



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, July 14, 2009

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 1:00 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

**GOLETA CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

Members:

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

July 14, 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 23, 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. 09-087-DRB

44 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-003)

This is a request for *Final* 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. (Continued from 6-23-09) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-23-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) He noticed that there was some pump noise when he made a site visit, and suggested that an effort be made to purchase new equipment units that have quieter motors to address this concern; b) The project will be very similar to what exists presently but a little larger; c) The proposed color would probably blend in better than what is existing; and d) He would support the project as submitted.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The slats should be the dark brown color; and b) Agreed with Member Wignot's comments.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

July 14, 2009

Page 3 of 14

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-087-DRB, 44 Castilian Drive, as submitted, with the following Condition: 1) The slats shall be the dark brown color; and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-087-DRB, to July 14, 2009, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-055-DRB

52 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-110-091)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 5,990-square foot commercial property on a 24,394-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to replace the existing Washington Mutual signage with Chase Bank signage of varying types including a freestanding monument sign, two wall signs, two ATM signs, and ground signs at the entrance and exit to the property. Signage details are as follows:

Freestanding Monument Sign:

The proposed Freestanding Monument Sign would measure 17-feet tall by 3.3-feet wide for an aggregate of 56 square feet. As proposed, the vertically aligned sign would have white routed aluminum letters measuring 2-feet wide and a blue Chase Bank logo measuring 2.3-feet wide. The sign would be internally illuminated.

Wall Signs:

Northeast Elevation – The proposed wall sign would measure 1.7-feet tall by 11.7-feet wide for an aggregate of 20 square feet. The sign would have black internally illuminated 7.4-inch deep channel letters measuring 1.7-feet tall and a blue Chase Bank logo measuring 2.2-feet wide.

Southwest Elevation – The proposed wall sign would measure 2-feet tall by 14-feet wide for an aggregate of 28 square feet. The sign would have black internally illuminated 7.8-inch deep channel letters measuring 2-feet tall and a blue Chase bank logo measuring 2.6-feet wide.

ATM Signs:

Two signs are proposed atop the ATMs that would measure 1.2-feet tall by 3.8-feet wide for an aggregate of 5 square feet. The internally illuminated signs would have white letters measuring 6-inches tall and a blue Chase Bank logo.

Ground Signs:

The proposed ground signs marking the entrance, and exit to the property would measure 1.8-feet tall by 1.1-feet wide for an aggregate of 2 square feet. The non-illuminated signs would be mounted on a 3-foot tall pole.

The project was filed by agent Bill Hellmann on behalf of Chase Bank, property owner. Related cases: 92-SCC-011; 99-SCC-010. (Brian Hiefield)

Design Review Board Agenda

July 14, 2009

Page 4 of 14

H-2. 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. (Continued from 6-23-09) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-23-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide examples of the illuminated signs showing how the proposed lighting systems will work, including LED upright fixtures; b) Provide the landscape plan at the next review which will be helpful. She noted that when the landscape plan was reviewed by the DRB, there was an expectation that monument signs would be placed at certain locations which are not shown on the current signage plan; c) Provide examples of the graphic design for the Temporary Project Marketing Signs. The design shown in the plans does not communicate the same aesthetic feeling of the proposed monument signs; d) It is appreciated that there are no plans for temporary flags or banner signs; e) Provide examples of the signage shown within the scale of the business park environment, and show the relationship of the signage to the site; f) There is concern that there will be too many signs although it is understood that the project site is a big campus; and g) It is appreciated that the signage plan is robust and well thought out.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) There may be redundancy of information on the building signs and directional signs. The elimination of signage redundancy would need to be considered as the signage plans move forward; b) The current design shown on the plans for the Project Marketing Sign is not acceptable; c) Project Marketing Signs should be identified on the plans as Temporary Project Marketing Signs because they will eventually be removed; d) The number of Temporary Project Marketing Signs along Hollister Avenue should be minimized; e) While there is a maximum square footage area for the Anchor Tenant Building Sign, the maximum font size and maximum logo size are more important to consider. It would not seem necessary for the maximum heights to exceed eighteen or twenty-four inches for the signs to be readable; and f) Suggested that language be added to indicate the applicant will submit signage plans in the future that are associated with the wetlands restoration component.
3. Member Smith commented: a) Requested that an example of the Temporary Project Marketing Signs be shown within the context of the proposed architectural renderings of the project site.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

