Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, property owner. Related case: 74-CP-39, 07-211-SCC. (Continued from 5-13-08*, 4-22-08*, 4-8-08*, 3-11-08*, 82-26-08*, 2-12-08*, 1-23-08*, 1-8-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-08-08 Meeting:

1. The preference for lighting is downward halo-lit illumination which is fully shielded. The applicant is requested to restudy and provide cut sheets that show lighting that is fully shielded. The illumination should be restricted to just lighting the sign. A suggestion was made that the applicant possibly consider two simple lights that can be fully shielded.
2. Possibly consider a pole light standard to provide lighting at the corner instead of a light for the sign. A pole light would also be a decorative feature for the landscaping.
3. The applicant is requested to address concerns with staff regarding the sight distance and placement of the sign, and to show that the placement of the sign is consistent with the site plan.
4. The applicant is requested to provide the landscape plan showing the new sign.
5. The design of the sign is fine.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION: By consensus (Recused: Schneider) the Sign Subcommittee continued Item H-3, No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to January 23, 2008, with comments.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-168-DRB

5360 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-101-017)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 3,600-square foot commercial building on an approximately 12,600-square foot lot in the CN zone district. The applicant requests approval of a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the building. The proposed OSP provides for one wall sign per tenant. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign. The project was filed by Jeffrey and Kimberly Danhauer, property owners. Related cases: 09-030-OSP. (Shine Ling)

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-026-DRB

5940 Calle Real (APN 069-110-045)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 3,100-square foot commercial restaurant building on an approximately 22,000-square foot parcel in

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 7 of 21

the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to use a 710-square foot outdoor area in front of the restaurant for dining and to construct a windscreen and firepit for the area. Materials for the windscreen would consist of glass and concrete painted off-white to match the restaurant building. Materials for the firepit would consist of CMU blocks with stone veneer and a metal fireplace screen. The project was filed by Dawn Sherry, architect, on behalf of Fresco North, tenant, and Bob Bartlett, property owner. Related cases: 09-026-LUP. (Continued from 3-24-09) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-24-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Chair Wignot commented: a) the glass windscreen will provide for a better dining experience on a windy day and screening of the adjacent traffic; b) the planters are needed and will be an improvement to the appearance; c) the trash storage area, which is currently unscreened and not enclosed, is a detraction when people enter the restaurant from the new rear entrance; d) consider using the area in parking space #21 to add some type of screening for the trash storage area; e) at first he questioned the rationale of placing the firepit feature at this location; and f) expressed some concern with regard to the potential for graffiti on the glass surface of the windscreen.
2. Member Brown commented: a) the windscreen will provide shelter and a screen for the diners which will be useful because this section of Calle Real is busy and noisy; b) the vegetation needs to be far enough back so it will not hang over the sidewalk; c) planters will be needed, especially with regard to the wall; and d) when considering the sign application, the applicant will need to know which of the existing signs are legally permitted signs.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) a couple of years ago he observed that a firepit feature at a coffee establishment near a busy street seemed to work; and b) suggested the applicant consider lowering the post approximately three or four inches lower than the edge of the glass at the top of the glass rail.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, No. 09-026-DRB, 5940 Calle Real, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) the applicant shall study enclosing and screening the trash storage area; and to continue Item L-3, No. 09-026-DRB, to April 14, 2009, for Final review on the Final Calendar.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-033-DRB

5633 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-073-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 1,448-square foot single-story residence with an attached two-car garage on a 6,000-square foot lot in the 7-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 8 of 21

demolish the existing residence and install a manufactured home on a new foundation system. The existing garage would remain and be remodeled and is proposed to be attached to the manufactured home. The resulting one-story structure would be 1,746 square feet, consisting of a 1,188-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 558-square foot two-car garage with storage area. The proposed project is consistent with the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district. Materials and finishes of the manufactured home are proposed to remain the same and consist of grey-brown plaster and siding; materials of the garage are proposed to match the manufactured home. The project was filed by Amy Taylor, architect, on behalf of Wendy and Eric McFarland, property owners. Related cases: 09-033-LUP. (Shine Ling)

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 05-034-DRB CONTINUED TO 4/28/09

8301 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-200-012 & 079-200-013) TIME CERTAIN 4:00-6:00

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.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 9 of 21

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 3-10-09, 2-24-09*, 1-27-09) (April Verbanac, David Stone)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-10-09 Meeting:

The majority of members agreed that the revisions to the project in response to Conceptual comments are appreciated and that the plans and model are very useful.

