



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, April 13, 2010

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:30 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

April 13, 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 March 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

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-141-DRB

5877 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-112-003)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 2,362-square foot commercial property on a 4,100-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to replace the existing bakery store front, and add landscaping and hardscape to the rear of the property to provide an outdoor seating area. This project will not result in any added square footage. The project was filed by agent Jack Shaffer on behalf of the Martin Koobation Family Trust, property owner. Related cases: LUR-47335, LUR-51775. (Continued from 3-23-10*, 2-9-10*, 1-12-10*, 12-8-09*, 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Applicant request to continue to May 11, 2010

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

10-27-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Herrera commented: a) The proposed project is a huge improvement on the site.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed project is a great improvement; b) The colors are appreciated; and c) He noticed that there is distinctive stone

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 13, 2010

Page 3 of 16

material on the façade of the buildings on either side of the site which was not incorporated into the design; however, the design works well without it.

3. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with Member Branch's comments; b) The project fits in with the distinctive stone material on both sides of the project site and the warm, earthy palette of the building; and c) The idea of the bi-fold doors is appreciated.
4. Member Schneider commented: a) The design is somewhat simple and straightforward, and works very well; and b) The intensity of the proposed color will be played down somewhat because the storefront faces north.

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

F-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-013-DRB

5660 Pembroke Court (APN 069-670-009)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 1,090-square foot residence and an attached 541-square foot 2-car garage on a 2,552-square foot condominium lot within the 2.5-acre Cambridge Residences development in the DR-3.3 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 150-square foot addition infilling exterior covered patio space at the rear of the dwelling under the existing roof line. The resulting 1-story structure would be 1,781 square feet, consisting of a 1,240-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 541-square foot 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Ben Woodall on behalf of Stanley Jagoda, property owner. Related cases: 86-DP-81; 10-013-SCD; 10-013-LUP. (Continued from 3-23-10) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-23-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide details regarding the plans for exterior lighting; and b) Suggested the applicant consider reusing the existing exterior light fixture that projects the light downward.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) Requested that the applicant restudy the exterior lighting requirements for the proposed project.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) Questioned whether the proposed project would reduce the original landscape area that was required when the Final Development Plan was originally approved.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-013-DRB, 5660 Pembroke Court, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The applicant shall restudy the exterior lighting and present the details at Final review for clarification; and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-013-DRB, to April 13, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 13, 2010

Page 4 of 16

F-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-022-DRB

7404 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-064)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. On the eastern parcel of the HBP at 7404 Hollister (Building 8), the applicant proposes to construct a 160-square foot addition for a utility room, and also to install a 75-square foot diesel-powered emergency backup power generator. The generator would be enclosed within a 10-foot tall stucco wall with a corrugated metal gate, finished to match the existing building. The project was filed by Andrew Brenner of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of Hollister Business Park Ltd., property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 10-022-LUP; 10-022-SCD. (Continued from 3-23-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-23-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wlgnot commented: a) Although it may not be within the purview of the DRB, he noted from his experience that the exhaust stack that is usually associated with this type of product is typically a problem if it is not extended higher up because of the potential for fumes in the immediate area, which is something the applicant may want to consider; and b) On his site visit, he noticed that some of the buildings on the site were not as well marked as others with regard to signage that shows the street address and other identification.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide cut sheets for the proposed wall lighting fixture, and to clarify whether the existing fixture will be reused or replaced.

