



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, February 9, 2010

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:00 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 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

February 9, 2010

Page 2 of 21

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for January 26, 2010

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

B-4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

B-5. APPOINTMENT TO SUBCOMMITTEES

B-6. STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN PRESENTATION TIME CERTAIN 3:15-4:00

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. 09-034-DRB

207 Carlo Drive (APN 077-181-008)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property is a 9,150-square foot graded vacant lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. An existing capped and abandoned former Goleta Water District well is located on the property. The applicant proposes to construct a new 2,460-square foot 2-story single family dwelling with an attached 438-square foot 2-car garage, consisting of 1,533 square feet on the first-floor and 927 square feet on the second-floor. The applicant also proposes to construct an attached 130-square foot patio cover. The resulting 2-story structure including the attached 2-car garage would be 2,898 square feet plus the proposed patio cover. This proposal is within the maximum allowable floor area for this property, which is 2,677 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. The project was filed by Vijay Prajapati, property owner. Related cases: 09-034-LUP. (Continued from 1-26-10, 12-8-09, 10-27-09, 9-8-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 3 of 21

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-26-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) From his personal experience, he would recommend adding gutters fully around the roof; b) The exterior light proposed on the yard on the north side of the house would be useful, however the fixture must be shielded and should not shine into the neighbor's yard; and c) Possibly consider motion detectors on the north side of the house.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) With regard to the landscape plan, her personal preference would be a design with less lawn elements; b) The proposed recessed lights under the entryway should be sufficient, therefore, the proposed exterior lights in the front entry are not necessary; c) If the applicant considers adding gutters to the roof, the gutters should empty into the lawn area or somewhere else on the property, and not onto the street; and d) Consider pavers in the driveway, or other methods, to allow water to filter through.
3. Member Messner commented: a) The proposed landscape plan details are fine.
4. Member Branch commented: a) The applicant's efforts to work with the DRB and the neighbors are appreciated; b) The proposed color scheme is okay; c) A flat tile material might work better as opposed to an s-tile; d) The revised entry design is better than the previous proposal; e) He is not sure about the round column design at the entry, but the proportion is getting better; f) The rafter tails are appreciated and the design seems to be more in character; g) The proposed stucco trims seem too busy, noting that a plain rectangular trim might work better in the neighborhood; h) Consider placing trim around the vents similar to the trim on the windows; i) The trim above the garage adds detail, noting that typically this type of trim goes all the way across or there is exposed wood; j) The proposed two lights at the entry could be eliminated; k) The one light fixture on top of the address sign may be appropriate; and l) The rear porch element on the west elevation has a character that lends itself to the form of the house.
5. Member Schneider commented: a) Agreed with Member Branch that flat tiles would be more appropriate and would fit better with the proposed stucco color; b) Half round gutters would work fine with the proposed eave details; c) The proposed recessed lighting underneath the entry should provide sufficient lighting, therefore, the two proposed wall-mounted lights at the entry can be eliminated; d) Agreed with Member Branch that simplifying the window trim would be better; e) Encouraged the reduction of the lawn element as much as possible, particularly the element to the north of the driveway where planting materials would be more appropriate.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to continue Item J-1, DRB Permit No. 09-034-DRB, 207 Carlo Drive, to February 9, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar, with the following comments: a) The proposed lights on the front of the house shall be eliminated, with the exception of the recessed lighting; b) The applicant shall provide cut sheets showing fixtures that are shielded for the remainder of the lights that are proposed; c) Flat tiles shall be used on the roof rather than the proposed s-tiles; d) Rectangular trim shall be used for the windows, keeping the sill piece heavier than the sides and the top; e) The vents shall have trim that is similar to the windows; f) The area to the north of the driveway should be planted entirely with all landscaping materials and no grass; g) The roof gutters should be half round, with the water directed onto the applicant's property, away from the house, but not flowing onto the street;

and to continue Item J-1, DRB Permit No. 09-034-DRB, to February 9, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-118-DRB

