City of Santa Barbara

Community Development Department

Memorandum

DATE: February 24, 2010

TO: Single Family Design Board (SFDB)

FROM: Jaime Limón, Senior Planner
Heather Baker, Project Planner
Tony Boughman, Planning Technician II

SUBJECT: NPO Two-Year Review Proposed Updates for:
Single Family Design Board Guidelines &
Single Family Residential Design Guidelines

On December 15th, 2009, City Council:

- Initiated changes recommended in the "Two-Year Review of Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance/Single Family Design Guidelines Update (NPO Update)"; with Staff to work with a subcommittee of the Single Family Design Board (SFDB) and the Ordinance Committee; and
- Directed Staff to return to Council with ordinance and guideline amendments for adoption.

Staff met with a subcommittee of the SFDB on January 28, February 4, and February 11 to review the proposed changes to the Single Family Residential Design Guidelines (SFRDG) and Single Family Design Board Guidelines (SFDBG) presented in this memo. Staff plans to present ordinance changes directed by Council to the Ordinance Committee in March 2010. Revisions to the SFRDG are being formatted and will be available for a final presentation to the SFDB prior to presentation to Council for consideration, planned for April 2010.

Proposed guideline changes are organized in this memo as listed in the Table of Contents on the following page. Please note that guideline text proposals are shown in indented formatting. All the text is proposed as new unless shown as edits to existing guidelines. Strike-out indicates deletion of existing text and underlining indicates proposed new text within existing text. The origin of the item in the 12-15-09 Council Agenda Report (CAR) is also referenced for each item, with excerpts from the 12-15-09 CAR italicized.

The 12-15-09 CAR is available for reference on-line at:
http://www.santabarbaraca.gov/CAP/

Table of Contents

2-25-10 Memo to SFDB Regarding
NPO Two-Year Review Proposed Updates for:
Single Family Design Board Guidelines &
Single Family Residential Design Guidelines

I. Single Family Design Board Guidelines, pages 1 – 11

Part I: Architectural Design

A. Administrative Review Adjustments: Retaining Walls (12-15-09 CAR Item 5), Black Chain Link Fencing (12-15-09 CAR Item 5A), Projects Not Publicly Visible (12-15-09 CAR Item 9A) and Minor Addition and Accessory Structures.
B. Uncovered Parking (12-15-09 CAR Item 7A)

Part 2: Landscaping - Creeks Division Website Reference

Part 3: Meeting Procedures Changes

A. Noticing (12-15-09 CAR Items 2 and 2A)
B. Vacant Lot Review (12-15-09 CAR Item 6)
C. Votes on FAR Modification Projects
D. Subdivision Projects (12-15-10 CAR Item 6)

II. Single Family Residential Design Guidelines (12-15-09 CAR Item 6), pages 12 - 19

A. Creeks References
B. Water Conservation References
C. Uncovered Parking Design Guidelines
D. Covered Elements Guidelines
E. FAR Guidelines Implementation
F. 20 Closest Homes Data Use Guidance
G. Basement Guidelines
H. Glass Railings
I. Lighting Guideline Revisions
J. Coastal Bluff Considerations - Good Neighbor Guidelines

III. Budget Reduction Adjustments (12-15-09 CAR Item 9), page 20

I. Single Family Design Board Guidelines Draft Changes

Part I: Architectural Design Changes

A. Administrative Review Adjustments: Retaining Walls (12-15-09 CAR Item 5), Black Chain Link Fencing (12-15-09 CAR Item 5A), Projects Not Publicly Visible (12-15-09 CAR Item 9A) and Minor Addition and Accessory Structures.

On 12-15-09 Council directed broader Administrative Review of some Design Review projects such as retaining walls, black chain link fencing and projects not publicly visible. Staff also proposes broadening of minor addition and accessory structure administrative reviews.

Part 1, Page 2, SFDB Guidelines proposed text, including 12-15-09 CAR Item 5A, 9A and staff proposals regarding expanded addition and accessory structure review, shown in strikeout and underline:

SECTION 3 Administrative Approval Standards…

Projects eligible for Administrative Approval. The following types of projects are eligible for administrative review and approval if the project complies with both the General Administrative Review Standards and the applicable Project-Specific Standards for Administrative Review.

