



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, February 23, 2010

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

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

Members:

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

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

Notices:

- Requests for review of project plans or change of scheduling should be made to the City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, 93117; Telephone (805)961-7500.
 - In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City of Goleta at (805)961-7500. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City staff to make reasonable arrangements.
 - Preliminary approval or denial of a project by the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Goleta Planning Commission within ten (10) calendar days following the action. Please contact the Planning & Environmental Services Department for more information.
 - Design Review Board approvals do not constitute Land Use Clearances.
 - The square footage figures on this agenda are subject to change during the review process.
 - The length of Agenda items is only an estimate. Applicants are responsible for being available when their item is to be heard. Any item for which the applicant is not immediately available may be continued to the next meeting.
-

Design Review Board Agenda

February 23, 2010

Page 2 of 16

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for February 9, 2010

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

B-4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

B-5. APPOINTMENT TO SUBCOMMITTEES

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. 09-159-DRB

6560 Camino Caseta (APN 077-412-024)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 3,053-square foot two-story residence with an attached two-car garage on a 9,148-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 380-square foot addition on the first floor and a 122-square foot unenclosed veranda on the front of the residence. The resulting two-story structure would be 3,433 square feet, consisting of a 2,971-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 462-square foot two-car garage. The proposed project exceeds the maximum floor area guidelines for the R-1 zone district. Materials proposed would match those of the existing residence. The project was filed by James Zimmerman AIA, architect, on behalf of Francis and Catherine Donohoe, property owners. Related cases: 09-159-LUP. (Continued from 1-26-10, 12-8-09*) (Shine Ling)

Applicant request to continue to March 23, 2010

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-26-10 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) There are a lot of two-story residences in the neighborhood, which is very nice neighborhood; b) The architectural design of

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 23, 2010

Page 3 of 16

- the proposed project is appreciated; c) The proposed veranda is a nice aesthetic element to add to the house and it will probably have a lot of use, particularly in good weather; d) One existing bedroom will be eliminated; e) There have been no public comments from neighbors expressing concerns as far as he knows; f) He would support the proposed project, even though the size is ten percent over the recommended floor area ratio; and g) He believes this project shows justification that an exception can be made to the recommended floor area ratio guideline; and h) The applicant will need to provide cut sheets showing that proposed lighting fixtures comply with Dark Sky principles.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed architectural design is nice; and b) With regard to exceeding the recommended floor area ratio guideline, he believes this case is an example of a proposed project adding positively to the aesthetics of the neighborhood;
 3. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed project is a nice aesthetic element that will enhance the neighborhood as well as the existing house; and b) Encouraged the use of board and bat materials to tie into the existing house.
 4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed project with the addition of the veranda will be a very nice improvement and benefit for the neighborhood; and b) The appearance of the project does not seem to show that the recommended floor area ratio guideline is exceeded.
 5. Member Messner commented: a) The project design works well with the neighborhood even though the project exceeds the recommended floor area ratio guidelines.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, 6560 Camino Caseta, as submitted, with the following Conditions: 1) The applicant shall provide the proposed color details; 2) The applicant shall provide cut sheets showing that the proposed light fixtures comply with Dark Sky principles; and 3) Board and bat material shall be used for the new addition element; and to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-159-DRB, to February 23, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-169-DRB

75 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-008)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 12,661-square foot commercial property on a 59,975-square foot lot in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to permit an as-built rain canopy in the rear yard setback and to construct a 10-foot tall block wall for a length of approximately 75 feet along the rear yard property line, and construct an 864-square foot rain canopy in the western side yard setback. A portion of the as-built rain canopy encloses an area of 1,153-square feet; thereby creating a 1,153 square-foot addition. Pre-finished metal panels and aluminum windows would replace existing louvers on the rear elevation and continue onto the front elevation, covering (but not enclosing) a truck dock area. The resulting one-story structure would be 12,661-square feet. The project was filed by Rex Ruskauff, architect, on behalf of Castilian LLC, property owner. Related cases: 06-070-DP AM01; 06-070-CUP; 09-169-LUP. (Continued from 1-12-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