MOTION: Messner moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 10-022-DRB, 7404 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The applicant shall present the cut sheets for the proposed lighting fixture and clarify whether the existing lighting fixture will be reused or replaced; and to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 10-022-DRB, to April 13, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

F-4. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-034-DRB

75 South Ellwood Station Road (APN 073-020-024)

This is a request for *Final* review of a proposed, co-located wireless communications facility. The property includes a 19,000-square foot building that serves as an unattended Verizon telephone-call switching center as well as a 70-foot high mono-pine with a total of six panel antennae, two wall-mounted GPS antennas, a back-up diesel generator, lighting, and associated appurtenant equipment on a 1.15 acre parcel in the PU zone district. The existing monopole is screened by a faux pine tree (a "mono-pine"). The applicant proposes to co-locate three directional panel antennae on the existing Verizon mono-pine as well as two directional micro-wave dishes to connect this site to other Clearwire cell sites.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 13, 2010

Page 5 of 16

The monopole would be medium-dark gray in a “slim-line” design with a base diameter of 24 inches tapering to a top diameter of 18 inches. The upper antenna array would be at a maximum height of 65 feet above grade, while the lower antenna array would be at 60 feet above grade, such that a 1-foot gap would be provided between the two arrays. Each antenna array would be approximately 3.5 feet in diameter, such that each antenna panel would protrude approximately 1-foot from the monopole.

All at-grade facility components would be located within a 60-square foot leased area enclosed by a wooden fence and gate inside a larger 595-square foot area enclosed by an existing chain-link fence. Power for the co-located facility would be provided by a new underground power line.

Access to the lease area would be provided via an existing 12-foot wide access easement from Ellwood Station Road to the lease area. The easement would be aligned along the north side of the existing building and would utilize existing paved portions of the parking lot and drive aisles. No new landscaping is proposed, and no grading is required.

The project was filed by agent Norcal Consulting for Clearwire US LLC, applicant. Related case: 10-034-LUP. (Continued from 3-23-10) (Alan Hanson)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-23-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) When he visited the site today, he drove further up north on Ellwood Station Road and parked near the Vulcan cement factory. He looked southwesterly towards the existing monopine and first noticed three power poles, which were more visible, before observing the monopine in the distance. Since the applicant is proposing to co-locate on the existing monopine which is pretty much concealed, he does not have concerns regarding the proposed project; and b) On his site visit, he observed that the low wall that separates the sidewalk from the parking lot on the site is heavily tagged with graffiti which detracts visually from the streetscape. He questioned staff regarding how to address the responsibility with regard to graffiti clean-up. He also observed an employee of the Vulcan factory who was painting out graffiti on a fence located on the Vulcan property.
2. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The new antennas will be placed on the existing monopine in an area where the branches are somewhat sparse, therefore, it would be good to relocate and add branches to increase the foliage in that area in a manner similar to the top of the monopine which is denser where there are existing antennae; b) The proposed colors should match or blend in with the existing colors; and c) The applicant is requested to present more detailed plans at the next review, including materials and colors, and visual simulations showing a mock-up.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The branches that are removed to add the new antennas should be replaced and some new branches should be added, similar to the top of the existing monopine where there is more branch density.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 13, 2010

Page 6 of 16

4. Member Branch commented: a) Relocate and add branches in the co-location area so the branch density at the top of the existing monopine will be continued further down on the monopine.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-5, DRB Permit No. 10-034-DRB, 75 South Ellwood Station Road, with the following conditions: 1) Additional branches shall be added to the existing monopine, down around the co-location area for the new antennas to continue the density of the limbs in a manner similar to the top of the monopine; 2) The colors shall match existing and/or blend in; and 3) The applicant shall present visual simulations showing a mock-up at Final review; and to continue Item L-5, DRB Permit No. 10-034-DRB, to April 13, 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 *Preliminary/Final* 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 3-9-10, 2-23-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-9-10 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) She noted that the tenant sign on Building "B", Sheet 4 of 8, has only one line of text which is shown on the first line and should be either centered or located on the bottom line.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-192-DRB, 5718 Hollister Avenue, to April 13, 2010, with the following comments: 1) The height of the address numbers and letters shall be 12" on Building A, and the height shall be 9" on Building "B" and Building "C"; 2) The size of the text for the tenant signs shall remain the same whether there are one or two lines; 3) The directory sign on the Building "C" south elevation shall be modified to be a little wider and shorter, to make room to add the building and unit number on the first line of text, so there are only two lines per tenant; 4) On the Building "B" inner east elevation, the address, "5718" should be added above the letter "B" for consistency; and 5) The language in the OSP shall be reviewed by staff and modified accordingly with regard to the suggestion to change the language in Item B.1 and Item B.2 to read "One directory wall sign" rather than "One directional wall sign".

