



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, June 23, 2009

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 1:30 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:

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

June 23, 2009

Page 2 of 14

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for June 9, 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. 09-084-DRB

5266 Hollister Avenue (APN 065-050-022)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes three commercial buildings totaling 26,422 square feet on a 3.4-acre parcel in the PI zone district. The applicant proposes to install security gates on the west and east entryways to the courtyard for the rear building of the complex (Building C). The gates would be constructed of steel and painted to match the beige color of the building, with a botanical motif painted green and welded over the security bars. Security bars are also proposed to be installed in the interior of the security office and would be screened by curtains. No changes to height, floor area, landscaping, or parking are proposed. The project was filed by William Fedderson of Luminare Design Group, agent, on behalf of Stonebrook Square Ltd., property owner. Related cases: 09-084-LUP. (Continued from 6-9-09) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-9-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Branch commented: a) The new design with the wider steel decoration and the color is more effective; and b) Overall, the proposed project is fine.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide clarification regarding the requirements for egress hardware details which should be considered aesthetically; b) The concept of the design is quite nice; and c) Recommended that both of the gates at the front be opened during the day.
3. Member Brown commented: a) The design is appreciated because the project appears friendlier than just having security bars.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 23, 2009

Page 3 of 14

- Chair Smith commented: a) The project is very well done; and b) The new design with the wider steel decoration will work well

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, No. 09-084-DRB, 5266 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The plans shall show the double gate opening at the front; and 2) The applicant is requested to provide clarification regarding the requirements for egress hardware which should be considered aesthetically; and to continue Item L-2, No. 09-084-DRB, to June 23, 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 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 5-26-09*, 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:

- 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.
- 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.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 23, 2009

Page 4 of 14

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-042-DRB

111 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-025)

This is a request for *Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes a 21,800-square foot commercial building with a 2,570-square foot outdoor mechanical equipment yard on a 3.6-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes an Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the building. The proposed OSP provides for two (2) different types of signs: a monument sign and wall signs. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by Jeff Gorrell of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Mark Winnikoff of Frieslander Holdings LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-042-OSP. (Continued from 6-9-09; 5-12-09) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-9-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) The requested changes are fine; and b) The list of prohibitive signs is appreciated. She noticed that the existing landscaping will need to be removed to install the proposed monument sign in the front, and expressed concern that consideration should have been given with regard to providing for other landscaping. (Assistant Planner Shine Ling stated that staff will request a landscape detail from the applicant when the Sign Permit and the Land Use Permit for the structure are considered).

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION: By consensus, the Sign Subcommittee continued Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-042-DRB, 111 Castilian Drive, to June 23, 2009, for Preliminary/Final review, with the changes as submitted.

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-071-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The Cabrillo Business Park is comprised of a 92.25-acre site in the Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. At full build out, the Cabrillo Business Park would total 946,282 square feet, including 704,600 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Hollister Business Park. The proposed OSP provides for seven (7) different types of signs: monument signs, directional signs, wall signs, recreation area signs, retail building signs, temporary leasing signs, and miscellaneous signs. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by Troy White of Dudek, agent, on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-071-OSP; - CUP. (Shine Ling)

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 23, 2009

Page 5 of 14

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-169-DRB & 08-170-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 M-RP and M-S-GOL zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Buildings 12A and 12B and associated improvements as part of the phased build out of the Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 12A would be a one-story, 10,000-square foot structure and Building 12B would be a one-story, 7,500-square foot structure. Associated improvements for each building include onsite sidewalks, asphalt, curb and gutters, landscaping, and parking. New materials consist of metal, concrete, accent stone, and glazing. At full build out the Cabrillo Business Park as proposed to be amended would total 948,782 square feet, including 707,100 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. The project was filed by agent Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 08-107-DP AM, 08-039-LUP, 08-040-LUP, 08-041-LUP, 08-042-LUP, 08-160-LUP, 08-119-LUP, 08-025-LUP, 07-144-MC, 07-236-MC, 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN (Continued from 5-12-09*, 2-10-09*, 11-12-08, 10-14-08). (Cindy Moore)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

11-12-08 Meeting:

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

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

J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-086-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