Design Review Board Agenda

February 23, 2010

Page 4 of 16

1-12-10 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The applicant will need to study the drainage and gutter issues with the intent to have the gutter around the perimeter of the entirety of the canopy; and b) The signage will need to be addressed as a separate application.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) There will need to be a resolution with regard to the unpermitted signs; and b) Consider permitting the existing signs.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-169-DRB, 75 Castilian Drive, with the following conditions: 1) The applicant shall study the gutter and drainage issues with the intent to have the gutter around the entirety of the canopy; and 2) There needs to be a resolution with regard to the unpermitted signs and the signage will be addressed as a separate application; and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 09-169-DRB, to February 23, 2010, for Final Review on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-192-DRB

5718 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-081-035)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The properties include three retail commercial buildings comprising a total of approximately 9,600 square feet on a 0.51-acre parcel in the C-2 zone district. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the shopping center. The proposed OSP provides for two (2) different types of signs: directional signs and wall signs. The project was filed by Jack Hira of J and S Properties, property owner. Related cases: 09-192-OSP; -CUP. (Shine Ling)

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-087-DRB

266 Spruce Drive (APN 079-530-027)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 2,061-square foot residence and an attached 450-square foot 2-car garage on an 8,968-square foot lot in the 8-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 1,081-square foot basement, demolish the existing 450-square foot garage, and construct an attached 472-square foot 2-car garage in the same location as the existing garage. The resulting 1-story structure with basement would be 3,449 square feet, consisting of a 2,977-square foot single-family dwelling with basement and an attached 472-square foot 2-car garage. 684-cubic yards of cut for grading is proposed for construction of the basement. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence aside from new doors, windows, and exterior

Design Review Board Agenda

February 23, 2010

Page 5 of 16

lighting as shown on plans. The project was filed by agent Brian Nelson on behalf of Robert Cambron, property owner. Related cases: 09-092-MOD. (Continued from 12-8-09, 10-27-09, 10-14-08, 09-23-08*, 9-09-08*, 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

12-8-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Branch commented: a) When looking at the front elevation, it seems like some kind of low-lying shrub will do well in front of the light well.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The applicant will need to provide a landscape plan for the front yard, from the public's view of the front yard, to include the area next to the stairwell that goes to the lower level.
3. Member Wignot commented: a) The wrought-iron style safety rail that is shown around the exterior stairwell is a good change from the previous solid stucco concrete detail because it makes the existence of the stairwell more noticeable; and b) The applicant will need to provide for drainage in the stairwell that goes to the lower level. (Brian Nelson stated that a sump pump will be provided for drainage in the stairwell.)

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to grant Preliminary Approval of Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 08-087-DRB, 266 Spruce Drive, with the following Conditions: 1) The applicant shall submit a color and material board; 2) The rail around the exterior stair that goes down to the lower level shall be detailed on the plans; and 3) The applicant shall provide a landscape plan for the front yard; and to continue Item K-1, DRB Permit No. 08-087-DRB, to February 23, 2010, for Final review on the Final Calendar.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. 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. (Continued from 2-9-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-9-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

February 23, 2010

Page 6 of 16

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The busy Storke Road frontage does not seem like an appropriate location for an outdoor eating area because of the potential for impacts that would include traffic noise and exposure to air pollution, noting that the photographs show a bus stop nearby; b) The west exposure at the outdoor eating area on a hot day would be a concern – possibly umbrellas or screening would help; c) It seems problematic that someone wanting to enter the building from across Storke Road by ADA handicapped access would need to circle around three-fourths of the existing building to get to the front door; and d) He does not believe that he can support the proposed project.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Requested the applicant provide details with regard to the proposed outdoor seating space on the eastern side; b) The proposed project would benefit by the addition of more landscaping; c) Some landscaping on the western side is needed to help soften the starkness of the architecture, and provide some sort of shade trees in big pots and some sort of vine on the fence; and d) She noted that she has concerns with regard to outdoor seating that is located next to a major roadway.
3. Member Messner commented: a) The project landscape architect should consider that there are some trees and vines that would do well in pots, and that some species actually prefer being in a container, for the western patio area; b) The proposed Weeping Bottlebrush tree in the accessory area seems to just “date” the area and should be replaced by a species that is possibly lacy and more upright with an upper canopy, that is non-deciduous and evergreen; and c) Possibly consider planting a mix of some different trees that are in the same family to provide for some aesthetic variety, for example, some trees that may flower at different times of the year.
4. Member Herrera commented: a) The proposed tree species around the building are okay; and b) Agreed with Member Messner’s comments regarding landscaping that is needed on the western side patio.
5. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with DRB comments that landscaping is needed on the western patio; b) More details are needed with regard to the outdoor seating area on the east elevation; c) With regard to ADA handicapped access, it may also be difficult to access the building from Hollister Avenue, which should at least be restudied; and d) In general, the railing at least helps break up the architecture on the lower level of the building.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 4 to 1 vote (No: Wignot; Absent: Schneider; Recused: Branch), to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-003-DRB, 270 Storke Road, to February 23, 2010, with comments, that include: 1) The applicant shall present plans for additional landscaping on the western and eastern elevations; 2) The applicant shall provide landscaping details with regard to the area around the accessory structure; 3) The applicant shall provide details with regard to any additional outdoor seating areas to the east and north; and 4) Restudy the ADA handicapped access to the building from Hollister Avenue and from Storke Road.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-037-DRB

