



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES - UNAPPROVED

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

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, July 14, 2009

CONSENT CALENDAR – 2:45 P.M.

Scott Branch, Planning Staff

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 1:00 P.M.

Members: Carl Schneider, Cecilia Brown, Thomas Smith

STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members: Chris Messner, Bob Wignot, Simon Herrera

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

**GOLETA CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

Members:

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

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)
Carl Schneider (Architect)
Bob Wignot (At-Large Member)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the City of Goleta Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Smith at 3:10 p.m. in the Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California.

Board Members present: Thomas Smith, Chair; Scott Branch; Chris Messner; Carl Schneider; and Bob Wignot.

Board Members absent: Cecilia Brown, Vice Chair; and Simon Herrera.

Staff present: Scott Kolwitz, Senior Planner; Laura Vlk, Associate Planner; Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

July 14, 2009

Page 2 of 12

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for June 23, 2009

Member Messner presented an e-mail dated July 13, 2009, with recommended amendments.

MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Abstain: Schneider; Absent: Brown, Herrera), to approve the Design Review Board Minutes for June 23, 2009, as amended.

B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Street Tree Subcommittee Chair Messner reported that the next Subcommittee meeting will be on August 11, 2009, at 2:00 p.m.

B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported: 1) He suggested that DRB members who may have attended some of the events during the Santa Barbara Architectural Week, July 7-17, 2009, may have some information to share. 2) On Monday, July 20, the Planning Commission will consider Track 1 General Plan Amendments. 3) On July 21, 2009, the City Council will conduct the second reading of the Telecommunications Facilities Regulations ordinance. 4) The following DRB meetings are cancelled during the summer: July 28, August 25, and September 22, 2009. 5) With regard to discussion at the last DRB meeting, staff is working ongoing with the Community Services Department regarding how to best handle outreach efforts for adding more tree species to the Recommended Street Tree Planting List, and he will report back if there is an update. Looking back at the history when the original list was created by the Street Tree Subcommittee, there was not an outreach. The list was endorsed by the DRB and forwarded as a recommendation to the Community Services Department. Staff have essentially been referring to the list for their recommendations.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, suggested that there may be some time available, due to the summer meeting schedule, to possibly revisit and encourage consideration of the DRB's recommendations to the City Council with regard to the Sign Ordinance and Lighting Standards Guidelines. He commented that it would be a start to provide an opportunity for some City enforcement.

D. REVIEW OF AGENDA: A brief review of the agenda for requests for continuance.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz reported that there are no amendments to the agenda.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

July 14, 2009

Page 3 of 12

E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Consent Calendar Member Branch reported that today he reviewed with Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-087-DRB, 44 Castilian Drive.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-087-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 208-square foot water filtration equipment yard, and a 3,623-square foot rear equipment yard on a 3.25-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to expand the water filtration equipment yard to 650 square feet and install additional equipment for wastewater treatment and discharge. The yard would be enclosed by a 9.5-foot tall chain-link fence and roofed with a metal canopy. No changes in building height, building coverage, signage, or floor area for the main building 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: 09-087-SCD; -LUP. (Continued from 6-23-09) (Shine Ling)

Consent Calendar Action on July 14, 2009:

Consent Calendar Member Branch reported that today he reviewed with Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz Item F-1, DRB Permit No. 09-087-DRB, 44 Castilian Drive, and that Final Approval was granted as submitted. He stated that the applicant added a note on the plans indicating that the slats on the fence will be a dark brown color. Also, the applicant added a couple of wall pack lights that are within the fence and below the top fence level, to illuminate only what is inside the fence, which should be okay.

G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Sign Subcommittee Member Schneider reported that the Sign Subcommittee met today and reviewed Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-055-DRB, 52 North Fairview Avenue; and Item H-2, No. 09-071-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue.

H. SIGN CALENDAR

H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-055-DRB

52 North Fairview Avenue (APN 069-110-091)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 5,990-square foot commercial property on a 24,394-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to replace the existing Washington Mutual signage with Chase Bank signage of varying types including a freestanding monument sign, two wall signs, two ATM signs, and ground signs at the entrance and exit to the property. Signage details are as follows:

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

July 14, 2009

Page 4 of 12

Freestanding Monument Sign:

The proposed Freestanding Monument Sign would measure 17-feet tall by 3.3-feet wide for an aggregate of 56 square feet. As proposed, the vertically aligned sign would have white routed aluminum letters measuring 2-feet wide and a blue Chase Bank logo measuring 2.3-feet wide. The sign would be internally illuminated.