1. Member Brown commented:
 - a. The revised landscape plan is appreciated.
 - b. The revisions which eliminate one building and relocate another building improve the view corridors and visual aesthetics.
 - c. The color change is appreciated. Rich colors are recommended.
 - d. Dark sky features are important to consider at the Conceptual stage.
 - e. Consider whether the jitney path could be broadened and also provide for pedestrian access, moving the bioswale to the east side of the public path.
 - f. Requested more undulation of the buildings in front that appear too rigid to reduce some of the mass of the built environment. Currently there are no buildings seen when walking down the path. The buildings in the back have greater articulation and undulation.
 - g. The reduction in the building heights is appreciated. The overall height of the three-story buildings is still a concern.
 - h. Regarding the view from the jitney path, requested the applicant check the structure that appears to be protruding into the path.
 - i. Regarding the view through the motor court, suggested that the tree in the center be removed because it does not seem to fit and appears too formal for the beach. Widening the view corridor to the ocean would be appreciated.
 - j. Concerns remain about the sustainability and suitability of the vegetated roofs.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 10 of 21

- k. The plants chosen for the bioswales are fairly large and probably do not belong in bioswales. Grasses would be more appropriate. Some of the proposed species may not be available locally. The proposed species, particularly trees, should be grown from native seeds to this area.
2. Member Schneider commented:
 - a. The color change will help make the buildings seem to recede rather than stand out.
 - b. Expressed concern regarding the repetitiveness feature of the style.
 - c. Suggested breaking up the massing of the buildings on the site plan by conceptually eliminating some of the units as follows: Building 1: Eliminate the top floor unit to the west (there would be a two-story unit on the west side and a three-story building on the east portion, stepping up). Building 2: Remain as proposed. Building 3: Change Building 3 opposite to the recommendation for Building 1. Regarding the view from the motor court: Suggested dropping the two third-story buildings on either side of the corridor which would allow the view to open up. Building 6: Eliminate the unit farthest to the east on the top floor which would help soften the building and open up the area near the public access path and jitney path.
 - d. Vegetated roofs will be a good feature but will require long-term irrigation (preferably with reclaimed water) and appropriate plant species to be successful. Suggested that the applicant consult with a local landscape architect regarding the selection of appropriate plant materials for the vegetated roofs and bioswale.
 - e. Locating the intermediate trees between the two arcs is a good feature.
 - f. He would support the modification request for the setback encroachments, stating that the proposed parking structure is basically underground.
 - g. He has concerns regarding the building height modification request, probably because of the repetitive nature of the proposed architectural style. Height modifications may be appropriate toward the interior of the development where not visible. He noted that some of the heights are significantly over the requirement.
3. Member Branch commented:
 - a. The effect of the location of the tree in the motor court is appreciated. He does not agree with Member Brown that the tree should be removed.
 - b. After viewing the model, it seems that privacy needs to be considered with regard to the residential aspect (the units will be privately owned), noting that some of the decks are close.
 - c. He would support the modification request for the setback.
 - d. The modification request for the height limit would be difficult to support because the modification is not in conjunction with a hardship.
 - e. The proposed vegetated roofs, if successful, will be a good feature.
 - f. The separation of the public path and the jitney path seems appropriate. He expressed concern that the public path becomes too narrow.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented:
 - a. The revisions are a big improvement and the direction is appreciated.
 - b. The plans for the public access path area appreciated.
 - c. The pedestrian path and jitney path should be separate and not merged.
 - d. The proposed vegetated roofs will be a good feature and beneficial with regard to the view from the units in back.
 - e. The changes that add architectural undulation and modifications of the building heights are appreciated.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 11 of 21

