

Esparto Citizens Advisory Committee Design Review Guidelines May 8, 2006

Esparto Citizens Advisory Committee

Wayne Belshaw
Mike Goodin
Pat Harrison
Melissa Jordan
Alice Meserve Manas
Giacomo Moris
Ron Voss

Architectural and Design Review Sub-Committee

Mary Castillo
Tammy Fullerton
Pat Harrison
Artis Jensen
Lance Lowe
Helen Voss

Table of Contents

	<u>page</u>
Vision Statement	2
Guideline Overview	4
Introduction	4
Discretionary and Non-Discretionary Approval Processes	6
Street Standards	9
Lighting	16
Walls and Screening	17
Landscaping	19
List of Trees/plants	22
Single-family Residential Design	23
Objectives	23
Public Areas	25
Private Areas	26
Architectural Diversity	28
Garages	29
Multi-family Residential	32
Objectives	32
Guidelines	32
Downtown Commercial Design Concepts	37
Objectives	37
Sidewalks	39
Public Areas and Open Spaces	40
Renovated and/or New Commercial	42
Mixed-use Projects	44
Commercial Development	47
Guidelines	47
Parking	51
Industrial Design Concepts	53
Signs and Signage	55

Vision Statement

The first impression of the vision of Esparto begins at the State sign giving the elevation and population. At that point the image is established as to whether we are a community without long term planning or a community with plans and visions.

Any signage established at this point sets the tone for the rest of the community and up-Valley as well. Are we an offshoot of the casino or a community committed to preserving the integrity of the rural Capay Valley, its agriculture, beauty and history?

The small community atmosphere and historic integrity can be maintained. Many small California communities are excellent examples of how Esparto should look in the future. Specific plans and visions for a livable community that is both socially inclusive and environmentally sound should be addressed immediately. In writing the design review guidelines used by various communities, the following were incorporated:

1. A major highway was designed to become a boulevard, i.e. Hwy 16 through Esparto.
2. From the entrance of the town proper (city limits or general town boundary) the road was bounded by green space on both sides of the highway, planted with evergreen and flowering trees. This would apply to both sides of Hwy 16 as it crosses the bridge and moves west on Hwy 16 before it turns to the right into the downtown or progresses west, as the road becomes county road 21A. This would provide a visual entrance into town from the east; this applies to exit areas also.
3. Avoid isolated pods of look-alike houses in a single price range.
4. Pedestrian friendly appearance with subdivisions being joined by green space.
5. Delete overly wide streets in the subdivisions. The wide streets appear to condone speed rather than slower residential driving.
6. Sidewalks shall be provided at appropriate widths throughout the community.

7. The architecture should reflect the diverse community and the rural setting.
8. Adequate parks and recreation facilities speak to the concern for health and well-being in the community.

ESPARTO DESIGN GUIDELINES

Design Review vs. Aesthetic Control

Design review is not synonymous with aesthetic control. The latter dwells upon the superficial aspects of the visual setting. Aesthetic control is narrowly focused and prescriptive. Design review should be broadly oriented and encourage the creative application of design principles to a specific site. Aesthetic control seeks to severely limit choices, while design review attempts to expand choices. Aesthetic control is concerned with product, while design review is concerned with performance. Aesthetic control is exclusionary; design review embraces different solutions to general criteria. Aesthetic control uses rigid rules, while design review deals in principles. Moreover, aesthetic control involves unilateral mandates; design review involves collaboration and accommodation throughout the design process. Finally, aesthetic control values conformity, while design review values creativity. Fortunately, the shallow and often rigid techniques of aesthetic control is giving way to design review, which is more comprehensive and effective (Design Review, Mark L. Hinshaw, AICP)

Introduction

The Esparto Design Guidelines provide a regulatory framework to implement the Goals and Policies of the Esparto General Plan and expand the basic development standards of the Yolo County Code. Specifically, the design guidelines cover nine sections and are intended implement the Esparto General Plan land use policies and strategies and represent the desires of the Esparto community relative to urban design, pedestrian circulation, community and neighborhood identity, and residential, commercial, and industrial project design. The Esparto Design Guidelines shall serve to provide design professionals, property owners, residents, staff, and decision-makers with a clear and common understanding of the County's and Esparto community's expectations for the planning, design and review of development proposals in the town of Esparto.

Purpose and Intent

The purpose of design review in Esparto is as follows:

1. To encourage high quality land planning and architecture reflecting the historical architecture qualities of Esparto;
2. To encourage development in keeping with the desired character of the town of Esparto;
3. To ensure physical, visual, and functional compatibility between land uses; and,
4. To ensure proper attention is paid to site and architectural design, thereby ensuring consistency with community values.

Design Review Required when:

- a. Ministerial approval is required prior to issuance of any building permits (e.g., Site Plan Review applications) and,
- b. Prior to or in conjunction with discretionary development applications (e.g. Conditional Use Permit, Variance, etc.).

Design Review for Subdivision Maps shall be processed in conjunction with the Tentative Subdivision Map application. Design Review is required for development types listed below:

- a. Single-family Residential Parcel and Subdivision Maps;
- b. Master Home Plans for Single-Family Residential Subdivisions and Manufactured Homes;
- c. Multi-family Residential Development Projects;
- d. Non-Residential Development (e.g. commercial, office, industrial, and public/quasi-public development.)

Authority to Approve Design Review.

The Planning Director or designee is responsible for implementing the Esparto Design Review Guidelines on ministerial single-family residential, multi-family and non-residential development on existing parcels within Esparto, subject to

appeal to the Planning Commission.

The Esparto Citizens Advisory Committee shall make recommendation to the Planning Commission and/or Board of Supervisors on discretionary projects within the scope of the Esparto General Plan.

The Zoning Administrator, Planning Commission, and/or Board of Supervisors are responsible for Design Review determinations on discretionary single-family residential subdivision maps, multi-family residential and non-residential projects. Such design review shall be conducted concurrently with project consideration.

The Design Review process is tentatively complete when the Zoning Administrator, Planning Commission, and/or Board of Supervisors takes action to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the discretionary application. However, implementation of the action (e.g. site improvement plans, building permits) may not occur until such time as the required appeal period has expired or been fully exercised.

Processing Requirements

The following flow charts are designed to clearly aid in implementing the processing of plans for development for projects requiring discretionary and non-discretionary approvals.

**DESIGN REVIEW
NOT REQUIRING DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL**

5/06