7394 Davenport Road (APN 073-222-019)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes a 2,722-square foot two-story duplex with an attached 198-square foot patio cover, an attached 220-square foot 1-car carport, and an attached 406-square foot 2-car garage on a 11,134-square foot lot in the DR-10 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 1,054-square feet in additions, consisting of a 43-square foot enclosed front porch, a 340-square foot addition on the first-floor and a 671-square foot addition on the second-floor. The resulting two-story structure would be 4,600 square feet, consisting of a 3,776-square foot duplex, a 198-square foot patio cover, an attached 220-square foot 1-car carport, and an attached 406-square foot 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Joe Echeverria on behalf of Mark and Chyoung McCann, property owners. Related cases: 70-M-17; 09-118-LUP. (Continued from 1-26-10, 12-8-09, 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-26-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Branch commented: a) The applicant responded previously to the DRB request to eliminate the proposed cantilever; and b) The site accommodates the parking, although, initially he had some questions regarding the parking.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The applicant responded to the DRB request to help reduce the massing somewhat; and b) The architecture for the proposed project is designed to match existing.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Recused: Wignot; Absent: Herrera, Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 09-118-DRB, 7394 Davenport Road, as submitted; and to continue Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 09-118-DRB, to February 9, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-141-DRB

5877 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-112-003)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 2,362-square foot commercial property on a 4,100-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to replace the existing bakery store front, and add landscaping and hardscape to the rear of the property to provide an outdoor seating area. This project will not result in any added square footage. The project was filed by agent Jack Shaffer on behalf of the Martin Koobation Family Trust, property owner. Related cases: LUR-47335, LUR-51775. (Continued from 1-12-10*, 12-8-09*, 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Applicant request to continue to March 23, 2010

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 5 of 21

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

10-27-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Herrera commented: a) The proposed project is a huge improvement on the site.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed project is a great improvement; b) The colors are appreciated; and c) He noticed that there is distinctive stone material on the façade of the buildings on either side of the site which was not incorporated into the design; however, the design works well without it.
3. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with Member Branch's comments; b) The project fits in with the distinctive stone material on both sides of the project site and the warm, earthly palette of the building; and c) The idea of the bi-fold doors is appreciated.
4. Member Schneider commented: a) The design is somewhat simple and straight-forward, and works very well; and b) The intensity of the proposed color will be played down somewhat because the storefront faces north.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Brown, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, 5877 Hollister Avenue, as submitted; and to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-141-DRB, to December 8, 2009; for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-162-DRB

915-1795 Kellogg Avenue (APN 071-090-049)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 17 building, 75-unit apartment complex on a 4.96-acre lot in the DR-16 zone district. The applicant proposes to repaint the existing buildings with one of three color schemes as shown on the project plans. Color Scheme One; Dapper Tan (ICI-479), Palladian Plum (ICI-24), Classic Liberty Red (ICI-159). Color Scheme Two; Yellow Barn (ICI-188), Golden Rice (ICI-88), Classic Liberty Red (ICI-159). Color Scheme Three; Plymouth Rock (ICI-1038), Palladian Plum (ICI-24), Classic Liberty Red (ICI-159). The applicant also proposes to replace the building addresses with 10-inch high silver colored metal numbers mounted on ½ -inch black PVC. The project was filed by agent Mary Chang on behalf of the Goleta Valley Housing Committee, property owner. (Continued from 1-26-10, 1-12-10) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-26-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed color selection overall is fine; b) He supports the proposed project; and c) He noted that he personally believes that Color Scheme Three appears somewhat dark and could be a little lighter.
2. Member Branch commented: a) His suggestion to paint the wood paneling a couple of shades darker is a subtle aesthetic detail, otherwise it would not look like it was originally intended to be that color; however, he understands the applicant's concern regarding costs.

MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 6 of 21

Permit No. 09-162-DRB, 915-1795 Kellogg Avenue, including the color scheme, as submitted, and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-162-DRB, to February 9, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-5. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-171-DRB