- f. Suggested providing some more openness between Buildings 3 and 4. Possibly consider removing a third-story unit on each side as recommended by Member Schneider.
 - g. The modification request regarding the height limit is not presented as a hardship.
5. Member Herrera commented:
- a. The reclaimed water aspect is good for the project.
 - b. The revisions made to reduce building heights are appreciated.
 - c. The tree in the motor court is fine; however, if the tree is removed, suggest replacing it with a small water feature that would allow for a view to the ocean.
 - d. Non-invasive grasses should not be selected for the property.
 - e. Use permeable pavers in the parking lot as much as possible.
6. Chair Wignot commented:
- a. Requested the applicant respond to the following questions: a) Is the plant species proposed for the pathway appropriate and how will it be maintained? b) Will storage be provided for condominium owners for items and/or vehicles?
 - b. He expressed concern that he would not be able to make findings for approval of the conceptual project as follows:
Finding #1: He cannot find that there is a compatibility with the existing neighborhood, particularly the existing Bacara style and other structures on the site. The project would be more appropriate as an infill project where there are similar structures. With regard to the size, bulk, and scale of the project, the size of the units seems too large.
Finding #3: The project does not demonstrate a harmonious relationship with adjoining developments.
Finding #13: The public scenic views from the access road, the public parking area, the beach access way, and the beach will be substantially blocked off by this project.
Finding #17: The appearance of the neighborhood is impacted by the proposed project.
Finding #18: Relocating the existing public vertical access way to a narrow corridor between the condominium buildings and the bluff diminishes public health and safety. He believes that the public walking along the proposed access area would be at risk in the event of bluff erosion or an earthquake. The proposed changes would narrow the emergency vehicle access road that would pass through a public parking lot and require two gates rather than one gate to be unlocked for emergency access.
 - c. The proposed relocation of the public access way to the east will end in an area of the beach where there are still remnants of oil field operations. These are a hazard and should be removed in accordance with original conditions of approval.
 - d. Expressed concern that public beach access will be marginalized.
 - e. For purposes of Conceptual review by the DRB, he believes that the applicant has adequately explained the nature of the design of the project.
 - f. The proposed General Plan Amendments will be reviewed by the decision-makers. He expressed concern that the applicant has requested so many amendments to the General Plan.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item M-1, No. 05-034-DRB, 8301 Hollister

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 12 of 21

Avenue, to April 14, 2009, at a time certain of 4:00 p.m., with comments including:

- a) Restudy the interplay of the jitney path, pedestrian path and emergency access and consider whether it would be appropriate for pedestrians to walk on the jitney path.
- b) Vegetated roofs will need appropriate plant materials and on-going irrigation to be successful.
- c) Further study the interplay of buildings and address the concerns regarding massing and scale, address the building edges, how to accomplish more interest and how to provide a better transition from the public space to the private space.
- d) Further examine the design to address the concern regarding the repetitive feature in the buildings in the back.
- e) The building height modification will be difficult to support.
- f) Permeable surface materials are recommended as much as possible.
- g) Restudy the entry motor court area with regard to modifications suggested to broaden the view shed.

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. (Continued from 3-10-09) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-10-09 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) This area is a very unique corridor and it is important that buildings blend and do not stand out. b) The proposed project stands out and does not fit into the corridor. c) The aesthetic view when coming over Los Carneros toward the mountains needs to be considered. d) Consider locating the parking lot in the front to open the view.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The Los Carneros/Calle Real corner is an important corridor. b) The best location for the driveway access is on Calle Real. c) The architectural style needs to be more agrarian; for example, gables and shed roofs; and possibly board and bat or flat concrete tile. d) The existing Towbes project form is typical agrarian but not necessarily the materials. d) The tower needs to integrate more. e) Suggest removing the trellis on the north side which is on the section of the building that needs to be softened. f) The trellis on the south side is okay. g) It would be worthwhile to install a sidewalk along Los Carneros.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 13 of 21

3. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed project feels like one large mass. b) Consider breaking the project into two smaller masses. c) The design should be considered as part of the entry to this portion of Goleta and with regard to the orchard views. d) The Stow House and train depot styles would be most appropriate to consider. e) The Towbes project is simpler but he does not recommend that it be emulated. f) Suggested bigger break-ups and deeper recesses, possibly with some porch elements. g) Consider subterranean parking.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) Consider tucking the building into the southeast corner. b) Look at the Calle Real/Patterson fire station or the Patterson Packing building as examples of style. c) As asymmetrical design with gables, shed and hip roofs is possible. d) A rural style might make the project design feel better.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) The placement of the building as proposed seems to create visual barriers to the intersection. b) Requested the applicant provide details regarding the landscape, hardscape and footprint percentages.
6. Chair Wignot commented: a) Suggest the applicant look at the commercial building on the corner of Calle Real and Carlo Drive that previously was a barn, and the dentist office east of the Spectrum Health Club which is a single-story building. b) The size and bulk of the proposed project is not compatible with the neighborhood.

STRAW VOTE: How many members believe that the size, bulk and scale of the building is suitable?

Members who believe the proposed size, bulk and scale of the building is suitable.

(3)

Vice Chair Smith suggested that changes in the style would reduce the size, bulk, and scale. Member Schneider stated that softening the corner of the building and also shifting the second story mass to the south would be helpful. Member Branch believes there are architectural changes that can be worked out.

Members who do not believe the proposed size, bulk and scale of the building is suitable: (3)

Member Brown stated that she does not know if changes in the architectural style will make a difference. Member Herrera stated that the size needs to be reduced. Chair Wignot believes that the size and bulk is not compatible with the neighborhood.

Member Absent: Messner. (1).

