



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, May 25, 2010

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Chair's Designee and Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:45 P.M.

Members: Scott Branch, Carl Schneider, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Simon Herrera, Chris Messner, Bob Wignot

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:

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

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Carl Schneider (Architect)
Thomas Smith (At-Large Member)
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

May 25, 2010

Page 2 of 15

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

- A. Design Review Board Minutes for April 27, 2010
- B. Design Review Board Minutes for May 11, 2010

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

C. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** General comments regarding topics over which the Design Review Board has discretion will be allowed. Comments from concerned parties regarding specific projects not on today's agenda will be limited to three minutes per person.

D. **REVIEW OF AGENDA & PROJECTED AGENDA:** A brief review of the agenda for requests for continuance and scheduled projects on the next agenda.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-049-DRB

44 Castilian Drive (APN 073-150-003)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 46,750-square foot commercial building, a 650-square foot water filtration equipment yard, and a 3,623-square foot rear equipment yard, and a 138-square foot emergency generator/equipment area, on a 3.25-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to replace two liquid nitrogen storage tanks within the rear equipment yard with two larger tanks. The tanks occupy an area of approximately 105 square feet and have a height of 31 feet. The project would be constructed in phases, with one tank to be installed in 2010 and the other in 2011. No changes to parking or landscaping are proposed. The project was filed by Brian Beebe of Anderson Systems, agent, on behalf of Peter Goodell for Castilian Associates, property owner. Related cases: 09-147-LUP. (Continued from 5-11-10, 4-27-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

5-11-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed liquid nitrogen storage tanks would probably not be seen from Hollister Avenue, and possibly not from Castilian Drive; b) The proposed tanks will be seen from Highway 101 because there is no vegetation on the site and the whole back of the building is exposed;

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 25, 2010

Page 3 of 15

- c) The project is located in an area where an industrial use already exists; d) Unfortunately, the existing tanks are painted white which stand out when viewed from Highway 101; and e) The color of the proposed tanks should be toned down to blend in.
2. Chair Brown commented: a) Recommended that the new tanks be painted a gray or tan color; b) The plans need to accurately reflect the proposed plans, including placement of the tanks; and c) It would be nice to have a whole row of trees at the back of the property within the view from Highway 101.
3. Member Branch commented: a) Recommended that the proposed tanks be painted a gray color to help provide a contrast to the sky; and b) The plans need to reflect the existing and the proposed project.
4. Member Messner commented: a) Recommended that the proposed tanks be painted a gray or greenish color.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith, Wignot) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-049-DRB, 44 Castilian Drive, with the following condition: 1) The applicant shall provide plans that accurately reflect the existing and the proposed plans including the location, scale, height, and colors; and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-049-DRB, to May 25, 2010, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-060-DRB

420 South Fairview Avenue (APN 071-130-061)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes a 73,203-square foot commercial building on a 4.93-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to place one wall sign on the western façade of the building facing Fairview Avenue. The wall sign will read "Autoliv" on one line of text. The sign would be 24 inches tall by 75.25 inches wide and have an area of 12.5 square feet. The sign would be constructed of 0.5-inch thick cast aluminum letters painted dark bronze (Frazee 8716N "Western Reserve") that would be pin-mounted on the façade. No lighting is proposed. The project was filed by William Messori, agent, on behalf of Autoliv, tenant, and The Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 10-060-SCC. (Shine Ling)

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

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 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 5-11-10*, 4-27-10*, 4-13-10*, 3-23-10*, 3-9-10, 2-9-10) (Scott Kolwitz)

Applicant request to continue to June 8, 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.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 25, 2010

Page 5 of 15

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 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. 10-053-DRB

7170 Davenport Road (APN 073-230-050)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 183-unit apartment complex with ten separate apartment buildings, associated carports, a clubhouse adjacent to a pool, and a rental/manager's office on an 8.22-acre lot in the DR-10 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 172-square foot addition to the rental/manager's office, and to provide a handicapped accessible parking space and accessible ramp from the parking area to the rental/manager's office. All materials used for this project are to match the existing rental/manager's office. The project was filed by Courtney Seepie on behalf of The Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 69-M-125; 72-M-71; 10-053-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

