



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, May 26, 2009

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 P.M.

Scott Branch, Chris Messner, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:45 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:

Thomas Smith (At-Large Member), Chair
Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member), Vice Chair
Scott Branch (Architect)
Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Carl Schneider (Architect)
Bob Wignot (At-Large Member)

Notices:

- Requests for review of project plans or change of scheduling should be made to the City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, 93117; Telephone (805)961-7500.
 - In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City of Goleta at (805)961-7500. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City staff to make reasonable arrangements.
 - Preliminary approval or denial of a project by the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Goleta Planning Commission within ten (10) calendar days following the action. Please contact the Planning & 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

May 26, 2009

Page 2 of 13

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for May 12, 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. 09-023-DRB

351 S. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue (APNs 065-090-022, -023, -028)

This is a request for *Final* review of Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital which proposes to improve its existing facilities to comply with State Senate Bill 1953. Existing development consists of a 93,090-square foot hospital. The applicant proposes to replace the hospital with an entirely new facility and demolish the old hospital building, resulting in a total of 152,925 square feet. Parking to serve the hospital will be redeveloped onsite and a temporary construction parking area is under construction across South Patterson Avenue in the northwestern portion of the parcel known as the "Hollipat" site. Phased construction is planned through 2011 in a manner that will continue to provide all existing medical services to the community. The hospital parcel has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Office & Institutional with a Hospital Overlay. The zoning for the hospital is Professional & Institutional (PI) and the southern portion of the hospital parcel has the Approach Zone Overlay. The project was filed by agent Suzanne Elledge on behalf of the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital, property owner. Related cases: 07-171-OA, 07-171-DP, 09-002-CUP. (Continued from 5-12-09, 4-28-09, 3-24-09, 7-8-08, 6-24-08, 5-28-08, 5-13-08*, 2-12-08, 01-23-08, 12-18-07, 11-06-07) (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

5-12-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) The landscape palette is very lush and will add a great deal to the southern elevation, noting that people will be viewing the

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 26, 2009

Page 3 of 13

- landscaping more and not viewing as much the concerns there were about the building; and b) The pop of color provided by the Red Trumpet Vine plantings will be nice.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) As a whole, the changes in response to DRB comments have helped the proposed project, including the addition of the white color, the Rheinzink screen wall, and the green screen; and will work well along with the landscaping which is very lush; b) The Midland Tan color adds another level of color which works fairly well, even though there is only place on the building where this color is located; c) A pavement treatment needs to be applied to highlight the pedestrian path as it crosses the traffic circulation driveway area in the front area; d) After further consideration since the last review, he realizes that the front elevation is so relatively strong that the simplicity on the south and western elevations breaks down; and e) The applicant's efforts to work with the DRB are appreciated.
 3. Member Branch commented: a) The changes are a good improvement, noting that when making changes consideration was needed with regard to OSHPD review requirements; b) Adding the white color is a good solution; and c) The Midland Tan color is acceptable, although it feels narrow, noting that the true elevation will rarely be seen by motorists along Patterson Avenue.
 4. Member Messner commented: a) The changes are appreciated, especially adding the white color, and adding the Midland Tan color that helps break up the massing on the east elevation; b) The Canary Island Pine trees will do fine where they fit into the plan, especially with the maintenance that will be provided by the hospital, and because of the shape of the tree, and not being close to sidewalks where there could be problems with cones and droppings; and c) Expressed appreciation that all of the nine existing Guadalupe Fan Palm trees, which are old and part of the history of Goleta, will be retained in the landscape plan.
 5. Member Herrera commented: a) The plant palette selection is appropriate; b) The plant colors and flowers will blend very well; and c) The Canary Island Pine tree species is a good selection, with the dark green color, and will fit well with the building.
 6. Chair Smith commented: a) The landscape palette does a lot for the project, considering the nature of the building structure; b) The white color is appreciated because it adds some interest and pops out; c) The green screen landscaping is appreciated; and d) Agreed with comments from the other DRB members.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent Wignot), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-1, No. 09-023-DRB, 351 S. Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The applicant shall provide plans at Final review that highlight a distinct pedestrian pathway as it crosses the traffic circulation driveway area in front of the hospital, using a pavement treatment with a color and texture difference; and to continue Item K-1 to May 26, 2009, for Final Review on the Consent Calendar.