5750 Dawson Avenue (APN 071-121-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes 7,020 square feet in the C-3 zone district and is currently vacant as a result of a 2007 fire. The applicant proposes to construct a new 1,440-square foot two-story contractor's workshop building and an equipment storage yard. Access would be provided via an existing curb cut on Dawson Avenue and a new curb cut on Rutherford Street. A 6-foot tall wall with rolling gates and landscaping would be installed along the perimeter of the property. Materials proposed include split-face block on the first floor and board and batting on the second floor. No grading is proposed. The project was filed by Mark Sauter of John S. Carter, Inc., agent, for Tom Kennedy, property owner. Related cases: 09-171-LUP. (Continued from 1-26-10, 1-12-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-26-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The applicant's proposal to eliminate the proposed King Palm on the east side of the garage is acceptable; b) She had initially expressed concern about planting King Palms on the side of the garage because the planter spaces are typically too small and the species would grow up against the building; c) Planting the King Palm species in front would not be a problem; d) The proposed Boston Ivy species in front is very nice and would be sufficient landscaping, in her opinion, because the site is in an industrial area and also that property owner will need to make an effort to maintain the landscaping; e) The proposed lighting cut sheets look good; f) This is a good example of a project that looks nice and will help spruce up Old Town; and g) If the property owner is willing, the concept of painting a mural on the building would be a novel precedent.
2. Member Wignot commented: a) The size of the planters for the proposed King Palm plantings need to be large enough to accommodate the species.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The revised architectural plans, which fit more with an industrial design, are appreciated; and b) His preference regarding the building material would be split face block rather than plaster.
4. Member Branch commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide architectural details including the parapets and the cable railing at Final review.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-171-DRB, 5750 Dawson Avenue, as submitted, with the following conditions: 1) The proposed King Palm species on the east side of the garage shall be eliminated; 2) The size of the planter on the west side of the garage shall be extended enough to accommodate the proposed King Palm; 3) The material for the windows shall be bronze aluminum to match the material color board submitted; and to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 09-171-DRB, to February 9, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 7 of 21

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-008-DRB

6900-7095 Marketplace Drive (APN 073-440-013;-014; -015; -016; -017; -018; -024)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes the Camino Real Marketplace, which contains a total of 483,257 square feet of retail commercial space and an outdoor garden center of 22,484 square feet on 49 acres in the SC zone district. The applicant proposes minor amendments to the Camino Real Marketplace Overall Sign Plan. The project was filed by Kim Schizas of Camino Real LLC, property owner. (Shine Ling)

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-086-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-610-011)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes two screened storage areas and nine buildings totaling 326,490 square feet on a 92.25-acre lot in the Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. The applicant proposes to construct Building 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, lighting, 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. Building 4 was referenced on previous agendas under DRB permit number 37-SB-DRB. The project was filed on June 1, 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. (Continued from 6-23-09*, 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.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 8 of 21

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.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-189-DRB

811 Cambridge Drive (APN 069-080-009)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property is an undeveloped 1.01-acre parcel 20-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 3,150-square foot single-story residence with an additional 1,088-square foot 3-car garage, 154-square foot breezeway and 258 feet of porches. The resulting single-story structure would be 4,392 square feet, consisting of a 3,150-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached (via 154-square foot breezeway) 1,088-square foot 3-car garage. This proposal is within the maximum floor area ratio guidelines for this property, which is 4,379 square feet plus an allocation of 650 square feet for a 3-car garage. New materials consist of stucco siding painted "X-53 Pure Ivory (Base 100)," a wood front door with a natural stain, Loewen wood windows painted "Sage Green," and a red barrel tiled roof. The project was filed by agent Preston Mann of Mann Construction on behalf of Lindsay and Lesa Mann, property owner. Related cases: 09-183-CC, 09-189-LUP. (Scott Kolwitz)

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-003-DRB

270 Storke Road (APN 073-100-032)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes the Storke Plaza Shopping Center, which contains 2 buildings totaling 31,970 square feet on 2.25 gross acres in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a new 437-square foot outdoor patio on the Storke Road frontage for a tenant space at the northern end of the building at 270 Storke Road. Minor changes to the primary storefront windows and doors are also proposed. The tenant space would be converted to restaurant use. An updated landscaping plan is proposed. The project was filed by Scott Branch of Burnell, Branch & Pester

Architecture, agent, on behalf of Marc Winnikoff of Storke Road II LLP, property owner. (Shine Ling)

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-143-DRB

Hollister Avenue Northwest of Glen Annie Road (APN 073-030-020, -021)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes 9,546-square feet of development consisting of a television studio and drive-thru ATM facilities on 23.55 acres located on Hollister Avenue between Glen Annie Road and Santa Felicia Drive within the Inland Area of the City zoned MHS/AHO DR-12.3 and M-RP and partially covered by the F(APR). The applicant proposes to demolish the existing 9,546-square feet of development consisting of a television studio and drive-thru ATM facilities and to construct 89,914 square feet of commercial development and 300 residential rental units and 5 live/work condominiums.

The commercial condominiums would range between 520 to 25,000 square feet totaling 89,914 square feet. Amenities include plazas, pedestrian walkways, 339 parking spaces, drive aisles, operations screening, a 204,800-cubic foot underground stormwater storage area, landscaping, and exterior lighting.

