



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, August 11, 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 – 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

August 11, 2009

Page 2 of 17

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for July 14, 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. 09-114-DRB

111 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-025)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a 21,800-square foot commercial building and a 2,568-square foot outdoor mechanical equipment yard on a 3.6-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to modify the design of the enclosure for the outdoor mechanical equipment yard. The revised design would utilize black tennis fiber mesh over black chain link fencing and galvanized metal posts and tube frames. The height of the fencing would vary from 12.5 feet to 16 feet. The project was filed by Mark Armstrong of Cunningham Paris Construction, agent, on behalf of Mark Winnikoff of Frieslander Holdings LLC and Nederlander Holdings, LLC, property owners. Related cases: 08-207-SCD; -LUP. (Shine Ling)

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:

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 3 of 17

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. (Continued from 7-14-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-14-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Freestanding Monument Sign:

General: The proposed 17' Freestanding Monument Sign is not appropriate for the site. The existing Freestanding Monument Sign may be reconfigured.

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed 17' Freestanding Monument Sign is not appropriate or necessary at the corner of the site and should be omitted, noting two Wall Signs are proposed for each end of the building; b) A lower sign would be more appropriate; and c) Consider reconfiguring the existing Freestanding Monument Sign.
2. Member Brown commented: a) Concurred with Member Schneider's comments, stating that the corner is overburdened with items; b) There is too much of the proposed sign for what it is trying to communicate and the sign does not make an improvement on the site; c) The existing Freestanding Monument Sign type would be appropriate on the corner; and d) The design of the existing monument sign seems out of proportion and would be better if lower and without the logo on top.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 4 of 17

3. Member Smith commented: a) The proposed sign is too much for the site; and b) Reconfigure the existing Freestanding Monument Sign, keeping the lettering and the logo of Chase the same height level as the existing Washington Mutual lettering; and c) He appreciates that a lot of replacement signs have moved away from the almost square, rectangular style.

Wall Signs:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The height of the text should be approximately 12 inches, which was approved for both the Shell and Vons gas stations on the corner; b) The proposed font sizes are too big and not necessary for the site; and c) The logo should be proportionate to the text so the logo could be bigger than the text size.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The smaller text of approximately 12 inches would be appropriate with the proportionate logo; and b) The view from Fairview Avenue is of the monument sign as well as Sign 3 which does not need to be so large.
3. Member Smith commented: a) He agreed with comments from Member Brown and Member Schneider.

ATM Signs:

General: The applicant is requested to provide details to help understand the overhead security lighting system and a photograph example of the internal edge illumination on the ATM Surrounds. If the applicant decides to pursue the Overall Sign Plan process, there is general support for the proposed ATM signs.

1. Member Schneider commented: a) He does not associate ATM Surrounds as being a canopy sign; b) The two proposed signs on the ATM Surrounds, with lettering approximately 5 or 6 inches in height, are acceptable; and c) He appreciates that the existing name on the canopy was removed.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The proposed signs on the ATM surrounds are fine; b) Consider providing lighting that that is fully shielded under the canopy of the ATM Surrounds; and c) The applicant is requested to provide details to understand the overhead security lights and a photograph example of the internal edge illumination on the ATM Surrounds.

Ground Signs:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The applicant may consider using the Chase corporate color on the Ground Signs since the Ground Sign definition only allows the words "entrance" or "exit" and does not address colors.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The Ground Signs should be no taller than 3 feet and an aggregate of 2 square feet to comply with requirements.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-055-DRB, 52 North Fairview Avenue, to August 11, 2009, with comments.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-071-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-610-001, -002, -003, -004, -005 & -006)

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 948,782 square feet, including 707,100 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 7-14-09, 6-23-09) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-14-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Temporary Marketing Signs:

1. Member Brown commented: a) There needs to be a way, possibly with language in the Overall Sign Plan, to control the number of Temporary Marketing Signs so there will only be signs for particular buildings when needed for marketing purposes; and b) The Temporary Marketing Signs will look much better when the graphics are revised.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The applicant's plans to set guidelines in the CC&Rs for text and graphics on the Temporary Marketing Signs is a good solution to ensure consistency when there are different brokers.