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-033-DRB

5633 Armitos Avenue (APN 071-073-006)

This is a request for *Final* 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 demolish the existing residence and install a manufactured home on a new foundation system. The

Design Review Board Agenda

May 26, 2009

Page 4 of 13

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. (Continued from 5-12-09, 4-14-09) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

5-12-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed roof solution for the front entry seems to work; and b) The posts seem somewhat leggy and he would prefer the posts were more substantial, particularly now that the roof overhang is broader and the whole entry structure feels more substantial.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The posts are somewhat leggy; b) The proposed roof solution is relatively successful from the street elevation; and c) It seems odd that the porch structure does not connect to the main structure, although it is located on the side and will probably not be visible. (Amy Taylor, agent, stated that the porch structure cannot be structurally attached to the manufactured home; however, there will be an overlap that will provide for an overhang for protection from rain.)
3. Member Messner commented: a) He appreciates the proposed landscape plan.
4. Chair Smith commented: a) The proposed plans for the front entry transition nicely from the flat roof of the garage to the other roof pitch in the back.
5. Member Brown commented: a) With regard to the proposed Water Gum tree, the *Tristania* species do not look robust when first planted, are very slender, and would not provide adequate shading; b) The idea of planting canopy trees is to provide shade; c) Reconsider the selection of the street tree species; and d) Consider planting a larger tree in the front yard, closer to the sidewalk, to provide a canopy for the sidewalk.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Wignot), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-033-DRB, 5633 Armitos Avenue, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The applicant shall reconsider and select a street tree species with no litter and a slightly larger canopy; and the applicant may consider placing a larger tree in the front yard closer to the sidewalk; and to continue Item L-1 to May 26, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

Design Review Board Agenda

May 26, 2009

Page 5 of 13

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 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 5-12-09*, 4-28-09*, 4-14-09, 5-13-08*, 4-22-08*, 4-8-08*, 3-11-08*, 2-26-08*, 2-12-08*, 1-23-08*, 1-8-08, 12-18-07) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

4-14-09 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) The design of the sign is fine. b) Expressed concern regarding light trespass because the proposed lighting is not downward lit. c) Consider possibly inserting LEDs under the letters.
2. Member Smith commented: a) The proposed grid louver shield may not resolve the concern with regard to light trespass.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 07-211-DRB, 120 South Patterson Avenue, to April 28, 2009, with the following comments: 1) The proposed sign is fine. 2) The applicant is directed to explore lighting methods that provide lighting only on the face of the sign to resolve the concern regarding light trespass. 3) The proposed lighting, which is not downward lit, is not acceptable.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

Design Review Board Agenda

May 26, 2009

Page 6 of 13

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. 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 5-12-09, 4-14-09, 3-10-09) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

5-12-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Requested the applicant conduct an inventory of the trees on the south side of the property (most of which are on the Towbes property) to determine their health status and where trees may be needed to be planted on the south side of the site to fill in the gaps.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The project is moving in a good direction; b) The survey and addition of trees on the south side is a good idea; and c) The pop-out element on the east elevation does not work. A couple of windows and some vents would be a good solution.
3. Member Brown commented: a) A landscape plan with a palette that is similar to the landscaping for the proposed Islamic Center across Calle Real would tie the two projects together; b) Consider native plantings, for example, the Coffee Berry, or some other species with color; which would provide a nice view when looking towards the preserve; c) The applicant should look at the trash enclosure at Fairview and Shirrell which has a nice design; d) The doors, windows, colors and lighting fixtures will need more study, and consider some things that are more decorative and/or interesting because the building is fairly plain; e) Consider paned windows; and f) Cut sheets are needed for the lighting fixtures.
4. Member Herrera commented: a) The height of the mounds and landscaping elements should be kept low on both sides of the entrance for visibility purposes.
5. Chair Smith commented: a) The proposed project is moving in a good direction and the changes are appreciated; b) Adding some mounding or some kind of berming (that would be low in height) would be nice to soften the street corner and the building; c) The lighting fixtures need some character with more interest; and d) Agreed with Member Branch that the projection on the east elevation should be removed.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 26, 2009

Page 7 of 13

MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Wignot), to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 06-180-DRB, SE Corner of Los Carneros/Calle Real, with comments to May 26, 2009.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

N-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-064-DRB

5441 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-140-072)

This is a request for *Advisory* review. The property is a vacant 20.5-acre parcel that historically has cultivated organic row crops in the AG-I-10 zone district. The applicant requests the Design Review Board to consider public improvements within the right-of-way for Hollister Avenue and within the roadway dedication limits for Plaza del Centro (La Sumida Garden Lane) associated with the Santa Barbara County approved church development located on the subject parcel. Proposed public improvements within the Hollister Avenue right-of-way include a sidewalk, median alterations, and landscaping. Improvements within the La Sumida Gardens roadway dedication limits include a pathway, landscaping, curb and gutter. The project was filed by Jonathan Leech of Dudek, on behalf of Saint Athanasius Orthodox Church, Deacon Gary McFarland, property owner. Related cases: (Santa Barbara County) 01-CUP-00000-00152. (Scott Kolwitz)

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. APPROVED VS BUILT SLIDESHOW

O-2. ZONING ADMINISTRATOR/SIGNAGE PROGRAMS PROCESS PATH DISCUSSION

O-3. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-4. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

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

May 26, 2009

Page 9 of 13

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

May 26, 2009

Page 10 of 13

- 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

May 26, 2009

Page 11 of 13

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

May 26, 2009

Page 12 of 13

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

May 26, 2009

Page 13 of 13

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.