- Awnings
- Additions, ~~or new accessory structures~~ specified small ~~one-story~~
- Dark Colored or Hot Dip Galvanized Chain Link Fences – not in front yard
- Chimneys and Metal Flues
- Color Changes - Exterior
- Decks
- Doors
- Driveways/Paving/Minor Site Work
- Fences
- Garages
- Landscape Improvements
- Lighting: Exterior
- Mechanical Equipment: General
- Mechanical Equipment: Rooftop Equipment
- Manufactured Homes – One Story
- Roofs (and "Reroofs")
- Accessory Structures~~Sheds~~, Spas and Trash/Recycling Enclosures
- Skylights
- Soil Remediation Systems
- Time extension – First One-~~1~~-year extension
- Trellises

- Walls
- Windows

Page 4, 3.2 Administrative Review, Project Specific Standards and page 7, proposed text shown in strikeout and underline:

3.2. **Administrative Review, Project-Specific Standards**

A. **Additions – Minor ~~One-Story~~:** ~~Minor one-story a~~Additions may be reviewed and approved administratively if all of the following apply to the project:

1. no second unit in resulting project;

~~2.resulting home is less than 17' tall;~~

~~3.~~2. addition is less than 50% of amount of existing square footage in 1992;

~~4.~~3. the project is less than 85% of the maximum FAR;

~~5.~~4. less than 250 square feet is proposed to be added ~~to the first floor~~;

~~6.~~5. the addition is not highly visible from public viewing locations;

~~7. there is no grading if the project site is greater than 15% slope;~~

~~8.~~6. less than 100 cubic yards of grading is proposed;

~~9.~~7. the addition complies with retaining wall guidelines; and

~~10.~~8. ~~the project has a two-star green building program rating and~~ there is no vegetative roof in the proposed resulting project.

Exception: A minor addition which is less than 17' tall, not publicly visible and located in consideration of neighbors and appropriately screened need not comply with criteria 5 or 8 above…

D. **Decks – Residential:** Decks over 200 square feet in area or decks elevated above the first floor level are not eligible for administrative approvals, unless the deck is not publicly visible and located in consideration of neighbors and appropriately screened…

N. **Porches.** If all of the following standards are met, residential porches may be administratively approved…
…5. If the porch is publicly visible, the porch is modest in scale and the porch roof is not higher than 12 feet...

Page 7 proposed changes shown in strikeout and underline below.

P. **Accessory Structures~~Sheds~~, Spas and Trash/Recycling Enclosures.**
All of the following standards must be met in order to be eligible for administrative review and approval:

1. The accessory structure, spa, ~~shed~~ or enclosure area is 250~~150~~ square feet or less.
2. Accessory structures are located in consideration of neighbors and appropriately screened.
3. Materials match site fencing or the main structure's materials and colors.
4. Any mechanical equipment associated with the structure meets the mechanical equipment administrative approval criteria above.

Part 1, Page 8, SFDB Guidelines. Proposed text changes to address including 12-15-09 CAR Item 5 shown in strikeout and underline below.

T. **Trellises.** Chain link, chicken wire, metal, plastic, vinyl, wire-mesh and unfaced cement block trellis materials are not eligible for Administrative Staff Review. Trellises are eligible for administrative approval if all of the following are satisfied:
1. The trellis covers less than 250 square feet and is less than 12 feet tall. Exception: If the project is not publicly visible, located in consideration of neighbors and appropriately screened, then this criteria is not required for approval...

U. **Walls – Residential ~~(Freestanding Only, Not Retaining)~~.** ~~Walls of non-traditional material, such as unfaced concrete block, railroad ties, faux materials or plaster walls in hillside areas are not eligible for administrative approvals~~. Walls approved administratively must meet all the following criteria:
1. Less than 4 feet tall. Exception: If the project is not publicly visible, located in consideration of neighbors and appropriately screened, then this criteria does not apply.
2. Less than 50 cubic yards of grading outside the main building footprint for the wall project.
3. Wall style is compatible with the structures on the property.
4. Similar in character with other walls visible in the neighborhood from public viewing locations.
5. Hillside Design District Walls: shall follow all Single Family Design Guidelines regarding blending with the natural surroundings.
6. Lot Line Walls: Wall height, length and use of materials shall be compatible with higher quality construction examples in the neighborhood.

B. Uncovered Parking (12-15-09 CAR Item 7A)

On 12-15-09, the City Council directed staff to pursue CAR optional Item 7A:

Study an option to allow case by case waivers which could be granted by the SFDB for two uncovered parking spaces for homes under 80% of the maximum FAR could be added. Design Review would be required for the uncovered parking spaces.

After further consideration, staff recommends that proposals for two-uncovered parking spaces be addressed through the existing Staff Hearing Officer Modification process and design review by the Single Family Design Board. The ordinance will be amended to trigger Design Review where an uncovered parking space modification is proposed. Also, clarifications as to the SFDB and HLC's roles in commenting on modifications are proposed to be included in the Single Family Design Board Guidelines in Part I in a new Section as follows.