L-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-066-DRB

7414 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-065)

This is a request for *Conceptual/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 modify an existing storefront window system on the main (eastern) elevation. 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: 10-066-LUP. (Shine Ling)

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-029-DRB

7690 Winchester Circle (APN 079-130-039)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 2,053-square foot daycare center and 3 uncovered parking spaces on a 22,706-square foot, common open space lot in the DR 4.6 zone district. The applicant proposes to convert the daycare center into a single family residence. The application also includes 809 square feet in additions consisting of 177 square feet of first floor family/living room additions, a 60-square foot entry addition, a 97-square foot, second story loft, and a new 475 square foot, 2 car garage. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,862 square feet, consisting of a 2,387-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 475-square foot 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing structure. The project was filed by the Winchester Home Owners Association, property owner. Related cases: 08-029-TPM, 08-029-DP RV. (Laura Vik)

M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-174-DRB

5484 Overpass Road (APN 071-220-033)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 5,780-square foot shop building, a 1,362-square foot office building, a 18,835-square foot unenclosed materials storage area, a 640-square foot storage unit, and two unused fuel pumps and associated underground fuel tanks on a 84,070-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a wireless communications facility 10 feet from the northern property line in the rear yard. A 70-foot tall monopine would be constructed to support 9 antennae. The service area would occupy 1,000 square feet and would include the monopine structure, associated equipment cabinets, and an emergency generator. The facility would connect to a power/telephone pole adjacent to the lease site. Access to the site is via an existing access road to the construction yard. The project was filed by Jay Higgins of SAC Wireless, agent, on behalf of Verizon Wireless, lessee, and Randy and Susan Douglas, property owners. Related cases: 09-174-CUP. (Continued from 5-11-10, 4-27-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

5-11-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Chair Brown commented: a) The proposed monopine design is not acceptable in this location and it draws attention because it is so poorly designed, particularly in the context because it is a different tree species than the existing trees which include the eucalyptus species; b) She suggested for discussion purposes whether the DRB would consider a monopole rather than a monopine; c) The applicant is requested to provide photo simulations that show the monopine design revised with longer limbs at the bottom and a shape that tapers from the top to the bottom; d) When the DRB Conceptual Review is completed, the plans will need to be updated before the project is reviewed by the Planning Commission; and e) Requested that the applicant check the map showing the service areas with regard to whether there will be some overlap.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 25, 2010

Page 7 of 15

2. Member Schneider commented: a) Since the last meeting, he has driven around the site many times trying to visualize the proposed project; b) His main concern is that the proposed monopine is so close to Highway 217 that there would be no question when driving by that it is a fake tree; c) Monopine designs can work well if the majority of the public is viewing the monopine from a distance; d) For example, the Schwann property on Kellogg Avenue would be located farther away from the public view and a preferred location; e) He thought about considering a bare monopole but expressed concern that it would still have the antenna structure on top; f) The proposed monopine design is better than the monopine on Ellwood Station Road which is very symmetrical and the different layers of limbs can be seen right through from a distance; g) The monopine design needs to have a slight taper from the top to the bottom, and the density is critical; and h) He expressed concern that the plans have not shown the proposed project in the field very accurately.
3. Member Branch commented: a) He would rather not support a monopole design; b) If an alternative location cannot be found, he believes the difference in the colors of the foliage will make the monopine stand out the most; c) The color of the monopine should match the existing eucalyptus trees as much as possible; d) The proposed color of the monopine is stark while the eucalyptus foliage has a blend of brown and red colors; e) The limbs of the tree need to be longer and more substantial at the bottom; f) He noted that it would be desirable for other tree species to be emulated, for example, the eucalyptus canopy is narrow at the bottom while the canopy of a pine tree is the opposite; g) The faux monopine is more noticeable right next to the freeway; and h) Requested that the applicant obtain a sample of the foliage from the existing eucalyptus tree at the proposed site and present it along with a sample of the proposed monopine faux foliage.
4. Member Messner commented: a) It is very important that the placement of a lot of the limbs on the monopine are uneven; and b) The color of the trunk and the leaves need to have some unevenness between the brown and green which he believes will blend in well among the existing trees.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Absent Herrera, Smith, Wignot) to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-174-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, to May 25, 2010, with comments, and to direct the applicant as follows: 1) Respond to comments with regard to the branch structure, branch placement and branch density; 2) Present new photo simulations showing the view from Highway 217; and 3) Present color samples from the existing foliage on the site and proposed colors for the monopine.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