July 14, 2009

Page 5 of 14

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION: By consensus, the Sign Subcommittee continued Item H-3, DRB Permit No. 09-071-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, with comments, to July 14, 2009, at 1:00 p.m., for review on the Sign Subcommittee Calendar.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-067-DRB

6550 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-330-006)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 38,000-square foot commercial building on a 3.43-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to remodel the façade of the building's southwest corner. Three new canopies above the main entrance (north elevation) with a total roof area of 562 square feet are proposed. Also, a 395-square foot aluminum canopy with a 20-foot tall entry wall is proposed to partially enclose a courtyard area in front of the main entrance. No changes in building coverage, signage, or floor area are proposed. Materials proposed for the façade remodel include stainless steel for the canopies, and blue reflective glass with white mullions to match existing. Colors would consist of Sherwin Williams "Interactive Cream" SW6113 for the building and Sherwin Williams "Coconut Husks" SW6111 for the entry wall. A new landscape plan is also proposed for the front courtyard, with new plantings consisting of specimen palm trees, lilies, yellow-leaved Calamus, and other plant species. The project was filed by Anthony Molina of Poliquin Kellogg Design Group, agent, on behalf of Alan Grosbard of Park One LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-067-LUP. (Continued from 6-09-09). (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-09-09 Meeting:

1. Member Herrera commented: a) The proposed planting species are a good selection; and b) The plantings, especially the grasses, will look very nice and will be a big improvement.
2. Member Messner commented: a) All of the proposed planting species are good selections, including the *Clivia* species and the Black Mondo Grass; b) The *Juncas patens* species is good because its ability for the roots to filter contaminants in the soil from stormwater runoff; c) The proposed landscape plan is appreciated; and d) Coral Trees are problematic and will break down in the long run, noting that problems will begin if the trees are trimmed improperly.
3. Member Brown commented: a) The proposed plant palette is nice; b) The *Bergenia cordofolio* species is a very interesting plant and not seen very often; c) The proposed brown color for the entry area does not seem to be a friendly or inviting color; d) A green color would seem more appropriate for the entry area; or possibly consider another color; e) The applicant will need to present the proposed lighting plan; f) Any new landscaping that will be installed in addition to the proposed plans should reinforce the proposed plant palette; and g) If the existing Coral Trees are proposed to be removed, the plans will need to be

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

July 14, 2009

Page 6 of 14

reviewed. (Member Brown agreed with a staff comment to encourage the applicant to consider the sensitivity of the Glen Annie Creek area when implementing the project).

4. Member Schneider commented: a) Overall, the proposed project is a big improvement and is moving in a good direction, both architecturally and with the landscape plan; b) The architectural concept is appreciated, including the creation of the entry wall and the courtyard; c) The proposed brown color may not be appropriate for the entry and should be restudied. His concerns are to create a contrast between the colors, and that the color of the wall should be a rich color. Gray would not be appropriate; d) The existing Coral Trees look nice and appear to be in good shape; but Coral Trees are problematic in the long-run, because they break down and do not last. Removing the Coral Trees would be a drastic change and they would need to be replaced by plantings of a significant specimen size; e) He pointed out that the view of the proposed architectural elements at the corner of the building is blocked by the existing Coral Trees; f) Landscaping should be added in the parking lot, for example, in the parking strips and fingers; and g) The glass forms should be returned in at the corner of the building at the Los Carneros and Hollister Avenue intersection.
5. Member Branch commented: a) Agreed with Member Schneider's comment regarding returning the glass forms in on the lower levels at the corner of the building; b) The color for the wall at the entrance area should be a rich color and create a good, high contrast; c) The proposed brown color is good, although it may be too much of a copper tone; and d) Overall, the applicant has done a good job.
6. Chair Smith commented: a) The proposed brown color and proposed texture for the wall at the entrance are not appropriate; b) Consider changing the wall texture to something more reflective, with more of a sheen on the vertical element; c) A slate green color (as suggested by the applicant) on the wall would keep more with the plant palette and windows; d) Overall, the proposed plan is a vast improvement; e) The vertical element and the canopies at the entrance area are appreciated; and f) Agreed with Members Branch and Schneider that the forms should be returned in at the corner of the building.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-067-DRB, 6550 Hollister Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) The applicant shall restudy and provide different color and texture considerations for the wall at the entry area; 2) The applicant shall provide a lighting plan if lighting is proposed for now or in the future; 3) The glass forms should be returned in at the corner of the building at the Los Carneros/Hollister Avenue intersection; 4) If additional landscaping will be added that is not included in the proposed landscape plan, the selection of the species shall complement the proposed plant palette; and 5) If the existing Coral Trees will be removed, the proposed plans shall be presented for review; and to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-067-DRB, to July 14, 2009, for Final review on the Final Calendar.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