SECTION 4 MODIFICATIONS

4.1 Single Family Design Board Role in Commenting on Modification Requests

Modification requests are approved by either the Staff Hearing Officer or the Planning Commission. SFDB or HLC comment on modification requests occurs at Concept Review hearings prior to the request being heard by the SHO or PC. The SFDB or HLC's role in commenting on the modification is limited to whether the proposed modification poses aesthetic issues, such as inconsistency with neighborhood development patterns or exacerbates conflicts with the Single Family Residential Design Guidelines. General support or not of a modification as a land use decision is not the purview of the SFDB or HLC. Following is an example of SFDB or HLC comment on modification requests:

"The proposed modification *is/is not* aesthetically appropriate. The proposed modification *poses/does not pose* consistency issues with Single Family Residential Design Guidelines (*if applicable, include guideline reference number or numbers for reference*)."

4.2 Modifications of Yard, Lot and Floor Area Regulations

For these cases, additional comment from the SFDB as to whether the modification promotes an appearance of uniformity of improvement or not is helpful. Comment on whether the modification promotes an appearance of uniformity of development is helpful because the Zoning Ordinance requires the modification to promote uniformity of improvement for a modification approval of yard, lot and floor area regulations.

4.3 Uncovered Parking Space Modification Requests

For modification of parking or loading requirements the Zoning Ordinance requires:

> "The modification will not be inconsistent with the purposes and intent of this Title and will not cause an increase in the demand for parking space or loading space in the immediate area."

A project request for a modification to allow uncovered parking spaces rather than the required two covered parking spaces would not affect the ability of the project to address car parking demand. However, aesthetic and other project impacts or issues should be addressed.

The SFDB or HLC is to comment on the effectiveness of the project's proposed screening of the uncovered spaces from public view and the aesthetic quality of structures and landscaping related to automobile and bicycle parking and storage structures.

4.3.1 Recommended Project Aspects. Inclusion of the following items in uncovered parking modification proposals will make the project more likely to be able to be supported. The SFDB and HLC comments on the aesthetic qualities of uncovered parking areas, permeable paving, landscaping plantings and hardscapes, storage structures or exterior cabinets, and bicycle racks and shelters, or any other project aspects that arise from the uncovered parking modification proposal.

Recommended Items

a. **Location outside of any front yard.** The uncovered space(s) is/are not located in any front yard; and
b. **Screened from public view.** The uncovered space(s) proposed screening from public view is effective, and so noted by the SFDB or HLC in their comments on the project. Any gates proposed for screening are electronic, to ensure that they can be easily closed after each use; and
c. **Any converted garages to be appropriately designed.** For projects that include conversion of a garage to another use, garage door(s) must be removed and driveway paving to the converted garage must be replaced with appropriate landscaping; and
d. **Parking delineated.** The uncovered space is clearly delineated for parking use through the use of appropriate plant and hardscape landscape details. Landscape features prevent parking beyond the delineated parking spaces into other planted areas; and
e. **Appropriate shading.** Landscape planting proposals to ensure appropriate shading of the space to avoid the possibility of future plastic/canvas shade structure placement. New trees chosen to provide shade should have leaf litter, pollen or branching characteristics compatible with car parking, such as trees listed in the Architectural Board of Review Guidelines as appropriate for parking lots; and
f. **Appropriate storage provisions.** At least 200 cubic feet of lockable storage separated from occupied space by a firewall or detached distance suitable for the storage of hazardous cleaning and maintenance products is provided if no garage is

provided. Such storage is appropriate because garages are required to be constructed with "fire walls", making them a logical place to store such chemicals. With no garage space, a safe alternative place to store flammable household chemicals is needed. Also, providing appropriate storage space discourages future placement of lower aesthetic quality sheds; and

g. **Permeable paving.** The uncovered space(s) use(s) permeable material site slopes make permeable paving feasible. This project aspect provides a storm water management benefit which typical garages do not provide; and
h. **Formal bicycle parking.** A formal bicycle parking area supports a modification because garages are typically where bicycles are securely stored. Formal bicycle racks with paved maneuvering room consistent with City Transportation standards would support an uncovered parking modification request as it would ensure bicycle parking is adequately addressed. Sheltered bicycle parking would further support the proposal; and
i. **High quality details proposed**. High quality design details and materials are provided in all of the project aspects that support the uncovered parking space, e.g. landscaping plant and hardscape parking area delineations, screening and shading, and storage cabinet and bicycle parking provisions and the provision of the high quality design details is noted by the SFDB or HLC in their comments.

