



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, March 9, 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

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

March 9, 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 23, 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

- NONE

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. (Continued from 2-23-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-23-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) The applicant has done a good job in cleaning up the appearance of the site (she noted that when she made her site visit there

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 9, 2010

Page 3 of 16

- were unpermitted signs on the property); b) The proposed directory sign on the southern façade should be moved to the right, closer to the public's entrance to the complex, and the directory sign will only need to identify the tenants in Building "B" and Building "C"; c) The preference is for the building to look clean and neat, and not have too many signs that would clutter the southern façade; d) The proposed tenant sign for "Draperies by Renga" on the southern façade is deceiving regarding the location of this business because it is not located in Building "A"; and e) It may be useful to add the appropriate letters on the buildings to identify Buildings "A", "B", and "C".
2. Member Smith commented: a) The lettering on the proposed directory sign on the southern façade is too small to read from vehicles passing by; b) Suggested moving the directory sign on the southern façade to the right where "5718" is located, and listing only the tenants in Building "B" and Building "C", in a vertical format; c) The proposed directory sign on the western side of Building "A" is confusing and would direct people to the wrong property; and d) A directory sign on the south elevation of Building "C" would help identify tenants in Building "B" and Building "C" for persons driving into the property.
 3. Member Schneider commented: a) The text on the proposed directory on the south façade along Hollister Avenue is so small that the sign will become useless; b) A directory sign on the southern elevation of Building "C" would be useful to identify tenants in Building "B" and Building "C", but a directory sign is not needed on the fronts of Building "B" and Building "C" because once the public has entered the complex, the tenant signs will be visible on the buildings; c) The directory sign on the south façade should be more vertical; and d) The proposed directory sign on the western side of Building "A" should be eliminated.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-192-DRB, 5718 Hollister Avenue, to March 9, 2010, with the following comments: 1) The tenant signs on the southern façade of Building "A" will be only for the tenants in Building "A", and should be the approximate size that has been proposed by the applicant; 2) The proposed directory sign on the southern façade of Building "A" should be moved towards the right side (to where "5718" is currently shown on the southern façade), and this directory sign should only have the names of the tenants for Building "B" and Building "C", with the applicant to rework the size of text and spacing, and consider a vertical format; 3) The proposed directory sign on the southern façade of Building "C", that is visible from Hollister Avenue, should only have the names of the tenants for Building "B" and Building "C", which should be listed under the name of the respective building, and should be in a uniform size, approximately 12" in height; 4) Remove the proposed directory sign on the west elevation of Building "A" because it is superfluous and would be confusing; 5) A directory sign on the east elevation of Building "A" would not be appropriate; 6) The tenant signs on Building "B" and Building "C" should be the same size and design as the tenant signs on Building "A"; 7) The address of the building, "5718", should be added to the southern elevation of Building "C"; and 8) The proposed height of the address, "5718", on the southern façade of Building "A", should be taller, approximately 12 inches in height, and it would be preferable for the address to be located next to the name of the building complex.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 9, 2010

Page 4 of 16

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

I-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-017-DRB RV

6550 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-330-002)

This is a request for *Revised Final* review. The property includes a 38,000-square foot commercial building on a 3.43-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes a revised landscape plan for the project parcel. Revisions proposed include updated plantings for parking lot landscape islands, new patios and walkways, and the removal of coral trees at the Hollister/Los Carneros corner and replacement with Canary Island date palms. The project was filed by Derrik Eichelberger and Erin Carroll of Arcadia Studio, landscape architect, on behalf of Alan Grosbard of Park One LLC, property owner. Related cases: 10-017-LUPRV. (Shine Ling)