Design Review Board Agenda

July 14, 2009

Page 7 of 14

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. (Continued from 6-23-09). (Laura Vlk)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

6-23-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed design fits well with the overall appearance of the neighborhood, and keeps the same window treatment; b) He could support the project but there are some concerns with regard to the balconies and neighbors' privacy that need to be restudied, and possibly scaled back; c) Some of the proposed lights seem unnecessary; for example, lights on either side of the exterior doorways on the second floor, on the west elevation; d) The upper floor layout to enter the master bedroom through the bathroom seems somewhat awkward; and e) Requested the applicant provide a solar study to address the concern presented by neighbor Steven Holmes that the second floor addition would negatively impact his ability to install solar panel technology as a viable energy option on his property in the future.
2. Member Branch commented: a) From a site planning standpoint, the footprint of the addition seems appropriate to the site; b) The street elevation is innocuous, not a big impact on the neighborhood, but the proposed building feels huge when looking at the north and south elevations. c) He noted that the lot is very narrow, and also a nine-foot plate is proposed for the rear; d) Overall, the proposed project seems somewhat oversized and larger than it needs to be to achieve the applicant's solution, and does not meet the floor area ratio guidelines; e) The proposed family room seems undersized, suggesting the area could be massaged, taking more advantage of space on the ground floor, and noting that the 10-foot setback would be in constant shadow year round; f) He wondered whether a single-story solution is possible if the project went to the 5-foot setback; g) Agreed with privacy concerns, particularly on the south side; h) Obscure glass and other treatments to address privacy concerns on the north side would suffice; and i) Joining the two styles is successful, as well as keeping the front elevation simple.
3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed project is too large and aggressive for the size of the lot and not appropriate for the site; b) Agreed with Member Branch that there is room on the ground floor that can be used for the

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

July 14, 2009

Page 8 of 14

- project that would help eliminate the massing, particularly on the north side; c) Restudy the project to make the size smaller and way under the floor area ratio guidelines; and d) Eliminate the balconies which she would not support overlooking neighbors' yards, although she would probably support the balcony in front facing the street.
4. Member Messner commented: a) He agreed with comments made by Member Branch and Vice Chair Brown.
 5. Member Herrera commented: a) He agreed with most of the comments made by Member Branch; however, the addition is proposed in order to accommodate a large family; b) Perhaps eliminate one of the proposed balconies, which would be the one that has more of an impact on the neighbors' privacy; c) Possibly downsize by eliminating one room on the second floor; and d) Possibly consider a single-floor design.
 6. Chair Smith commented: a) He does not have a problem with the second floor because it is pulled away from the front setback and the streetscape; b) In his estimation, the front elevation hides somewhat the apparent size of the project, when looking north or south; c) In concept, he likes the project, but supports trimming some of the square footage to try and meet the FAR guidelines; d) Perhaps the proposed study could serve as the family room, which would pull the building in somewhat closer; e) Consider trimming some square footage on the second floor; f) He understands the privacy concerns from the DRB members regarding the proposed balconies, and he would like to hear from the neighbors on the south side; g) He prefers the balcony that faces the street; and h) He would agree with comments to perhaps reduce the prominence of the balconies.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Schneider) to continue Item L-1, Permit No. 07-182-DRB, 130 Nectarine Avenue, to July 14, 2009, with comments; and that the applicant restudy the size of the project as a whole, noting there were several comments expressing concern with regard to the proposed second story, and restudy scaling back the project.

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

July 14, 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

July 14, 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

July 14, 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

July 14, 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

July 14, 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.