Optional Additional Supporting Circumstances

The ABR or SFDB may also make note of any of the following additional supporting circumstances in their comment on uncovered parking modification requests.

a. **Street-friendly façade.** The proposal results in an exceptionally "street friendly" façade, whereby windows which support neighborhood safety and a appropriately scaled detailed façade is featured rather than a unfriendly/bulky/windowless garage appearance; or
b. **Open site design.** The proposal allows for a more "open" site design.
c. **Constrained lot.** The design is needed for site development flexibility on a constrained lot, such as a lot that is less than 55' wide or less than 10,000 square feet; or
d. **Facilitates effective response to legally non-conforming parking.** The proposal allows the applicant to avoid demolition of major portions of existing structures to accommodate an addition that triggers a two-car parking requirement where there was previously only a legally non-conforming one-car garage on site; or

e. **Home size less than 85% of maximum FAR.** The proposal results in a home size that is less than 85% of the maximum FAR for the lot. The lack of garage or carport square footage being counted in the total home size square footage does not lead to potentially excessive development of other parts of the home which could affect neighborhood compatibility.

Part 2: Landscaping

Creeks Division Website Reference. Insert reference and link to Creeks Division website on page 1 of the SFDB Guidelines Part 2: Landscaping section under "Relationship to Other City Handouts".

Part 3: Meeting Procedures Changes

A. Noticing (12-15-09 CAR Items 2 and 2A). Change references to the 20 closest lots to the 10 closest lots for hand-delivered noticing and delete reference to closest lots for the mailed noticing. Page 4 proposed revisions:

2.3 **Notices.**

A. **Consent and Full Board Items.** Some projects require a noticed hearing before the SFDB. When a noticed hearing is required, written notice of the hearing is mailed to the applicant, ~~the owners of the 20 closest lots,~~ and the owner of any lot within 300 feet of the project. In addition, notice of the hearing is posted on the site of the proposed project and "door to door" flier noticing must be given to the residents on the ~~20~~ 10 closest lots...

B. Vacant Lot Review (12-15-09 CAR Item 6). On page 6, eliminate item 2.6.A, "Site Concept Review". On page 8, eliminate "F. Vacant Lot Review Process".

C. Votes on FAR Modification Projects (12-15-09 CAR Item 6). Clarify that five supporting votes are required by the SFDB for projects which seek an FAR Modification to be able to proceed to the PC. Page 13 proposed text:

E. Zoning Modification of Net Floor Area. (SBMC 28.92.110.A.6) Applications requesting a modification to exceed the allowable maximum floor area must receive votes in support of the modification following a concept review of the project from not less than five (5) members of the Single Family Design Board or six (6) members of the Historic Landmarks Commission (on projects referred to the Commission pursuant to Section 22.69.030).

D. Subdivision Projects (12-15-10 CAR Item 6). 12-15-09 CAR Item 6 calls for additional information regarding the SFDB's role in review of residential subdivisions which are to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. To address this, text is proposed to be inserted in the SFDB Guidelines, Part III Meeting

Procedures, as a new "Item C" under Jurisdiction, Subdivision Grading Plans. SFDB Guidelines Part III Page 15 proposed text:

Subdivision Grading Plans. Applicable in single family zones only (SBMC 22.69.020.D). The following project aspects will be reviewed for these projects after any applicable Pre-Application Review Team review is completed.

(a) Site Design.

- Consistency with SFRDG 1 (Environmental Setting and Landscaping), 2 (Site Planning and Structure Placement), and 32 (Neighborhood Compatibility).
- Layout of lots and suitability of development for future building pads and building envelopes.
- Consistency with Hillside NPO finding for protection of natural topography Public/private roadway improvements, pedestrian sidewalks and parkways.
- Alignment of driveways, lengths and quantity of pavement proposed.
- Proposed entryway and pathway identification to front doors leading from streets.
- Degree of access that can be provided to lots and to future homes for visitors.
- Compatibility of design with surrounding neighborhoods in terms of lot sizes and building heights, building sizes and building massing. If necessary, the SFDB or HLC may request additional information to complete analysis of this item.
- Pedestrian connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods and community uses.
- Preservation of any existing significant public scenic views of and from the hillside.

(b) Grading.

- Consistency with grading findings and SFRDG 29 and 30, including appropriateness of grading quantities and cut and fill locations to avoid visible scarring.

(c) Retaining Walls, Fencing And Entry Gates.

- Consistency with SFRDG 34, regarding heights, lengths, materials, design and locations.
- Lot lines follow terrain and allow for reasonable would not promote construction of tall retaining walls or unusual fencing patterns on steep slopes.
- Neighborhood compatibility of any security gates.

(d) Site landscaping - Conceptual Landscape Plan.

- Consistency with SFRDG 1 (Environmental Setting and Landscaping).
- Street tree types and locations.
- Preservation of trees where possible.

- Evaluation and mitigation of any tree removals.
- Screening of site (if deemed appropriate).

(e) Site Drainage Facilities.

- Consistency with Single Family Residential Design Guidelines 4 to maximize site permeability.
- Drainage conveyance and retention systems, including appropriateness of any proposed fencing.
- Storm Water Management Program compliance.