N-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 04-121-DRB

Ekwill Street-Fowler Road extensions between S Fairview Avenue and Kellogg Avenue
This is a request for *Advisory* review of the Ekwill Street-Fowler Road capital improvement project. The project will construct extensions of Ekwill Street and Fowler Road as new east-west routes linking Fairview Avenue to Kellogg Avenue in a variety of multi-family, commercial and industrial zone districts. The project is located in the Redevelopment Area.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 25, 2010

Page 8 of 15

Both the Ekwill Street and Fowler Road extensions will consist of two or three lanes with road shoulders, bike lanes, and sidewalks with parkways on both sides, between Fairview Avenue and Kellogg Avenue. One lane will be eastbound, one lane westbound and as required a left turn lane will be accommodated. Roundabouts will be constructed at the proposed intersection of Ekwill Street/Pine Avenue and Fowler Road/Fairview Avenue. Ekwill Street and Fowler Road will cross Old San Jose Creek using arched culvert structures. A pre-fabricated pedestrian/bike bridge will also be constructed on the north side of Hollister Avenue over San Jose Creek.

The intersections of both Ekwill Street/Kellogg Avenue and Ekwill Street/Fairview Avenue will be stop sign controlled (a revision from the prior project that included signalization of these two intersections). The sidewalk on the north side of Ekwill Street will begin at Kellogg Avenue and extend to the west end of the existing RV dealership. At this point a branch of the Old San Jose Creek Trail will conform to the sidewalk and head north crossing Old San Jose Creek at a future pedestrian bridge. The trail will also branch towards the west running between the proposed Ekwill Street and the existing Old San Jose Creek. At Pine Avenue the trail will conform to the proposed sidewalk around the Pine Avenue/Ekwill Street roundabout. No additional portions of the Old San Jose Creek Trail will be constructed as part of the project.

The new portion of Fowler Road will extend from the proposed Fowler Road/Fairview Avenue roundabout to Technology Drive. The portion of Fowler Road from Technology Drive to Kellogg Avenue will be constructed on the same alignment as the existing South Street. Fowler Road will transition into Kellogg Avenue without the need for signals or stop signs.

The project will also construct two roundabouts at the Hollister Avenue/State Route 217 northbound and southbound ramp, and will include realignment of the existing southbound Route 217 off ramp to Hollister Avenue.

In addition to the roundabouts, Kellogg Avenue will also be widened slightly at Hollister Avenue to allow free right turn movements from northbound Kellogg Avenue to eastbound Hollister Avenue.

Project street trees consist of the following common name species: Chinese Flame Tree, Ornamental Pear, Island Live Oak, Chinese Elm, New Zealand Christmas Tree, Fuitless Olive, Bradford Flowering Pear, and Pink Trumpet Tree.

One building structure/residence located at 5544 Dearborn Place Goleta, CA 93117 will be removed or relocated. An easement will be required from the City of Santa Barbara to construct portions of Fowler Road. Related cases are 04-121-DP and a Government Code 65402 hearing for the project. (Laura Bridley)

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. APPROVED VS BUILT SLIDESHOW

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

May 25, 2010

Page 9 of 15

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

May 25, 2010

Page 11 of 15

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

May 25, 2010

Page 12 of 15

- 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

May 25, 2010

Page 13 of 15

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

May 25, 2010

Page 14 of 15

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

May 25, 2010

Page 15 of 15

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.