The 300 apartments would be comprised of a mix of one-bedroom (105 units totaling 52,920 square feet), two-bedroom (140 units totaling 136,391 square feet), and three bedroom (60 units totaling 71,551 square feet) units contained within five two-story buildings, and fifteen three-story building with a total of 260,862 square feet. Amenities would include a communal recreation building, pool/spa, pocket parks, pedestrian walkways, carwash and maintenance building, 583 parking spaces (in garages, carports and open areas) and drive aisles, landscaping, and exterior lighting.

Primary access is proposed via a new connection to the Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection, which is presently a "T" intersection controlled by traffic signals. The main access driveway is proposed to form the north leg of the intersection, resulting in a conventional four-leg intersection. The new approach would contain a left-turn lane and a left+ thru + right-turn lane for traffic outbound from the site plus two inbound lanes. Hollister Avenue would be widened on the north side to provide an eastbound left-turn lane and a westbound right-turn lane for traffic inbound to the site. Secondary access for the project would be provided via a new driveway connection to Hollister Avenue at the west end of the project site and a new connection to Glen Annie Road at the east end of the project site. The Glen Annie Road/Hollister Avenue intersection would be reconfigured to restrict southbound left-turns from Glen Annie Road to Hollister Avenue. A bus turnout is proposed just west of this intersection.

Estimated project grading would involve 51,000-cubic yards of cut and 33,000-cubic yards of fill (net export of 18,000-cubic yards of cut). Southern California Edison power-lines are proposed to be relocated from the southern property line to the northern and western boundaries of the project. Water and sewer would be

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 10 of 21

provided by the Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District. The project was filed by agent Ken Marshall of Dudek, Inc on behalf of Goleta Hollister, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 08-143-GPA; -RZ; -OA, -TM (TM 32,048); -DP; -CUP. (Continued from 11-10-09) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-12-10 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed project is a beautiful layout, but when looking at it from a “big picture” standpoint, he questions what the City is getting out of the project - for example, dedicated open space or features unique to Goleta have been provided by other large projects; b) The proposed restaurants are located too close to Hollister Avenue and trash enclosures; c) Consider an elevated deck or patios on the north side so restaurant diners can take advantage of mountain views which are part of the beauty of the site; and d) He recommended that a video drive-by animation would be very informative.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The reduction in density is appreciated; b) The traffic issue is a realistic concern, especially at peak times; c) The proposed project seems large enough to warrant another ancillary access on the west side of the project; d) The parking concerns regarding Glen Annie Road would depend on the functionality of the onsite parking; e) Aesthetically, adding the gateways and providing a kind of cul-de-sac for the residential units in the northeast area are good revisions; f) The proposed plans show quality but he believes that Member Wignot’s comment regarding the “big picture” is noteworthy; g) Overall, the proposed project is moving forward in a good direction; and h) The visual analysis computer renderings provided for this hearing are acceptable and adequate.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) He understands the concerns of the Pacific Glen neighborhood residents and he believes that the issues of traffic and parking can be dealt with more appropriately by the Planning Commission and the environmental review process; b) The proposed project is moving in a good direction architecturally and aesthetically, and the styles for both residential and commercial architecture are workable; c) Some of his concerns relative to the number of roof materials can be worked out later in the process; d) His main issue is open space, and therefore the applicant’s suggestion to consider a pocket park is a good start; e) The whole residential area feels a little too tight, even though there are open spaces; f) One suggested method to gain some open space included looking at the loop between Building 5 and Building 7 to eliminate some units and some parking, and therefore, Building 7 could be shifted away from the pool area which would allow for a bigger green space where the paving is removed; g) Consider relocating the green space from inside the cul-de-sac in the northeast corner to be near the basketball court or some other method to gain open space on this portion of the site; h) One suggestion to address the grade differential would be to eliminate the third-floor unit at the southernmost end of the buildings so there would be a two-story facade which would help lessen the perception when driving by which would otherwise be overwhelming; i) The site plan should enhance and encourage as much pedestrian activity as possible to the commercial areas and movies; j) The pedestrian linkages work well on the west side of the residential development, but the area near Building 7 and Building 8 needs to be studied and it seems like