(f) Site Utilities.

- Electrical distribution equipment and transformer locations.
- Gas metering locations, Fire Department backflow and cross connection devices.
- Central mailbox locations, if applicable.

(g) Parking Design. Location of proposed on-street and off-street parking and consistency with SFDG 5 (Parking Aesthetics).

(h) Privacy Design. Lot layout provides for sufficient setbacks between structures to create privacy between neighbors and compliance w with Good Neighbor Guidelines.

(i) Solar Access. Consistency with SFDG 3 regarding orientation of homes for the use of active and passive solar energy systems. Review of existing site trees that may impact solar energy use.

(j) Staff Hearing Officer and Planning Commission Purview. The following project elements are under the purview of the Staff Hearing Officer and Planning Commission Purview and do not require comments from the SFDB.

- Compliance with State Subdivision Act rules and regulations (e.g. avoidance of flag lots).
- Compliance with City of Santa Barbara General Plan.
- Compliance with City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code Title 27 "Subdivisions", including Findings, listed in 27.07.100.
- Appropriate residential density and lot sizes.
- Appropriate public or private street design.
- Traffic issues/impacts (i.e.: impact of additional traffic on existing neighborhoods or need for street lights).
- Setting of building envelopes and areas of restricted development.
- Protection of public view corridors from public streets, trails, parks and beaches.

II. Single Family Residential Design Guidelines Draft Changes
(12-15-09 CAR Item 6)

A. Creeks References. Improve references to city guidelines for projects alongside creeks and their specific landscaping issues (e.g. riparian and native plant preservation). For page 7-SP Guideline 1 Environmental Setting, insert a new sentence as follows.

> ...Projects adjacent to creeks should follow applicable "special area" landscape design guidelines for creeks, water courses and wetlands listed in the Single Family Design Board Guidelines. Native plant preservation is important on some sites. Additionally, consider potential impacts of new and remodeled structures in the vicinity of historic resources identified by the City.

B. Water Conservation References. Improve references to the city's landscaping guidelines for water conservation. Page 7-SP proposed revision to Guideline 1:

> 1. Environmental Setting & Landscaping
>
> 1a. **Integrate structures and site plan with the environmental setting.** Structures are integrated with the setting when new dwellings and additions look as if they belong on the site,...
>
> **1b. Comply with landscape standards, codes and guidelines.** Projects are required to comply with applicable city water wise standards and Storm Water Management Program components. Additionally, the SFDB Guidelines contain a chapter of Landscape Design Guidelines which all projects should comply with.

C. Uncovered Parking Design Guidelines. 12-15-09 CAR Item 6 calls for guidelines to address uncovered parking spaces. To address this, the following text is proposed to be inserted in the SFDG page 12-SP.

> **Uncovered Parking Aesthetics**
>
> Some projects may have uncovered parking for guests in addition to the two covered parking spaces required.
>
> 5.8 Uncovered parking should be screened from the street and neighbors and placed behind the main house structure when possible. Any screening gates should be compatible with the neighborhood.
>
> 5.9 Uncovered parking in front of a house should be screened from the street by topography, structures or landscaping.
>
> 5.10 Uncovered parking should be delineated with plant or hardscape landscaping.
>
> 5.11 Use appropriate landscape planting to ensure adequate shading of the space.

5.12 On flat sites where new paving is proposed for the uncovered space, the paving should be permeable.

D. Covered Elements Guidelines. The following text is proposed to be added to Page 18-C in the left-hand bulleted list. Additionally, a new subheading, "Volume, Bulk, Massing and Scale Issues" is proposed for the left hand column of page 18-C.

- **Second Story Decks:** Do wall elements, guardrails, furniture, or outdoor fireplaces contribute to the **bulk** or **scale** of the project?
- **Covered Porches, Loggias, and Covered Decks:** Do the covered porches, loggias, and/or covered decks enhance the building's design, appearance, and function? Do they contribute to excessive **mass, scale** and **bulk**? Careful consideration should be given to projects that propose greater than 250 square feet of these areas, or when they are greater than 10% of the total net square footage of the structure. Because they include roof structures these areas might easily be enclosed in the future, possibly without design review. Future enclosure of existing covered areas may contribute to unacceptable **size, bulk**, and **scale**, eliminate a desirable architectural feature, or exceed FAR limits.

E. FAR Guidelines Implementation. Page 18-C proposed text addition:

FARs measure and limit a structure's size based on lot size. FARs do not translate to an accurate measure of volume because plate heights and ceiling slopes for homes vary. However, they are a useful indication of a structure's bulk relative to its site. Architectural features such as covered porches, loggias, and covered decks contribute to the mass and bulk of a building. While they are not included in the FAR, they are considered as part of the project's mass and bulk. FARs provide general parameters of reasonable lot build-out according to lot size. FARs are often used to analyze a proposed project's potential for neighborhood compatibility. Many communities have implemented FARs to better control size, bulk and scale of development. Ideally FARs can help prevent sudden dramatic incompatible neighborhood changes.