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 23, 2009

Page 6 of 14

Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Building 4 and associated improvements as part of the phased build out of the previously approved Cabrillo Business Park project. Building 4 would be a two-story, 60,000-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. Building 4 was referenced on previous agendas under DRB permit number 37-SB-DRB. Related cases: 08-107-DP AM, 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN (Continued from 05-12-09*, 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:

7-22-08 Meeting:

1. Member Brown commented: a) the current proposed location for the Goleta Water District backflow preventer is the preferred location, noting that the equipment would be pushed back as far from the curb as possible, and that the current location shown is in the realm of forty feet; b) the backflow preventer equipment should be landscaped; c) requested that the applicant provide more details regarding the lighting plan, including cut sheets and lighting elements; and d) requested a better understanding with regard to the poles with the lighting standards.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) suggested that the water feature be pulled back and not so far into the parking lot; b) expressed support for the proposed location for the backflow preventer equipment; and c) the changes are fine and the project is looking very nice.
3. Member Branch commented: a) the boldness of the cobalt blue color is appreciated and the muted blue color is not attractive; b) agreed with Member Schneider's recommendation to move the water feature into the center of the landscape element; c) agreed with the DRB members' suggestion to move the water backflow preventer equipment as far off from the street as possible.
4. Vice Chair Smith commented: a) agreed with previous comments from members with regard to the location of the backflow preventer and moving the water feature; b) expressed appreciation for the changes on the Hollister Street frontage on Building 1, stating that the building is very nice and pays some homage to the original Delco Building located up the street by having the building step, and with the glass wrapping the corners.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) agreed with DRB comments recommending moving the backflow preventer from the sidewalk and relocating the water feature; and b) the building design is appreciated.
6. Member Messner commented: a) noted that he believes that the water fountain does not necessarily need to be brought into the center, stating that he would prefer off-center; and b) the bus stop needs to have a pull-out for the bus to facilitate traffic flow.
7. Chair Wignot commented: a) the project continues to move in a very good direction; b) the changes respond to the DRB comments from the previous

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 23, 2009

Page 7 of 14

meeting; c) recommended that the applicant refer to the City's current Recommended Street Tree List with regard to planting trees in the right-of-way; d) the suggestion that some of the existing palm trees be re-located to the median on Hollister Avenue would not comply with the City's recommended list; e) expressed support for the public comment suggestion removal of the pampas grass; f) agreed with the DRB comments supporting the location shown for the backflow preventer; and g) the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets.

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

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-182-DRB

130 Nectarine Avenue (APN 071-061-020)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 903-square foot, 1-story residence and a detached 462-square foot 2-car garage on a 5,771-square foot lot in the DR-30 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 1,095-square feet in additions, consisting of a 510-square foot first floor addition and the addition of a new 585-square foot second floor. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,460-square feet, consisting of a 1,998-square foot single-family dwelling and a detached, 462-square foot 2-car garage. This proposal exceeds the maximum allowable floor area guideline for this property, which is 1,831.3-square feet plus an allocation of 440-square feet for a 2-car garage, by 188.7-square feet. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Larry Thompson on behalf of Arturo Perez, property owner. Related cases: 07-182-LUP. (Laura Vlk)

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-087-DRB

44 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-003)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 46,750-square foot commercial building, a 208-square foot water filtration equipment yard, and a 3,623-square foot rear equipment yard on a 3.25-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to expand the water filtration equipment yard to 650 square feet and install additional equipment for wastewater treatment and discharge. The yard would be enclosed by a 9.5-foot tall chain-link fence and roofed with a metal canopy. No changes in building height, building coverage, signage, or floor area for the main building are proposed. The project was filed by Brian Beebe of Anderson Systems, agent, on behalf of Peter Goodell for Castilian Associates, property owner. Related cases: 09-087-SCD; -LUP. (Shine Ling)

Design Review Board Agenda

June 23, 2009

Page 8 of 14

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

- NONE

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 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

June 23, 2009

Page 10 of 14

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

June 23, 2009

Page 11 of 14

- 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

June 23, 2009

Page 12 of 14

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

June 23, 2009

Page 13 of 14

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

June 23, 2009

Page 14 of 14

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.