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 11 of 21

- there needs to be a secondary stairway or connection down to the road; and k) The visual analysis computer renderings provided are acceptable.
4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Expressed appreciation that the applicant is working with the neighbors; b) She appreciates Member Wignot's comment regarding the "big picture"; c) When developing an urban village, finding a balance between density and providing open space is a problem to be solved; d) The inter-connectivity of neighborhoods is important; e) Consider opening up some of the dead-end alleys, and adding an ancillary entry on the west side, to help facilitate traffic flow; f) Parallel parking would eliminate some of the neighbors' concerns regarding the visibility of taillights from cars parked perpendicularly on the eastern side; g) In her opinion, under-cover parking without garage doors would make the project more successful rather than garages because people tend to use garages for storage which would impact parking spaces; h) Study the internal circulation, particularly pedestrian access to the restaurant on the southeast corner; i) Building D needs to feel more like it is more articulated rather than just the back side of a building; j) The tower element on the clubhouse should be reduced on the southeast corner; k) It is important to the community to preserve the viewshed; l) There needs to be a better understanding regarding the western edge of the project and Santa Felicia Drive to address some of the neighbors' issues; m) The applicant is requested to study whether there are some privacy issues related to the Pacific Glen neighbors and Buildings 14, 16, and 18; n) The landscape plan should adhere to City standards regarding the number of trees in parking lots; o) The photovoltaic studies are appreciated; p) Consider flipping the live/work units with the shops to the east; and q) The proposed landscape palette is appreciated except for the London Plane Tree which is typically eliminated from palettes in the South Coast area because of its tendency to hybridize with the Sycamore trees.
 5. Member Messner commented: a) The revisions are appreciated including the gateways and planting materials; b) He would support the perpendicular parking on Glen Annie because it would provide for more parking spaces; c) The size of the parking spaces should be adequate rather than too compact; d) Some of the landscaping concepts are appreciated; and e) The proposed project is moving in the right direction.
 6. Member Herrera commented: a) Drainage and water detention efforts are important considerations to prevent impacts from flooding; b) Parking and traffic problems will need to be addressed; c) The proposed plant palate is appreciated; d) Suggested rotating the proposed project 90 degrees so the residences abut the residences and the commercial part abuts Santa Felicia Drive; and e) Agreed with Vice Chair Brown that "garage ports", without doors, would be appropriate.
 7. Chair Smith commented: a) His previous concern regarding the viewshed off Hollister Avenue seems to have been software-related; b) The proposed architecture looks very good, especially the commercial architecture; c) The extra variety of materials is appreciated because it gives a Main Street, small town U.S.A., kind of feel; d) Parking and traffic flow issues are major concerns; e) The proposed plan for the fence at Glen Annie Road is okay, while not closing off the property, and he does not envision anyone attempting to climb over the fence regularly; f) Requested more study to relieve ingress and egress on the west end; g) The revisions are appreciated; and h) The visual analysis provided is acceptable.
 8. The majority of the DRB members agreed that the Conceptual Review should be continued to address some issues, with the understanding that staff may proceed with the environmental review process.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 12 of 21

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 6 to 1 vote, (Noes: Wignot), to continue Item M-3, DRB Permit No. 08-143-DRB, Hollister Avenue Northwest of Glen Annie Road, with comments, to February 9, 2010.

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-075-DRB

6300 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-050-020)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. This is a request for *Conceptual* review of a 140-room extended stay hotel on a vacant portion of a parcel located at 6300 Hollister Avenue, between La Patera Lane and Robin Hill Road. The project site occupies the westerly 3.81 acres of a larger 10.95-acre parcel that contains an existing research-manufacturing facility, known as the Hollister Center. The 3.81 acres would be split to create the separate parcel for the hotel development. Reciprocal access and parking with the Hollister Center would be provided. The property is presently zoned M-RP (Industrial Research Park).

The proposed hotel is approximately 99,634 square feet and is designed in a U-shape configuration around a pool, framed by three building wings, each three-stories in height. The main entrance is oriented toward Hollister Avenue with access served from both Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. A new landscaped island in Hollister Avenue and a new left turn lane for eastbound vehicles approaching the hotel would be provided. Vehicles exiting the hotel's Hollister Avenue driveway would be limited to right turns only.

A total of 132 surface parking spaces are provided around the building perimeter, with 27 additional spaces that would be provided through a reciprocal parking agreement with the Hollister Center.

The proposed architecture is characterized as contemporary Mediterranean with emphasis on smooth stucco finish, accent awnings, wood trellis, cornice mouldings and concrete roof tile. Proposed uses include a pool, fitness center, library, guest laundry, and approximately 1,875 square feet of meeting space. The proposed hotel is intended to accommodate extended stay guests and would have full kitchens in each room. The project does not include a restaurant, but it is proposed to have a small ground floor kitchen to provide complimentary breakfast and a manager's reception in the evening.