Proposed is to revise Page 21C by inserting the following text after the section "Projects Under 85% of the Maximum FARs are Encouraged" and before the section "Properties Legal-Nonconforming as to a Required Maximum Size".

Applicability of FARs as Guidelines.

Maximum FARs are applied as guidelines rather than requirements on lots that are 15,000 square feet or larger, or located in multi-family or non-residential zones. Site and zoning variables might contribute to less reliability in the use of the 20 closest FAR Study.

Some situations may support higher FARs and projects that approach or exceed guideline FARs might not pose a problem and FAR compatibility may be less critical. Larger lots may allow more space between structures and in some cases may allow the project to be less visible to the public and to neighbors. In multi-family or non-residential zones where density of development is usually higher, single-family residential projects will likely have lower FARs than other types of development. These zones are likely to have more variety of development.

Other situations may support lower FARs. When the buildable portion of a site is small in relationship to the lot size, an FAR lower than what would normally be indicated for the lot size may be more appropriate. On some large lots not all of the lot area may be developable due to steep slopes or creek or ocean bluff setbacks. These site constraints can push development on a site closer to the street, or closer to neighbors. In the Riviera there are examples where development on larger lots is clustered close together around cul-de-sacs or built close to the public streets. The configuration of the lot may reduce its developable area, for example flag lots. Corner lots or other lots with multiple street frontages have increased area within the front setbacks and development on these lots may be more visible. In situations like these, compatibility with neighboring FARs may be more pertinent. As a general rule, where the development is closer to property boundaries or more visible to the public and to neighbors, the proposed FAR should be reduced.

F. 20 Closest Homes Data Use Guidance. Page 21C proposed additional text:

20 Closest FAR Study

When a project proposes to exceed 85% of a maximum required FAR, the applicant must provide a study of the FARs of the 20 closest lots. Using a geographic information system, the 20 closest lots are selected for the project's neighborhood. This information is a tool used by the review board to assist in determining the compatibility of a project's size within its neighborhood. Data on square footages and lot sizes are obtained from the County Assessor's Office or from City records and plan archives. The information is assumed to be approximate due to variations in calculation methods and because many County records reflect original home sizes, but the data allows a general sense of the project's size and FAR compatibility with nearby development. Factors to consider when using the 20 Closest FAR Study include:

- Variability of square footages in the neighborhood
- Variability of lot sizes and FARs in the neighborhood
- Site constraints; how much of the lot area is developable?

- Is the project near the average for the neighborhood?
- Is the project among the largest in the neighborhood?
- The project's volume, bulk, scale, height, and massing relative to its square footage
- Closer proximity to neighboring structures and/or denser development in the neighborhood suggests closer adherence to the size of adjacent structures and to the average size of structures in the study.

G. Basement Guidelines. 12-15-09 CAR Item 6 calls for guidelines regarding how to determine if a basement design and size is appropriate and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. To address this, the following text is proposed to be inserted on page 33-C.

18. Partial Basement Design.

Carefully design partial basements so that they do not inordinately create a bulky appearance, or contribute to an inappropriate apparent height.

Daylight, or partial basement designs, where some portions of the floor level are above ground are not considered a full basement. Daylight basements may obtain a 50% FAR reduction if at least half of the exterior perimeter walls are sufficiently below grade. (SBMC 28.15.083) Partial basement designs are integral to the entire project appearance and will be reviewed for size, bulk and scale, apparent height, appropriateness and neighborhood compatibility along with the rest of the project regardless of any basement discounts the project may have received. Floor areas completely underground and located within full basements levels are 100% exempt from inclusion in FAR calculations due to these areas not being significantly visible.

(Insert small photos of good examples of each of these types of basements, or small diagrams labeled, and potentially also include definitions of these terms:
- Partial / Daylight Basement
- Walk-Up Basement)

15.1 The following basement project types warrant careful review of basement floor areas:
- publicly visible daylight basement
- corner lot location
- especially visible hillside areas .
- if a partial basement size exceeds 25% of the house size
  In some cases, large visible daylight basement areas should be reduced, placed underground and hidden from view as they contribute to the size, bulk and scale of a house size.

15.2 Grading and cutting into sloped hillsides to create basement floors is an acceptable grading technique. However, the following basement construction techniques are discouraged:

- excessive fill placement
- excessive retaining walls placement
- elevating natural grades around a structure's perimeter to create basement floor areas. The placement of this type of grading fill elevates the building higher than the natural topography and may be considered an artificial mechanism to increase floor areas. The SFDB may limit this type of grading design.