Sheet G2.7: Type A and Type B Anchor Tenant Building Signs

1. Member Brown commented: a) Expressed concern regarding the size of a sign if a tenant requests all capital letters that have a maximum height of 24 inches; and b) Requested the applicant prepare guidelines with regard to the tenant signage that will allow for flexibility as well as discretion.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) A maximum height of 18" for capital letters and 24" for the logo would be more appropriate; and b) The proposed plan to limit the number of signs to two signs on each elevation is fine; noting it may become problematic in the long-run if there are more tenants in a building who all want their signs on the building.
3. Member Smith commented: a) He agreed with Member Schneider's comments; b) Suggested for consideration, if the name on a sign is all capital letters, the height requirement would be 18", and that the height requirement would be 2 feet if both capital and lower case letters are used.

Sheet G2.17a: Retail Tenant Signage

General agreement: One blade sign will be allowed per tenant per elevation. The proposed armature is nice and the proposed 22 square-foot size on an armature is acceptable.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 6 of 17

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Expressed concern that there does not seem to be a need for having so many blade signs in addition to logo signs.
2. Member Brown commented: a) Expressed concern regarding the potential for too many Retail Tenant Signs; b) The proposed armature is attractive, creative and interesting; and c) The proposed size of 22 square feet on an armature is okay.
3. Member Smith commented: a) It's important to control the amount of tenant's signage on the buildings so the signage does not become rampant.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote to continue with comments Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 09-071-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to August 11, 2009, for Conceptual review, at which time any revisions as well as the text of the Overall Sign Plan will be reviewed.

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-100-DRB

7127 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-440-012)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes a 1,304-square foot commercial tenant space within a shopping center on a 9.3 acre lot in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes to install a two-line sign for the "Wireless Now Verizon Wireless" store measuring a maximum of 2.08-feet tall by 8.79-feet wide for an aggregate of 19.25 square feet. The non-illuminated sign shall have ¾-inch deep red and black channel letters. The sign shall be centered on Wireless Now's frontage and located on the fascia within the approved sign area per The Plaza Overall Sign Plan. The project was filed by agent Ken Sorgman on behalf of Wireless Now, and Antonio Romasanta, property owner. Related cases: 23-SB-OSP; 23-SB-CUP; 23-SB-DP AM01; 23-SB-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

H-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-107-DRB RV

420, 430 & 490 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-130-057, -061 & -062)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The project site is located within the Fairview Corporate Center (FCC), which includes 17.31 acres gross (16.67 acres net) addressed as 420, 430, and 490 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-130-057, 071-130-061 & 071-130-062). Three commercial buildings are located on site: 420 South Fairview is a 73,203-square foot 2-story building; 430 South Fairview Avenue is a 60,797-square foot building; and 500 South Fairview Avenue is a 108,000-square foot building. The applicant proposes amendments to the FCC's Overall Sign Plan (OSP). The proposed changes to the OSP include the relocation and redesign of a monument sign and two additional wall signs for the building at 420 South Fairview Avenue. The project was filed by Craig Minus of The Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 09-107-OSP; 02-088-OSP, -DRB. (Shine Ling)

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 7 of 17

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-104-DRB RV

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-610-006)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The subject of this review is exterior building lighting for Building 2 of the Cabrillo Business Park project. No exterior building lighting was included in the Final approval granted for Building 2 by the DRB on April 14, 2009. The property includes two screened storage areas and nine buildings totaling 326,490 square feet on a 92.25-acre lot in the Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. 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 on July 8, 2009 by agent Dudek on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC., property owner. Related cases: 08-107-DP AM; 37-SB-RZ, -OA, -TM, -DP, -RN.