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-003-DRB

270 Storke Road (APN 073-100-032)

This is a request for *Final* 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 2-23-10, 2-9-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-23-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) He believes that his comments at the previous meeting are still valid with regard to the proposed location of the outdoor eating area close to the busy Storke/Hollister intersection because of the potential for impacts that would include traffic noise and exposure to air pollution, and the western exposure on a hot day; b) His concerns include the proximity of the bus stop and the amount of delivery truck traffic presently on Storke Road which will probably increase over time as the population increases; c) The west elevation is a very poor location for outside dining; d) An alternate solution would be to consider a design similar to Rusty's Pizza Parlor, next door, which would be to make an entryway with steps, that would have room for a ramp allowing for ADA access to the entrance coming from the north, and to possibly continue Rusty's theme of having interior window seats and bay windows on the west elevation; e) There may be room to add a few more tables and chairs to the east side, thus eliminating outdoor dining on the west side; f) The objective of DRB Goal #10 is to ensure that the continued health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood are not compromised; g) He does not support the project as proposed and would not be able to make DRB Finding #17 that the development will enhance the

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 9, 2010

Page 5 of 16

- appearance of the neighborhood, or Finding #18 that the public health, safety and welfare will be protected.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) From the standpoints of aesthetics and usability, the proposed project is a nice project; b) He believes there will be people who will utilize the outdoor dining area; c) He understands Member Wignot's concerns and comments regarding the intersection; d) He noted that presently this intersection is fairly non-pedestrian, because of the amount of traffic and width of the lanes, however, this project will help bring the pedestrian aspect to the intersection in the future; and e) He was not present at the previous hearing.
 3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) She appreciates Member Wignot's concerns, and noted that there are other outdoor café areas in the City that are being used while traffic goes by; b) The proposed green screen, vines, and trees, as well as the windows, will help soften the western elevation; and c) The applicant's revisions are appreciated.
 4. Member Herrera commented: a) The revisions are appreciated; and b) The proximity of the bus stop and the traffic are aspects that are not nice; however, the project will be an improvement to the whole area.
 5. Member Messner commented: a) When making a site visit today, he noticed that the traffic echoes; b) Consider adding some windows or other elements along the second bay (kitchen, restroom area) that would make the elevation more inviting and open; c) There may be an opportunity for ADA access near the driveway/stairway area; d) Planting trees with different heights will successfully help break up the landscaping in the accessory area; and e) The proposed *Ficus* plantings should be variegated species which would be less aggressive.
 6. Chair Smith commented: a) The proposed project will be a big improvement with regard to the streetscape along Storke Road; b) He could support the proposed project, especially with the proposed landscaping that will make the elevation more "friendly"; c) He did acknowledge there is a lot of traffic with regard to the outdoor dining area, and noted how this aspect may relate to personal preferences; d) Member Wignot's comments regarding ADA handicapped access are appreciated, but this aspect will need to be dealt with technically by the appropriate process; and e) He understands that there is ADA handicapped access from the parking lot side of the site.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 5 to 1 vote (No: Wignot; Recused: Branch) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 10-003-DRB, 270 Storke Road, with the following conditions: 1) The proposed trees in the pots in the patio area shall be a variegated species; and 2) The Bottlebrush species proposed for the storage area shall be changed to a species that is located on the current City Recommended Street Tree Planting List; and 3) As projects move forward on this property site, efforts to increase the tree canopy in the parking lot will be appreciated; and to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 10-003-DRB, to March 9, 2010, for Final review on the Final Calendar.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