5912-5940 & 5960 Olney Street (APN 071-153-008; -009; -010; -011; & -013)

Design Review Board Agenda

February 23, 2010

Page 7 of 16

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The properties consist of five parcels in the M-1 zone district (Coastal Zone), comprising a total of 28,346 square feet. An existing 3,656-square foot two-story commercial/industrial building is located at 5940 Olney Street; vacant paved lots are located at 5912, 5920, 5930, 5940, and 5960 Olney Street. The applicant proposes an as-built development plan and major conditional use permit for a car rental facility. The first floor of the existing building would be used for a rental office and four car repair bays for light car maintenance and hand car washing. One of the offices on the second floor is used for AVIS administration. The hours of operation would be from 4:30 a.m. to 11:30 p.m. An average of 50 cars per day would be rented from the facility. The total number of employees would be 20, spread over 3 work shifts, with a maximum of 8 during a typical day shift. The existing building is proposed to be used 'as-is' with no physical changes proposed. AVIS customer operations are restricted to the first floor office area. A total of 10 customer parking stalls are proposed (5 on the lot at 5940 Olney Street and 5 on the lots adjacent at 5912-5930 Olney Street). The project was filed by Leland J. Smith of Chester Smith Associates, architect, on behalf of Andrew Jaksich of AVIS Budget Group, tenant, and the Duckett Family Trust and Graziano and Romana Bernardi, property owners. Related cases: 08-037-DP; -CUP. (Continued from 1-12-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

1-12-10 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) Suggested that the proposed plans should include landscaping to comply closely with the City's standards requiring not less than 10 percent of the property landscaped; and b) The proprietor of the cement factory and storage yard near the site has discussed plans with the DRB regarding landscaping along the fencing on the cement factory property;
2. Chair Smith commented: a) Concurred with Member Wignot's comment suggesting that landscaping would be appropriate on the site, possibly around the entrance in tree wells; and b) The applicant will need to provide lighting plans.
3. Member Messner commented: a) Suggested consideration be given to planting one or two trees that would fit in a narrow area, rather than planting landscaping on the ground, which would be more appropriate because a canopy would be provided that would be more visible in the area that is very industrial; b) It is a good idea to plant one or more trees because of the canopy and oxygen source, but it is not suggested as being mandatory; and c) Suggested that there would be a motivation for the property owner to maintain landscaping if it was located at the entry area where there are customers.
4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) She does not believe there should be any landscaping but if the DRB requires landscaping, she would concur with Member Messner's suggestion to consider planting one or two trees; b) There does not seem to be any place for planting trees; c) Expressed concern that if landscaping is not maintained it will look very bad; d) The proposed lighting plans should comply with Dark Sky principles; and e) The existing lighting wall packs are unshielded and it appears there is an attempt to light the parking lot with the wall packs.
5. Member Branch commented: a) It may be difficult to find space for landscaping; and b) The suggestion to plant trees, which is a temporary solution, is a good

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

solution because it would provide a tree canopy; however, to some degree it may not be worth it because of the nature of the asphalt and concrete.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 08-037-DRB, 5912-5940 & 5960 Olney Street, with comments, including the request for the applicant to provide proposed lighting plans, and with the suggestion that some trees could be incorporated around the public area with a tree well; and to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 08-037-DRB, to February 23, 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 2-9-10, 1-26-10, 12-8-09) (Natasha Campbell)