Design Review Board Agenda

April 13, 2010

Page 7 of 16

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-019-DRB

5754 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-063-010)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes an approximately 4,340-square foot commercial building on a 10,000-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. This property is located in the Goleta Old Town Revitalization Area and the Goleta Old Town Heritage District. The applicant proposes to place one wall sign on the southern façade of the building facing Hollister Avenue. The wall sign will read "O'Reilly" on one line of text with a clover leaf logo within the 'O' of O'Reilly. The sign is a maximum of 4.08-feet tall by 10.5-feet long for an aggregate of 42.84 square feet. The sign will have internally LED illuminated channel letters with a ¾ -inch black trim cap, and 5-inch black aluminum returns. The letters will be white acrylic with black and green translucent vinyl on the faces. The project was filed by agent Brenda Compton of Dave's Signs, for O'Reilly Auto Parts, tenant, and Jay K. Torrey, property owner. Related cases: 10-019-SCC. (Brian Hiefield)

H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-032-DRB

6550 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-330-006)

This is a request for *Preliminary/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 requests a freestanding monument sign at the southwest corner of the property and a directional monument sign at the entrance driveway on Los Carneros Road. The project was filed by Derrik Eichelberger and Erin Carroll of Arcadia Studio, agent, on behalf of Park One LLC, property owner. Related cases: 10-032-LUP; 10-033-LUP; 10-032-SCC; 10-033-SCC; 10-033-CUP. (Continued from 3-23-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-23-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Brown commented: a) Expressed concern that the proposed lighting fixtures are up-lights because it is difficult sometimes to control the light trespass; and b) The applicant is requested to restudy the lighting plan and consider some other type of lighting to address the concern regarding light trespass.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed designs for the two signs are acceptable but without the proposed lighting; b) Halo-lit lighting would be very nice rather than the proposed lighting; and c) The applicant is requested to present a proposed resolution with regard to the lighting at the next review.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 2 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to support approval of the designs for the proposed two signs at Conceptual review, without the proposed lighting; and to continue Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 10-032-DRB, 6550 Hollister Avenue, to April 13, 2010, with comments.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 13, 2010

Page 8 of 16

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-031-DRB

7414 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-063)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. On the western parcel of the HBP at 7414 Hollister (Building 3), the applicant proposes to construct a 1,635-square foot addition for a cafeteria by enclosing an existing patio cover structure with a glass and aluminum storefront window system. New concrete walkways for access to the cafeteria are also proposed. The project was filed by Andrew Brenner of RCI Builders, agent, on behalf of IRE-SB Inc., property owner, and Citrix Online, tenant. Related cases: 10-031-LUP; 10-031-DPAM. (Continued from 3-23-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-23-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) Questioned whether the applicant plans to add heaters or ceiling fans; and b) He mentioned tinting the windows to address the possibility that birds would strike the clear glass because, from his experience, this problem has occurred which he now addresses by placing tape on glass windows.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The product being considered by the applicant for the moving partition is a great system.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to continue Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 10-031-DRB, 7414 Hollister Avenue, with positive comments in support of the proposed project as submitted for Conceptual review, to April 13, 2010, for Preliminary review.