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner) to continue Item M-2, No. 06-180-DRB, SE Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, with comments to April 14, 2009.

M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-106-DRB

5800 Cathedral Oaks Road (APN 069-090-050)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 11,974-square foot two-story clubhouse, a 1,575-square foot pool cabana, a total of 1,080-square feet in storage sheds, 84,144-square feet comprising 12 tennis courts, a 3,200-square foot pool, a 1,500-square foot pool, a 12,100-square foot pool patio, and 110 parking spaces on a 8.23 acre lot in the REC zone district. The applicant

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 14 of 21

proposes to construct a 2,265-square foot, two-story addition to the clubhouse consisting of 904-square foot lobby, reception area, storage area and elevator/stairs on the first-story and a 1,361-square foot exercise room and elevator/stairs on the second-floor. All materials used for this project are proposed to match the existing development. The applicant also proposes to construct 19 new parking spaces and remove 4 existing parallel parking spaces, which would bring total onsite parking to 124 spaces. The project was filed by Kirk Gradin of Banyan Architects on behalf of Cathedral Oaks Holdings, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 73-EIR-23, 73-CP-40, 73-CP-40 AM01, 07-106-CUP AM01, & 07-106-LUP. (Continued from 11-20-07*, 10-16-07*, 9-05-07*, 8-07-07*, 7-03-07) (Laura Vlk)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-03-07 Meeting:

1. The applicant is requested to provide additional information regarding the current drainage over the entire property. The DRB has several concerns regarding drainage on the site that include the relation to the steep slope, the drainage pattern, and whether the drain is sufficient to capture the additional stormwater runoff. Member Schneider suggested that there may be a solution from an engineering standpoint.
2. Consider using products in addition to pavers in the parking lot, such as Uni-Echo Stone, that would allow water to percolate. Suggest the applicant refer to the City's parking lot at the Sperling Preserve, across the street from Ellwood School, which has pavers that allow water to percolate.
3. Member Messner said he observed from his site visit that the drainage runs along the curb against the creek and does not go down the center of the existing parking lot. He noted that the slope is steep and needs something to slow down the runoff. He observed that the Eucalyptus trees located by the V gutters are dying of disease, and he is concerned if trees die there will be more light seepage. He suggested replacing the trees that are dying with certain shade tree species such as the *Acer macro-phyllum* (Big Leaf Maple), and the *Populous*, and the *Sycamore Platanus*, which would better help filter some of the contaminants washed off the parking lot and into the creek and drains. He believes the drainage, lighting and tree disease issues are interlocked and need to be addressed as a whole.
4. Member Pierce suggested that there are columnar-type tree species such as the Brisbane Box, which have a full canopy at the top, with basically a view of only the trunk for approximately seven feet, which would be useful to diffuse light to the neighbors if there was a problem with plantings in the riparian zone, which could be planted on the west side of the basketball court where there is planting area.
5. Consider eliminating the planting fingers in the parking lot, thereby shortening the length of the paving, and planting trees adjacent to the edge of the parking lot to provide for a canopy.
6. Recommend planting some additional appropriate trees that would provide for more shade in the parking lot. Shade seems to be lacking, particularly with the addition of paving in the parking lot.
7. Member Schneider said that the architecture design works very well and ties in well to the existing building. He noted that the large windows on the second floor

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 15 of 21

look out to a fence with green windscreen, which may be something to consider; although the design fits with the architectural style, if the fence were removed.

8. Chair Branch said that the addition is quite handsome. He supports keeping the large windows on the second floor as proposed because there may be issues if the windows were changed now and then the fence was removed later.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown and carried by a 7 to 0 vote to continue Item J-5, No. 07-106-DRB, to August 7, 2007, with the following comments: 1) The applicant is requested to provide additional information which will explain drainage over the entire property as best as possible. 2) Suggest consideration that the drainage in the new parking lot is handled in some way that it does not contribute to the existing parking lot drainage situation and that, in some manner such as surface flow or bioswale, it flows to the creek. 3) The applicant is requested to consider the comments regarding landscaping and planting materials, and to conduct an assessment of what trees on the site are dying. 4) If lighting will be added in the parking lot, the applicant is requested to provide a lighting plan and cut sheets regarding lighting fixtures. 5) The architecture of the building is fine.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

April 14, 2009

Page 16 of 21

Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines

Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)

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

Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)

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

April 14, 2009

Page 17 of 21

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

April 14, 2009

Page 18 of 21

- 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

April 14, 2009

Page 19 of 21

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

April 14, 2009

Page 20 of 21

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

April 14, 2009

Page 21 of 21

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.