Applicant request to continue to March 9, 2010

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-9-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The DRB has worked with the applicant to try to reduce the visual impacts and to move the proposed project further back from Hollister Avenue; b) At this point, if the applicant believes that they have taken the revisions as far as they can, it would be beneficial to have the City's consultant update the visual simulations and video drive by simulations to reflect the revised hotel design and how it affects scenic views of the mountains for persons traveling along Hollister Avenue; c) The updated visual simulations will provide an opportunity to compare the current revised project design with the original design to see if there have been some significant changes and it will help the DRB consider whether the proposed project that exceeds the recommended Floor Area Ratio guidelines can be supported; d) The information provided by the updated visual simulations will be an important component with regard to his review of the proposed project; and e) He questioned whether the applicant conducted a solar study regarding how shading from the three-story building may affect the terrace garden pool area.
2. Member Branch commented: a) Some of the changes made by the applicant in response to suggestions by the DRB to address concerns regarding mass, bulk, and scale, have been helpful and are appreciated, which include reduction in the height and massing on the hotel's southeast and southwest corners, and the additional setback on Hollister Avenue; b) The current revised scheme is better, particularly as shown on Sheet A-5.0, with the two-story component on the southwest corner, and it makes a noticeable difference when driving eastbound on Hollister Avenue; c) The southwest corner of the building is a critical component of the proposed project, and the information provided by the updated visual and drive by video simulations will be very useful; d) There is a lot of building proposed on this site, but at the same time, one aspect of the proposed project is that he has been told there is a community need for this type of product, therefore, he suggests it may be appropriate to consider how significant is that need; he doesn't have the data to know how much it's needed; e) In his opinion, the proposed style of architecture as a whole is too non-descript. It looks like a hotel that you'd see in San Jose. It doesn't look right for Goleta, although the solution and details can be worked out later.
3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The changes that have been made by the applicant to try and meet the City's standards are appreciated, but she still has issues; b) The applicant's constraints are economic, ours are the General Plan; c) The main issues of her concern are still being able to make the findings regarding the project being compatible with the neighborhood, the size bulk and scale of the proposed project, and how the project fits in with this viewscape on Hollister Avenue; d) She believes that the proposed project is very big and expressed concern that issues regarding size, bulk and scale, and neighborhood compatibility, may continue unless the project does not exceed the recommended Hotel Overlay FAR in the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance; e) She expressed concern regarding the possibility that the

Design Review Board Agenda

February 23, 2010

Page 10 of 16

community standards that were set by the General Plan process may be compromised; f) At this time, she recommends that the updated visual and drive by simulations be prepared by the City's consultant which will provide a better understanding of how the project will fit into the viewshed and streetscape; and g) Although the review today is not focused on the architectural style, she noted that the proposed style is a kind of anomaly and does not fit.

4. Member Herrera commented: a) He thanked the applicant for the efforts to comply with community standards; and b) He believes a hotel is very much needed in Goleta, but the proposed project is still too high on the south elevation and too large for the site.
5. Chair Smith commented: a) Wanted to know more about the hotel room numbers discussed in Trey Pinner's letter as well as related land costs and land improvement costs; b) Agreed with the DRB members' comments; c) The proposed project still feels too big, although the applicant has been working with the DRB and the Ad Hoc Committee; d) He noted that the community has worked hard with regard to setting standards in the General Plan; and e) The updated visual and drive by simulations should provide for a good understanding with regard to the proposed project at this point.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Schneider) to continue Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 09-075-DRB, 6300 Hollister Avenue, to February 23, 2010; and direct staff to work with the applicant to determine if the applicant will decide to respond to DRB comments with further revisions to the proposed project, or provide staff with information that is needed for the City's consultant to prepare updated visual simulations and video drive by showing how the project redesign affects the scenic views of the mountains for vehicles, cyclists or pedestrians traveling along Hollister Avenue, as well as the perceived massing and height of the proposed structure.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. CALIFORNIA INVASIVE PLANT COUNCIL LIST

O-2. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-3. 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 23, 2010

Page 12 of 16

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 23, 2010

Page 13 of 16

- 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 23, 2010

Page 14 of 16

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 23, 2010

Page 15 of 16

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 23, 2010

Page 16 of 16

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.