Trees would be placed along frontages, entry ways, parking areas, and elsewhere throughout the property. The plan also includes shrubs, groundcovers, vines, and biofiltration plants.

Utilities along the property's Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road frontage would be placed underground. An existing lift station located along Hollister Avenue is planned to be relocated eastward on Hollister Avenue by the GSD prior to construction of the hotel. Water service would be provided by the Goleta Water District. (Continued from 1-26-10, 12-8-09) (Natasha Campbell)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-26-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Of the options presented today, Option A is preferred; b) The Option A version on Sheet A-3.1 makes the building seem like mostly a two-story building with a three-story portion that builds up over the lobby along Hollister Avenue; c) It will be important to view updated visual simulations and video drive-by simulation by Ron Stevens that show the view with regard to the mountain ridgeline when driving eastbound and westbound on Hollister Avenue; d) It would be helpful to know the actual sizes of the rooms; e) When considering the architectural style, he noted that Goleta is a very eclectic community, with a variety of architecture including traditional, contemporary and Spanish; and f) The proposed architecture appears to have an universal character, however, he would prefer something that keeps more with a specific style.
2. Member Branch commented: a) Option A is the better option presented today, and the revisions made by the applicant help significantly with regard to the hip roof and stepping back some of the mass; b) He is not opposed overall to a three-story building, but he believes the mass facing Hollister Avenue needs to be different; c) When viewing Drawing A-4.7, he believes that the centralized three-story element that relates to the porte-cochere works okay, but as the mass moves to the southwest, it seems to bump up at the stair element. d) Consider moving the guest room at the rear to behind the front center mass and manipulating the stair into the mass to reduce the mass on the southwest corner; e) The three-story centralized mass of the building to the back is acceptable when considering the context of where the site is located and what the use of the building would bring to the community; f) The roof over the third floor is successful; g) Changing some of the eave details might help the architectural style fit more in Goleta as a whole; for example, the continuous flat roof with a cornice around it would work better if it were an actual pitched roof; h) He questioned whether the applicant considered a Marriott Residence Inn/Courtyard combination, which would lower the average room size and possibly reduce the overall size of the hotel so the project can meet the floor area ratio guidelines; and i) Following Vice Chair Brown's comments, Member Branch noted that her comments echoed what he was talking about. He remains concerned about how the building will look from Hollister Avenue and thinks the southwest corner needs adjustment.
3. Member Wignot commented: a) He expressed concern that the building will still appear as a three-story building from the view when driving by on Hollister Avenue, although it may be within the 35' height limit; and further stated that even if a two-story building were the same height as a three-story building, a building with three stories of windows would read as a taller building at three stories; (he noted that the Citrix building along Hollister Avenue is a two-story building with two stories of windows and appears as a two-story building, although he does not know the height of the Citrix building); b) Option A is the preferred option presented today; c) He noted that the applicant has made a good attempt to try and reduce the size, bulk and scale of the building by moving it back from Hollister Avenue by 23 feet and reducing some of the third-story elements on the front of the building; d) At the Ad Hoc Committee meeting, the property owners explained that they would be landscaping the frontage along Hollister Avenue from La Patera Lane to Robin Hill Road, which would include adding sidewalks and a bus stop; e) A concern expressed at the Ad Hoc

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 14 of 21

Committee meeting was that the large swaths of parking area in the front and back of the building on the adjacent property do not have very much landscaping, and a suggestion was made to provide additional tree wells; f) An updated visual simulation and a video drive-by simulation regarding the revised proposed option will be needed; and g) The current plans exceed the recommended floor area ratio (FAR) by approximately 12 percent. The Ad Hoc Committee previously asked the applicant to provide an example of a hotel plan that would comply with the [General Plan Hotel Overlay and Zoning Ordinance Hotel Overlay] FAR of 0.50; and h) Expressed concern that there needs to be an assurance that the shared parking component and inclusion of compact parking spaces will provide for sufficient parking.