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

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

5632 Cielo Avenue (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

Design Review Board Agenda

April 13, 2010

Page 9 of 16

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. This property was formerly addressed 811 Cambridge Drive. Related cases: 09-183-CC, 09-189-LUP. (Continued from 3-23-10*, 3-9-10, 2-9-10) (Scott Kolwitz)

Applicant request to continue to April 27, 2010

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-9-10 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide a section through the hammerhead for review.
2. Member Branch commented: a) From an aesthetic standpoint, the applicant will need to provide the details that include materials and heights with regard to the hammerhead area; b) The applicant will need to address the comments regarding retaining as much water onsite as possible and also consider the concept of berms; c) After visiting the site, he believes the proposed placement of the house is the most logical choice; d) The size of the house works from the standpoint of floor area ratio; e) In his opinion, the proposed architectural style is acceptable in this situation on this site, noting that it is on an infill lot and one-story design; f) The heights of the project could possibly be reduced a little bit in a couple of places, and maybe lower the tower, but the project is not too ostentatious; g) More details will be needed in the grading plan; and h) Conceptually, the plans are okay.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The Conceptual plans including the grading plan will need more detailing; b) The placement and orientation of the house is fine; c) The architectural character is probably fine; d) Encouraged darker colors, more earth tones, rather than the typical red tile roof and white color; e) The water retention system will need to meet the Stormwater Management Plan requirements, which will be reviewed within the jurisdiction of the Department of Community Services; f) He is not sure that the proposed surface ponds will be a solution that will be acceptable long-term; and g) The applicant is requested to provide an Arborist Report regarding plans to address the health of oak tree #3 and oak tree #5 which is a fairly significant tree.
4. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The grading plan and arborist report will be very helpful to facilitate the review of this project; b) Agreed with Member Branch that the plate heights could possibly be reduced in a couple of places; and c) It would be helpful for the project landscape architect to be present at the next review to answer questions because there are a lot of issues related to landscape.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) The water retention basin should look natural, and could look like a bioswale but still serve as a retention basin.
6. Chair Smith commented: a) The applicant is requested to provide a grading section through the hammerhead area for review; and b) There is a need for the retention basins, noting that a design with something bermed would be preferable and would blend in better rather than a design that is more industrial.

MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Brown, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 811 Cambridge Drive, to March

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

April 13, 2010

Page 10 of 16

23, 2010, with the following Conceptual comments: 1) The applicant is requested to present a grading plan that is more developed, especially with respect to the runoff; 2) The applicant shall submit an Arborist Report to staff for review; 3) The retention basins should be more natural in shape; 3) Restudy and consider lowering the plate heights, at least possibly around the tower portion of the house; 4) The applicant is requested to provide the grading section through the hammerhead and an elevation showing specific details with regard to materials and heights at the hammerhead area; and 5) The project landscape architect should attend the next review on March 23, 2010.

L-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-027-DRB

7716, 7717, 7726 & 7727 Kestrel Lane (APN 079-780-023; -024; -034; -035)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The properties include 4 vacant lots in the Bluffs Along the Santa Barbara Coast Subdivision, a partially constructed 62-home subdivision in the 7-R-1 zone district (Coastal Zone). The applicant proposes to construct the following Bluffs single-family model dwelling types: on Lot 42, Plan 2C Farmhouse (3,230 square feet); on Lot 43, Plan 1BR Rustic (2,788 square feet); on Lot 56, Plan 3A Villa (3,395 square feet); and on Lot 57, Plan 3BR Rustic (3,395 square feet). Materials would be light- to medium-earth tones, and would follow DRB-approved color schemes. The project was filed by Tiffany Sukay of Comstock Homes on behalf of Bob Comstock of Goleta Investment Partners, the property owner. Related cases: 67-SB-DRB; 10-027-LUP; 10-028-LUP; 10-029-LUP; 10-030-LUP. (Last heard 3-23-10*) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

3-23-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Wignot, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Absent: Smith), to take off calendar Item L-4, DRB Permit No. 10-027-DRB, 7716, 7717, 7726 & 7727 Kestrel Lane, per the applicant's request.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

- NONE

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

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

April 13, 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

April 13, 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

April 13, 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

April 13, 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

April 13, 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.