



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, June 8, 2010

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Chair's Designee and Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Scott Branch, Carl Schneider, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

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

June 8, 2010

Page 2 of 14

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for May 25, 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. 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 5-11-10*, 4-13-10*, 3-23-10*, 2-9-10*, 1-12-10*, 12-8-09*, 10-27-09) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

10-27-09 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

1. Member Herrera commented: a) The proposed project is a huge improvement on the site.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The proposed project is a great improvement; b) The colors are appreciated; and c) He noticed that there is distinctive stone material on the façade of the buildings on either side of the site which was not incorporated into the design; however, the design works well without it.
3. Chair Smith commented: a) Agreed with Member Branch's comments; b) The project fits in with the distinctive stone material on both sides of the project site and the warm, earthy palette of the building; and c) The idea of the bi-fold doors is appreciated.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 8, 2010

Page 3 of 14

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. 10-053-DRB

7170 Davenport Road (APN 073-230-050)

This is a request for *Final* 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. (Continued from 5-25-10) (Brian Hiefield)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

5-25-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The proposed addition is very minor and fits in very well with the present office area; and b) There should be a condition of approval that requires the applicant to replace, somewhere else on the site, the tree that will be removed to provide for handicapped accessible parking.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The existing landscaping on the site is pretty mature and nice; and b) The plans do not indicate that additional exterior lighting will be added.
3. Chair Brown commented: a) The replacement tree should be a canopy tree; and b) Recommended that the replacement tree species not have invasive roots that would interfere with the hardscape, but the tree should still provide a nice canopy, which will be useful to provide shade to cover the parking lot.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 6 to 0 vote (Recused: Schneider) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-053-DRB, 7170 Davenport Road, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The applicant shall provide details regarding the proposed location for the replacement tree on the site; and 2) The replacement tree shall be a canopy tree; and to continue Item L-2, DRB Permit No. 10-053-DRB, to June 8, 2010, for Final Approval on the Consent Calendar.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

H. SIGN CALENDAR

- NONE

Design Review Board Agenda

June 8, 2010

Page 4 of 14

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 5-25-10*, 5-11-10*, 4-27-10*, 4-13-10*, 3-23-10*, 3-9-10, 2-9-10) (Scott Kolwitz)

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.

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 8, 2010

Page 5 of 14

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 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. 10-066-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. (Continued from 5-25-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

5-25-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

Design Review Board Agenda

June 8, 2010

Page 6 of 14

1. Member Smith commented: a) Expressed concern that the applicant may need to restudy the architecture with regard to the very heavy roof mass supported by the two triangle elements that flank the entry; and b) Consider having the glass meet at the corner.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The building is a horizontal mass that is visually supported by triangular elements that project out, but when that whole element is cut out, the design needs to be restudied with regard to keeping the integrity of that form architecturally; b) The triangle to the south should remain as proposed; and c) Consider, as an option, turning the other triangle portion into a spandrel glass system.
3. Member Branch commented: a) It is important to add some more mass to the wall that is coming out to the roof element; and b) Member Schneider's suggestion to turn the triangle into a spandrel glass system would help define the entry.
4. Chair Brown commented: a) The applicant will need time to consider the DRB Conceptual comments and respond regarding the possibility of making the changes to the proposed project; and b) The DRB comments are presented for the purpose of enhancing the design.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to continue Item L-3, DRB Permit No. 10-066-DRB, 7414 Hollister Avenue, to June 8, 2010, with Conceptual comments that the applicant shall restudy the two different triangular forms in different fashions.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

M-1. 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 5-25-10, 5-11-10, 4-27-10) (Shine Ling)

Comments from prior DRB meeting:

5-25-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):

1. Member Wignot commented: a) Suggested the applicant consider the possibility of volunteering to plant additional live pine trees amongst the existing eucalyptus trees on the site and/or on the Caltrans right-of-way; b) The site is being camouflaged very well and the revised plans are an improvement over the plans

* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 8, 2010

Page 7 of 14

- that were presented previously; c) He acknowledged that most persons traveling along Highway 217 are not focused on individual trees but more on the road ahead; d) He questioned whether locating the wireless facility on the Caltrans right-of-way was an option; and e) There is a tall pine tree on the corner of Malva Avenue and Vega Drive that has had three or four new branches grow back after approximately 7-8 feet at the top were blown off during a wind storm. He stated that the tree now resembles the shape of the proposed monopine design, noting that the shape does exist in nature, although a rarity.
2. Chair Brown commented: a) The revised design is an improvement, although it does not emulate a pine tree very well; b) In Photo Simulation 1, the shape of the monopine still needs to be more conical, rather than bulging around the middle; c) Requested that the applicant refer to the form of the pine tree that is shown at the very right edge of the picture in Photo Simulation 3, as a template for the shape of the monopine, and consider that the branches appear to be somewhat uneven; d) Designs that do not fit in with their surroundings are noticeable; e) The concern is how to best disguise the faux monopine in the landscape; f) The applicant is requested to explain the method that will be used to assemble and install the monopine; and g) Her concerns are aesthetic, not functional, with regard to whether there is a service overlap and the possibility for selecting another site.
 3. Member Schneider commented: a) The revised plans are definitely an improvement; b) He supports selecting a color for the monopine that ties in with the eucalyptus trees from the standpoint that the typical pine tree color would stand out; c) The drawings should define the height of the lowest branches, which would probably start at the 20-foot level; and d) With regard to the comment by speaker Gary Vandeman, a simple straight pole may be appropriate in certain situations, but he believes that monopine design would be better for this site than a straight pole because it would need to have antennas mounted on top that project out approximately 3-4 feet for technology purposes.
 4. Member Branch commented: a) A huge improvement has been made to the plans that were presented at the previous meeting; b) Because of the number of antennas and the height of the monopine, it may not be possible to achieve a pure conical shape without becoming too symmetrical; however, he respects Chair Brown's support for a more conical design; c) From his review of Photo Simulation 1, the monopine seems to fit in well enough that he does not believe it would be a distraction for him when driving on Highway 217; d) Probably most people driving along the highway won't be paying that much attention to the monopine; and e) At this point in the review process, it is time for the photo simulations and plans to reflect the applicant's response to the DRB comments.
 5. Member Smith commented: a) The design should be more of a natural, conical shape; b) A monopine design with a conical shape would be applicable also for the applicant's other sites; c) The proposed location and colors are fine so far; d) The plans should now reflect the proposed revisions in response to the DRB comments; e) He does not believe there needs to be any other conifer species surrounding the monopine because, historically, some of the ranches in Goleta have imported specimen trees and it is not unusual to see conifers planted in the middle of these other species; and f) Planting more conifers at the site may call attention to the faux monopine design.
 6. Vice Chair Herrera commented: a) In his opinion, the monopine would look more natural if it was the color of a Star Pine tree, which it resembles, rather than the color of a eucalyptus tree, because it would look odd to persons who know about trees; b) In Photo Simulation 2, there is a gap between the top of the bridge and the lower branches that needs to be corrected on the plans so the

Design Review Board Agenda

June 8, 2010

Page 8 of 14

trunk is not visible from the highway; and c) The view of the monopine from Photo Simulation 1 is a great improvement, and it would look good if the same shape would be visible when looking at the tree in every direction.

MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to direct the applicant to respond to the Conceptual comments and to present new photo simulations and drawings that represent the revised proposal in terms of branch length, branch staggering, branch density, branch placement, minimum height of the bottom branches, and colors within the context of the existing trees; and to continue Item M-2, Permit No. 09-174-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, to June 8, 2010.

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- NONE

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

P. ADJOURNMENT

Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines

Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)

The purpose of the City Design Review Board (DRB) is to encourage development that exemplifies the best professional design practices so as to enhance the visual quality of the environment, benefit surrounding property values, and prevent poor quality of design.

Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)

The Goleta City Council established the DRB and DRB Bylaws in March of 2002 (Ordinance No. 02-14 as amended by Ordinance No. 02-26). DRB Bylaws have subsequently been amended through Resolutions 02-69, 04-03, 05-27, 07-22 & 09-04. The DRB currently operates under Bylaws from Resolution 09-04

Design Review Board Procedures

Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)

The DRB is guided by a set of general goals that define the major concerns and objectives of its review process. These goals are to:

- 1) ensure that development and building design is consistent with adopted community design standards (e.g. General Plan, Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architectural and Design Guidelines, Design Standards for Commercial Projects);
- 2) promote high standards in architectural design and the construction of aesthetically pleasing, architecturally correct, structures so that new development does not detract from existing neighborhood characteristics;
- 3) encourage the most appropriate use of land;
- 4) promote visual interest throughout the City through the preservation of public scenic, ocean and mountain vistas, creation of open space areas, and providing for a variety of architectural styles;
- 5) preserve creek areas through restoration and enhancement, discourage the removal of significant trees and foliage;
- 6) ensure neighborhood compatibility of all projects;
- 7) ensure that architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access;
- 8) ensure that grading and development are appropriate to the site and that long term visible scarring of the landscape is avoided where possible;
- 9) preserve and protect native and biologically and aesthetically valuable nonnative vegetation or to ensure adequate and appropriate replacement for vegetation loss;
- 10) ensure that the continued health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood are not compromised;
- 11) provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way;
- 12) ensure that construction is in appropriate proportion to lot size;
- 13) encourage energy efficiency; and
- 14) ensure that air circulation between structures is not impaired and shading is minimized on adjacent properties.

Design Review Board Agenda

June 8, 2010

Page 10 of 14

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

June 8, 2010

Page 11 of 14

- 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

June 8, 2010

Page 12 of 14

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

June 8, 2010

Page 13 of 14

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

June 8, 2010

Page 14 of 14

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.