15.3 Garage Basements. Excessive retaining wall placement to create driveway or walk-out basements is not acceptable. The design of a garage opening at the basement level can contribute to a structure's apparent height. Carefully ensure that any garage basement complies with Apparent Height Guideline 28 and Grading for Driveways Guideline 30.

H. Glass Railings. The following new text was discussed by a subcommittee on glass railings on 6/8/09 and 6/22/09 and by the SFDB on 7/6/09. Page 31C proposed text:

Glass Material:

16.7 In general, deck-railing materials should be selected to be consistent with the architectural style of the structure. The use of glass railings as guardrails or as windscreens is not the preferred material at highly visible locations due to the possible glare associated with these types of installations. Installations of reflective glass materials will be reviewed to determine if the installation is compatible with the structure and that it does not create significant glare problems. Large "picture" windows that are not broken up with mullions and/or muntins will be reviewed for architectural compatibility and for glare problems.

I. Lighting Guideline Revisions. Many of the following recommended lighting revisions shown in strikeout and underline to begin on page 69-N were drafted by Architect Steve Hausz with additional revisions recommended by the Subcommittee and staff.

38. Lighting Guidelines

Lighting for single family homes is usually proposed for security and decorative reasons, and ~~can~~ should be designed in a way that it ~~does not affect~~is not detrimental to neighboring properties. ~~More light is not necessarily better. The location and style of exterior lighting for single family homes can affect both the design of the home and that of neighboring properties. A well-structured~~good lighting plan for a home will provide sufficient light for adequate site security, ~~and complement the home design while not imposing on~~

~~surrounding neighbors~~ will use fixtures appropriate for the style of architecture, and will use the least amount of light and energy necessary to meet those objectives. "Night glow," the effect of artificial lights illuminating the night sky and making stars less visible, has become a concern in many neighborhoods. All projects must comply with the City of Santa Barbara's Outdoor Lighting o~~O~~rdinance (Municipal Code Chapter 22.75) and Outdoor Lighting and Streetlight Design Guidelines, as well as State energy codes. Following these guidelines will help create an attractive ambience ~~serene quality~~ in your neighborhood and allow Santa Barbara's stars to be more visible at night time.

The design of the exterior lighting should not attempt to compensate for ~~inadequate~~ low levels of street lighting typical in hillside neighborhoods. Lighting ~~-~~in hillside areas requires special attention and care, as the low ambient light levels can exaggerate the impact of poorly designed lighting. ~~Due to the proximity of neighbors, the effect of lighting is amplified with greater extents of darkness between buildings.~~

38.1 Generally. In general, all exterior lighting should be designed, located and lamped in order to prevent or minimize: overlighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and skyglow.

38.2 Minimize Lighting. Plan carefully to only install lighting where it is needed. Directional lighting and lower ~~watt bulbs~~intensity lamps can reduce lighting impacts. Indiscriminate flood~~-~~lighting of broad areas is unacceptable. Where safety "floodlighting" is proposed for areas such as garage entries, only use lighting activated by motion sensors and directed downward.

38.3 Keep Lighting Low and Close. Light sources for landscape lighting should be ~~at~~ near to the ground ~~level~~. Fixtures mounted on the building should relate to a human scale in their size and mounting height. Flood lighting for security, when used, must be aimed close to the building and not create glare for neighbors.

38.4 Consider Distant Views. ~~Light sources should not Consider Distant Views.~~ Light sources ~~should~~ must not be objectionable when seen from a distance. Is your property on a hillside visible from ~~lower lying~~other areas? Consider how to place lighting on your site in ways that will minimize visibility ~~not be visible~~ from distant locations.

38.5 Driveways. Where possible, design driveways and landscaping so that headlights do not shine onto neighboring properties. Avoid the use of lighting fixtures spaced along the length of a driveway, limiting use and placement to the minimum necessary for safety. Keep in mind the view of this lighting from surrounding areas.

38.6 Walkway Lighting. Along walkways, low-level lighting in the form of bollards or fixtures mounted on short posts are the preferred lighting solution. ~~Shatterproof coverings are recommended. Posts~~Fixtures should be located to avoid hazards for pedestrians or vehicles, and should account for growth of landscaping. Many solar powered low-level walkway lighting options are available.