I-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-111-DRB

15 Violet Lane (APN 077-141-067)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a partially constructed 3,130-square foot residence and an attached 570-square foot 3-car garage on a 10,728-square foot lot in the DR-4.6 zone district. The applicant proposes to revise the originally approved exterior elevations including new doors, windows, exterior lighting, and a change to the exterior fire place. The square footage of the originally approved structure would not change. The project was filed by agent Lawrence Thompson on behalf of Jon Rand, property owner. Related cases: 02-014-DRB, 02-014-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

J. FINAL CALENDAR

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

130 Nectarine Avenue (APN 071-061-020)

This is a request for *Final* 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 7-14-09, 6-23-09). (Laura Vlk)

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 8 of 17

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

7-14-09 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The applicant has addressed a number of his comments; b) He still believes that the second story will work in this location; c) The proposed deck on the east elevation will be relatively innocuous and does not appear to be looking down on anything much except the backyard area; d) The windows on the south elevation are over-large and could be reduced and placed higher so there is no significant view looking towards the neighbor's property to the south; e) It appears from the solar study that the second story addition will not negatively impact the neighbor's ability to install solar panel technology; and f) Consideration will need to be given with regard to how the deck on the west elevation will drain, noting that the shape of the deck is box-like.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The reduction of the size of the project is appreciated; b) Overall, the plan is more proportional to the site and there is now some more use of the yard; c) Agreed with Member Wignot's comment regarding the deck on the east elevation, stating that the photographs show the privacy concerns were addressed quite significantly; d) From a privacy standpoint, consider perhaps raising the sills of the upper windows slightly, with the understanding that some advantage should be taken of the sun on the south elevation; e) On the west elevation, he would prefer the element that appears more cottagey, similar to the overall style, rather than the element that feels more contemporary; g) He appreciates that the neighbor's concern regarding the solar access to the north was addressed; and h) Consider installing downward lights in the wall of the deck on the second floor, which would not throw light into the neighborhood, if that would meet the code requirements.
3. Member Messner commented: a) Agreed with comments from Member Wignot and Member Branch regarding the proposed decks; and b) With regard to planting trees and hedging for the purpose of screening and blockage, it is important to choose a species that would not become a burden for the neighbors to maintain (such as requiring weekly or monthly maintenance). He recommended selecting species that are more narrow and tall, and not so wide-spreading.
4. Chair Smith commented: a) The reduction in the size of the project addressed the concern very well; b) The west elevation is appreciated, noting that the design fits together well and he understands the door and window arrangement. The west elevation will not be seen that well from a perspective standpoint; and c) From a privacy standpoint, consider raising the sill of the windows slightly on the south elevation, with the understanding that some sunlight is needed from the south.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Abstain: Schneider; Absent: Brown, Herrera) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 07-182-DRB, 130 Nectarine Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) The applicant shall address the DRB comments concerning the windows on the south elevation; 2) The applicant shall provide a fully-detailed landscape plan; and 3) The applicant shall provide the lighting details; and to continue Item No. L-1, DRB Permit No. 07-182-DRB, to August 11, 2009, for Final review.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 9 of 17

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-102-DRB

5650 Calle Real (APN 069-160-042)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a hotel and restaurant totaling 42,694 square feet on a 4.23-acre site in the C-2 zone district. The applicant requests new outdoor lighting fixtures to light the building façade. Four downlights are proposed to be placed on the front faces of the four pillars of the port-cochere; two uplights are proposed to be placed on the south elevation of the hotel building fronting Kingston Avenue. Each fixture would consist of an Insight Masque façade lighting fixture with a ceramic metal halide bulb emitting green light. The fixtures would be positioned so the light would not wash beyond the building façade. No other changes to building floor area, exterior elevations, or land use are proposed. The project was filed by Gary Opdahl of Holiday Inn Santa Barbara-Goleta, agent, on behalf of FCH/JPM Hospitality (SPE) LLC, property owner. (Shine Ling)