4. Member Messner commented: a) He spoke in support of the pull-out style bus stop because it will help facilitate traffic flow on Hollister Avenue; and b) Regarding the architectural style, some recent projects at Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital and the airport will be using Santa Barbara sandstone as part of their design.
5. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The applicant's revisions have helped to free up some of the views, but some additional progress needs to be made; b) The public viewshed along Hollister Avenue is exceptionally important to the community's character and Goleta's General Plan standards require protection of the mountain views. She understands that Marriott has their own standards for development, but the project needs to comply with Goleta's standards, that include maintaining public views of the mountains. There are areas that can change and should be revised. c) Member Branch's suggestion to remove the mass on the southwest corner of the building may be a good solution; d) Possibly consider a three-story massing on the central core of the building, then stepping down to two stories; e) There may be some other additional changes that might make some difference; f) The floor area ratio guideline issue needs to be honored; g) Consider the use of materials that would be more reflective of the cultural resources of the area; h) It would be nice if the architecture style looks something like the community's character; i) Her preference would be a style that is somewhat simple and not overdone; j) A three-story façade that appears very monolithic is not very inviting; k) If the applicant considers a Spanish or Monterey style of architecture, there are some examples in Santa Barbara; and l) The architectural style should not be Southwestern; m) The proposed project is still impacting archaeological resources; n) The eastern view is really important; and o) The visual simulations should not be revised until the DRB has seen the newest project revisions.

Following the DRB members' comments, Tony Wrzosek, R.D. Olson Development, applicant, stated that they were not trying to force this project without concern for the City's standards. Gene Fong, project architect, and Tony Wrzosek stated that their understanding of the DRB comments was that the three-story element was okay for the entrance and that they would look at modifying the stairs and the southwest corner to the middle of the south elevation on the third floor.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, to February 9, 2010, with the following direction: 1) The applicant is requested to study the third-story element on the southwest corner of the proposed building with regard to the stair tower to reduce the mass based on the DRB comments and direction, and to present an Option D scheme.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 15 of 21

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

February 9, 2010

Page 17 of 21

Aspects Considered in Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.1)

The DRB shall review each project for conformity with the purpose of this Chapter, the applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects, and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations. The DRB's review shall include:

- 1) Height, bulk, scale and area coverage of buildings and structures and other site improvements.
- 2) Colors and types of building materials and application.
- 3) Physical and design relation with existing and proposed structures on the same site and in the immediately affected surrounding area.
- 4) Site layout, orientation, and location of buildings, and relationship with open areas and topography.
- 5) Height, materials, colors, and variations in boundary walls, fences, or screen planting.
- 6) Location and type of existing and proposed landscaping.
- 7) Sign design and exterior lighting.

Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)

In approving, approving with conditions, or denying an application, the DRB shall examine the materials submitted with the application and any other material provided to Planning and Environmental Services to determine whether the buildings, structures, or signs are appropriate and of good design in relation to other buildings, structures, or signs on the site and in the immediately affected surrounding area. Such determination shall be based upon the following findings, as well as any additional findings required pursuant to any applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations:

- 1) The development will be compatible with the neighborhood, and its size, bulk and scale will be appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.
- 2) Site layout, orientation, and location of structures, buildings, and signs are in an appropriate and well-designated relationship to one another, and to the environmental qualities, open spaces and topography of the property.
- 3) The project demonstrates a harmonious relationship with existing and proposed adjoining developments, avoiding excessive variety and monotonous repetition, but allowing similarity of style, if warranted.
- 4) There is harmony of material, color, and composition of all sides of a structure or buildings.
- 5) A limited number of materials will be on the exterior face of the building or structure.
- 6) There is consistency and unity of composition and treatment of exterior elevation.
- 7) Mechanical and electrical equipment is well integrated in the total design concept and screened from public view to the maximum extent practicable.
- 8) All visible onsite utility services are appropriate in size and location.
- 9) The grading will be appropriate to the site.
- 10) Adequate landscaping is provided in proportion to the project and the site with due regard to the preservation of specimen and landmark trees, and existing native vegetation.
- 11) The selection of plant materials is appropriate to the project and its environment, and adequate provision will be made for the long-term maintenance of such plant materials.
- 12) The project will preserve and protect, to the maximum extent practicable, any mature, specimen or skyline tree, or appropriately mitigate the loss.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 18 of 21

- 13) The development will not adversely affect significant public scenic views.
- 14) Signs, including their lighting, are well designed and are appropriate in size and location.
- 15) All exterior site, structure and building lighting is well-designed and appropriate in size and location.
- 16) The proposed development is consistent with any additional design standards as expressly adopted by the City Council.
- 17) The development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.
- 18) The public health, safety and welfare will be protected.
- 19) The project architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access.
- 20) The project will provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way.

Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

Conceptual Review

Conceptual review is a required step that allows the applicant and the DRB to participate in an informal discussion about the proposed project. Applicants are encouraged to initiate this review as early in the design process as possible. This level of review is intended to provide the applicant with good direction early in the process to avoid spending unnecessary time and money by developing a design concept that may be inconsistent with the City's architectural guidelines and development standards. When a project is scheduled for conceptual review, the DRB may grant preliminary approval if the required information is provided, the design and details are acceptable and the project is properly noticed for such dual approval.

Information required for conceptual review includes:

- a. Photographs which show the site from 3 to 5 vantage points or a panorama from the site and of the site as seen from the street, and photographs of the surrounding neighborhood showing the relationship of the site to such adjacent properties. Aerial photographs are helpful if available and may be required at later stages.
- b. Site plan showing vicinity map, topography, location of existing and proposed structures and driveways, and locations of all structures adjacent to the proposed structure. The site plan shall also indicate any proposed grading, an estimate of the amount of such grading, and any existing vegetation to be removed or retained.
- c. Site statistics including all proposed structures, square footage by use, and the number of covered and uncovered parking spaces.
- d. Schematics of the proposed project shall include rough floor plans and at least two elevations indicating the height of proposed structures. Perspective sketches of the project may also be required. Proposed materials and colors shall be indicated. (Schematics and sketches may be rough as long as they are to scale and describe the proposed development accurately and sufficiently well to allow review and discussion.)

Preliminary Review

Preliminary review involves the substantive analysis of a project's compliance with all applicable City architectural guidelines and development standards. Fundamental design issues such as precise size of all built elements, site plan, elevations and landscaping are resolved at this stage of review. The DRB will identify to the applicant those aspects of the project that are not in compliance with applicable architectural guidelines and development standards and the findings that the DRB is required to make.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 19 of 21

Preliminary approval of the project's design is the point in the process at which an appeal of DRB's decision can be made. Preliminary approval of the project's design is deemed a basis to proceed with working drawings, following the close of the appeal period and absent the filing of an appeal.

Information required for preliminary review, in addition to the information required for conceptual review, includes:

- a. Complete site plan showing all existing structures, proposed improvements, proposed grading, including cut and fill calculations, lot coverage statistics (i.e., building, paving, usable open space and landscape areas), vicinity map, and topography.
- b. Floor plans and roof plans (1/8" scale minimum).
- c. All elevations (1/8" scale minimum) with heights, materials and colors specified.
- d. Preliminary landscape plan, when required, showing existing and proposed trees and shrubs, including any existing vegetation to be removed. This landscape plan shall also include all retaining and freestanding walls, fences, gates and gateposts and proposed paving and should specify proposed materials and colors of all these items.
- e. Site section for projects on slopes of 20 percent or greater, and when required by the DRB.

Final Review

Final review confirms that the working drawings are in conformance with the project that received preliminary approval. In addition to reviewing site plan and elevations for conformance, building details and the landscape plan will be reviewed for acceptability.

Final review is conducted by the Planning and Environmental Services staff, in consultation with the DRB Chair or the Chair's designees. In the event that final plans are not in substantial conformance with the approved preliminary plans, the DRB Chair and Planning staff shall refer the matter to the full DRB for a final determination.

Information required for final review, in addition to the previous review requirements, includes:

- a. Complete set of architectural details, which must include window, eave & rake, chimney, railing and other pertinent architectural details, including building sections with finished floor, plate, and ridge heights indicated.
- b. 8 1/2" X 11" materials sample board of materials and colors to be used, as well as an indication of the materials and colors on the drawings. Sheet metal colors (for vents, exposed chimneys, flashing, etc.) shall also be indicated. All this information shall be included on the working drawings.
- c. Final site grading and drainage plan when required, including exact cut and fill calculations.
- d. Final landscape drawings, when required, showing the dripline of all trees and shrubs, and all wall, fence, and gate details. The drawings must show the size, name and location of plantings that will be visible from the street frontage, landscape screening which will integrate with the surrounding neighborhood, and irrigation for landscaping. Landscape drawings shall include a planting plan specifying layout of all plant materials, sizes, quantities and botanical and common names; and a final irrigation plan depicting layout and sizes of all equipment and components of a complete irrigation system (automated system required on commercial and multiple-residential developments). Planting and irrigation plans shall depict all site utilities, both above and below grade.

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

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 20 of 21

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 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

Design Review Board Agenda

February 9, 2010

Page 21 of 21

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 aeal hearing.