Design Review Board Agenda

March 9, 2010

Page 6 of 16

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. (Continued from 2-9-10) (Scott Kolwitz)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-9-10 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) When looking at the floor plan, there seems to be a number of areas that have unused space, for example, the entryway, the study and the walk-in closet; b) Possibly consider whether reorienting the building somewhat would simplify the structure and roofline, and may address some of the concerns; c) Consider whether orienting the southerly rooms and breakfast room more southwesterly would eliminate the need to add so much fill; and d) The shape of the proposed three-car garage design seems to be well thought-out, without commenting on its location on the property.
2. Member Branch commented: a) It appears that the applicant's goal is to do a project that is tasteful; b) Site sections, and details regarding the retaining walls, will be useful to understand the plans for the fill and cut soil; c) The one-story plan will be helpful when trying to fit the project in with the neighborhood; d) Restudy whether using an 8-foot plate possibly at the back of the garage may help address the concern of the neighbor behind the garage; e) Consider methods to address neighbors' concerns regarding keeping the stormwater runoff on site, for example, utilizing permeable materials; f) The proposed style of architecture is acceptable, in his opinion, because it is an infill lot, but the details are somewhat overdone in terms of the some of the heights and masses which can be worked out, for example re-considering the height of some of the towers; and g) Story poles will be needed at some point when the design is more developed;
3. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed architecture seems a little overdone; b) A style that is somewhat simpler would be more preferable; c) Consider toning down some of the Spanish influences, for example, the turrets; d) The runoff should be fully captured on site and there should be no runoff going to other properties; e) Because of the runoff concerns, it would seem that the footprint may need to be minimized; f) Expressed concern regarding the proposed grading and suggested not grading at the southern edge; g) An

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 9, 2010

Page 7 of 16

arborist report is requested with regard to existing Oak tree; h) It would be helpful for the project landscape architect to be present at the next meeting to provide details regarding drainage, runoff, and swales; and i) She noted that the private views cannot be protected but the DRB may try to work with the applicant and neighbors to address concerns regarding private views.

4. Member Herrera commented: a) Swales would help address concerns regarding stormwater runoff; and b) He appreciates the proposed architectural style.
5. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with Member Branch's suggestion that lowering the plate in the garage to 8 feet, possibly at the back wall area, might diminish the profile; b) The elevations need to be shown in conjunction with the grading plan; c) Details are needed regarding the grading at the turnaround at the bottom of the property; d) Adding permeable materials in the hardscape area in front of the house might help address runoff concerns; e) The placement of the house is in the logical spot; f) He does not have a concern with regard to the proposed architectural style; and g) Story poles will be needed at the appropriate time in the process.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Messner, Schneider), to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-0189-DRB, 811 Cambridge Drive, to March 9, 2010, with comments and the following direction: 1) The applicant shall provide a more developed grading plan showing the drainage and addressing areas of concern that include the hammerhead and drainage from the hardscape area around the house; 2) An arborist report shall be provided showing City standards with regard to adding hardscape under the drip line of the existing Oak tree; 3) The applicant shall provide elevations that are more developed showing the how the project relates in conjunction with the topography and grading plan; 4) The applicant shall provide site sections; 5) Consider the suggestion to reduce the plate heights in the garage; and 6) The existing retaining wall shall be labeled on the plans.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-015-DRB

98-110 South Kellogg Avenue (APN 071-340-001; -002; -003; -004; -005; -006; 007)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property comprises the Kellogg Ranch, which includes 7 condominiums on a 1.44-acre lot in the DR-20 zone district. The applicant proposes to repaint the existing buildings with a new color scheme, including an olive green color for the body, off-white for the trim, and slate gray for the roof (Frazee CLC 1209 Demon Days, CLW 1013W Akamina, and CL 3225D Fate, respectively). No new floor area or other exterior modifications to the structures are proposed. The project was filed by Reilly Pollard of the Kellogg Ranch Homeowners Association, property owner. (Shine Ling)

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. 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

Design Review Board Agenda

March 9, 2010

Page 8 of 16

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 2-23-10*, 2-9-10, 1-26-10, 12-8-09) (Natasha Campbell)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

2-9-10 Meeting (Approved 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

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 9, 2010

Page 9 of 16

- 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 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.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 9, 2010

Page 10 of 16

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. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Agenda

March 9, 2010

Page 11 of 16

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

March 9, 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

March 9, 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

March 9, 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

March 9, 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.

Design Review Board Agenda

March 9, 2010

Page 16 of 16

All Other Appeal Periods

The **Preliminary** or **Revised Final** approval or **denial** of a non-sign project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person withstanding may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. An appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within the ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed or closed early (such as on Fridays which close at 1:00 p.m.), the appeal period is extended until 5:30 p.m. on the following business day. Planning and Environmental Services will notify the DRB as to the scheduled date of the appeal hearing. The DRB will designate a member to attend an appeal hearing.