38.7 Light Shielding. Where other than low-intensity light sources are used, fixtures must incorporate shielding to prevent objectionable brightness or light trespass. The city's Outdoor Lighting Guidelines contains useful charts of the intensity of different light sources, and when shielding becomes required. Keep in mind that even low-intensity light sources that are shielded, may still be directly visible from downhill neighbors, and considered a nuisance. ~~Use light screening to avoid illuminating a greater area than intended. Light screening consists of shielding a light to only illuminate a desired area. Municipal Code Section 22.75.030.A requires downward directional lighting. The use of the following fixtures is prohibited in all zones:~~

~~1.Lighting fixtures mounted in such a way as to illuminate a roof or awning.~~

~~2.Lighting fixtures mounted to aim light only toward a property line.~~

~~3.Lighting fixtures mounted in a way that is distracting to motorists or that interferes with the safe operation of a motor vehicle, as may be determined by the City Engineer.~~

38.8 Landscape and Building Lighting. ~~Landscape lighting in the form of~~ "uUp-lighting" of trees and building elements is discouraged, but when doneused, ~~it must be done with narrow angle focused fixtures with low wattage lamping~~such lighting must be limited in its use, and fixtures must confine lighting to features being lit through use of shielding. lamps with low intensity and

appropriate beam spread, ~~and low intensity~~ and timers. ~~Any lighting in landscapes should be predominantly hidden "cutoff" fixtures with low wattage lamping on timers.~~

38.9 Outdoor Living Areas. Lighting for outdoor living areas such as decks, patios, and swimming pools should be designed to minimize the visibility of the lighting from the surrounding neighborhood. Mounting of floodlights on the building wall and aiming away from the building is not acceptable.

38.10 Prohibited Lighting. Municipal Code Section 22.75.030.A prohibits the use of the following fixtures in all zones:

1. Lighting fixtures mounted in such a way as to illuminate a roof or awning.
2. Lighting fixtures mounted to aim light only toward a property line.
3. Lighting fixtures mounted in a way that is distracting to motorists or that interferes with the safe operation of a motor vehicle, as may be determined by the City Engineer.

In addition to these ordinance provisions, lighting of architectural features or athletic courts is not appropriate for single family structures.

Also, delete photo on page 70-N and its caption:

> "This exterior lighting fixture features an inset light bulb which ensures lighting is only directed downward."

Revise middle caption for top illustration on page 71-N to delete the word "only".

J. Coastal Bluff Considerations - Good Neighbor Guidelines. Page 72-N, first column, second bullet, create third sub-bullet:

- Fences and hedges on Coastal bluff properties often follow property lines perpendicular to the shoreline. These fences and hedges should maintain an open and unobstructed feeling in keeping with the ocean front. Consider your views and your neighbors views that occur at oblique angles across one another's properties. Avoid privacy fencing or hedges that extend well beyond the house toward the ocean. Minimize the visibility of fences and hedges from neighboring houses and from the ocean and beach.

III. Budget Reduction Adjustments (12-15-09 CAR Item 9)

12-15-10 CAR Item 9 called for changes in Design Review purview in order to reduce the number of projects which the SFDB reviews, reducing City costs to address new budget constraints. The SFDB Subcommittee discussed this item with staff and recommended raising fees to be closer to full cost recovery for Design Review, rather than reducing review purview. Moderate fee revisions will be proposed for FY 2010-2011.

Specifically, 12-15-09 CAR proposal 9.A.1 proposed to eliminate review of many Hillside Exterior Alterations:

> ***Hillside Exterior Alterations.*** *The Design Review trigger for review of any proposed alteration on a property with a slope greater than 20% in the Hillside Design District which requires a building permit would be revised. Rather than any exterior alterations requiring a building permit on such sites triggering review, other project aspects, such as project height, size, retaining walls, significant second story decks, grading, etc. would trigger projects in the Hillside Design District for design review, just as those project aspects are triggered in Infill areas. The goal of this change is to reduce the quantity of inconsequential projects being subject to Design Review…*

After further consideration of comments received by SFDB subcommittee members regarding the sensitivity of high profile hillside areas, Staff now recommends that projects triggered for review by the Hillside Design District 20% slope Design Review trigger continue to be reviewed. The majority of the projects will continue to be reviewed administratively. Also, due to the suggestion of the SFDB Subcommittee, 65% or smaller FAR new home or major addition/remodel projects may undergo Consent Calendar review rather than the more time consuming Full Board review.

Expansion of projects eligible for administrative review is detailed in Section I of this report. The changes, listed below, will reduce staff's workload in response to budget constraints because Administrative Reviews are less costly to the City than Consent reviews.

<u>Expanded Administrative Review</u>

- Projects which are not publicly visible (12-15-09 CAR Item 9.A.2) Retaining Walls (12-15-09 CAR Item 5),
- Black Chain Link Fencing (12-15-09 CAR Item 5A),
- Expansion of Administrative Review of Minor Addition and Accessory Structures.

H:\Group Folders\PLAN\Design Review\NPO 2009 Review\SFDB Guidelines Memo\2-24-10 Memo to SFDB.doc