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-110-DRB

454 South Patterson Avenue (APN 065-090-013)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes three commercial/industrial buildings totaling 50,306 square feet of floor area on a 7.95-acre site in the PI zone district and within the Airport Approach Zone. The applicant proposes to install a diesel-powered emergency power generator and a trash enclosure at the rear of the building fronting Patterson Avenue. Minor changes to the southern elevation of the building to modify door and window openings are also proposed. The generator would be housed within a sound attenuation cabinet and enclosed by a CMU and plaster wall. An underground diesel storage tank would be located in the drive aisle between the building and the first row of parking spaces. The overall dimensions of the generator are 16 feet long by 6 feet wide; the overall dimensions of the enclosure walls are 25 feet long by 16 feet wide by 8.7 feet tall. The trash enclosure would be constructed of CMU and plaster walls with gates constructed of galvanized metal and would be 25 feet long by 13 feet wide by 6 feet tall. The project would result in a loss of 6 parking spaces, bringing the property's total parking space count to 366. The project was filed by Ed Lenvik of Lenvik and Minor Architects, agent, on behalf of Somera Patterson LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-110-SCD, -LUP; 08-199-DRB. (Shine Ling)

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-039-DRB

Various locations within City Right-of-Way and utility easements across public and private parcels

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The proposed project involves the installation of 19 radiofrequency transport service system nodes within City rights-

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 10 of 17

of-way (ROWs) and utility easements over various public and private properties throughout the City of Goleta. Each node would include an omnidirectional antenna and supporting equipment cabinet below the antenna mounted on an existing utility pole, traffic signal, or street light. Each node would be connected by fiber-optic cable installed either on existing utility poles, in joint conduit, or through shallow trenching within City streets. Support equipment for each node would be installed at a minimum height above existing grade of nine (9) feet. Two new City standard "marble lite" street lights would be installed at the Pacific Oaks/Phelps and Los Carneros/Cathedral Oaks intersections to provide mounting structures for proposed nodes that are consistent in height and design with existing street lights in these locations to minimize visual impacts to the existing visual context of these two areas. All antennae and supporting equipment would be non-reflective in color and materials. The electrical power supply for each node would be provided from existing utility lines installed on either existing utility poles or in joint conduit. No new utility poles for the supply of electrical power to any of the nodes are proposed. No removal or trimming of any native or any ornamental trees within any City ROWs, utility easements over either public or private parcels, or other City owned property as a result of project implementation would occur. The project was filed by HP Communications, agent on behalf of NextG, the applicant. Related cases: 09-039-CP. (Alan Hanson)

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-106-DRB

6878 Hollister Avenue/6868 Cortona Drive: APN 073-140-003; -004:

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The 3.05-acre property is vacant and is located within the PI (Professional/Institutional) zone district with Hotel Overlay. The applicant proposes to revise the Development Plan for the Rincon Palms Hotel and Restaurant Project, approved by the City in October 2008. The proposed revision includes: the addition of approximately 5,340 square feet of roof-top structures to improve the use of the hotel roof deck, some of which exceed the 35-foot height limit for the PI zone district, up to a maximum of 50 feet; expansion of hotel room sizes, resulting in an increase of overall floor area from 59,600 square feet to 75,580 square feet and a reduction in room count from 112 to 102; changes to the port-cochere structure and lobby area; relocation of the ground-floor conference patio, and the elimination of 3 parking spaces (2 surface; 1 underground). The restaurant component of the Development Plan would not be changed.

The revisions would result in a project that consists of the following: A 75,580-square foot hotel, 3 stories with a partial 4th-story and underground parking garage; outdoor pool and patios; a 6,000-square foot restaurant with a 1,000-square foot outdoor dining area; trellises and repeating columns along the southern boundary of the property; sidewalk, curb, and gutter improvements along Hollister Avenue and Cortona Drive. Access is proposed from both Cortona Drive and with the neighboring M-RP building at 6868 Cortona Drive. The project was filed by Laurel Perez of Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services, agent, on behalf of Kip Bradley for Cortona Opportunities LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-106-DP RV. (Shine Ling)

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 11 of 17

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

August 11, 2009

Page 13 of 17

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.
- 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.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 14 of 17

- 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.

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.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 15 of 17

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.

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.

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 16 of 17

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 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

Design Review Board Agenda

August 11, 2009

Page 17 of 17

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.