Wall Signs:

Northeast Elevation – The proposed wall sign would measure 1.7-feet tall by 11.7-feet wide for an aggregate of 20 square feet. The sign would have black internally illuminated 7.4-inch deep channel letters measuring 1.7-feet tall and a blue Chase Bank logo measuring 2.2-feet wide.

Southwest Elevation – The proposed wall sign would measure 2-feet tall by 14-feet wide for an aggregate of 28 square feet. The sign would have black internally illuminated 7.8-inch deep channel letters measuring 2-feet tall and a blue Chase bank logo measuring 2.6-feet wide.

ATM Signs:

Two signs are proposed atop the ATMs that would measure 1.2-feet tall by 3.8-feet wide for an aggregate of 5 square feet. The internally illuminated signs would have white letters measuring 6-inches tall and a blue Chase Bank logo.

Ground Signs:

The proposed ground signs marking the entrance, and exit to the property would measure 1.8-feet tall by 1.1-feet wide for an aggregate of 2 square feet. The non-illuminated signs would be mounted on a 3-foot tall pole.

The project was filed by agent Bill Hellmann on behalf of Chase Bank, property owner. Related cases: 92-SCC-011; 99-SCC-010. (Brian Hiefield)

Sign Subcommittee Review on July 14, 2009:

The plans were presented by Dustin J. Hansen, Manager, Signage Rebrand Program, on behalf of Chase Bank, property owner.

Brian Hiefield, Planning Technician, presented the staff report. He stated that the applicant would have the option to pursue the Overall Sign Plan process if the proposed ATM signage does not comply with the Sign Ordinance, or if the applicant wants to include Directional Signs, although it would be a longer process.

Sign Subcommittee Comments:

Freestanding Monument Sign:

General: The proposed 17' Freestanding Monument Sign is not appropriate for the site. The existing Freestanding Monument Sign may be reconfigured by the applicant.

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The proposed 17' Freestanding Monument Sign is not appropriate or necessary at the corner of the site and should be omitted, noting that two Wall Signs are proposed for each end of the building; b) A

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

July 14, 2009

Page 5 of 12

- lower sign would be more appropriate; and c) Consider reconfiguring the existing Freestanding Monument Sign.
2. Member Brown commented: a) Concurred with Member Schneider's comments, stating that the corner is overburdened with items; b) There is too much of the proposed sign for what it is trying to communicate and the sign does not make an improvement on the site; c) The existing Freestanding Monument Sign type would be appropriate on the corner; and d) The design of the existing monument sign seems out of proportion and would be better if lower and without the logo on top.
 3. Member Smith commented: a) The proposed sign is too much for the site; and b) Reconfigure the existing Freestanding Monument Sign, keeping the lettering and the logo of Chase the same height level as the existing Washington Mutual lettering; and c) He appreciates that a lot of replacement signs have moved away from the almost square, rectangular style.

Wall Signs:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The height of the text should be approximately 12 inches, which was approved for both the Shell and Vons gas stations on the corner; b) The proposed font sizes are too big and not necessary for the site; and c) The logo should be proportionate to the text so the logo could be bigger than the text size.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The smaller text of approximately 12 inches would be appropriate with the proportionate logo; and b) The view from Fairview Avenue is of the monument sign, as well as of Sign 3 which does not need to be so large.
3. Member Smith commented: a) He agreed with comments from Member Brown and Member Schneider.

ATM Signs:

General: The applicant is requested to provide details to help understand the overhead security lighting system and a photograph example of the internal edge illumination on the ATM Surrounds. If the applicant decides to pursue the Overall Sign Plan process, there is general support for the proposed ATM signs.

1. Member Schneider commented: a) He does not associate ATM Surrounds as being a canopy sign; b) The two proposed signs on the ATM Surrounds, with lettering approximately 5 or 6 inches in height, are acceptable; and c) He appreciates that the existing name on the canopy was removed.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The proposed signs on the ATM Surrounds are fine; b) Consider providing lighting that is fully shielded under the canopy of the ATM Surrounds; and c) The applicant is requested to provide details to help understand the overhead security lights and a photograph example of the internal edge illumination on the ATM Surrounds.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

July 14, 2009

Page 6 of 12

Ground Signs:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The applicant may consider using the Chase corporate color on the Ground Signs since the Ground Sign definition only allows the words "entrance" or "exit" and does not address colors.
2. Member Brown commented: a) The Ground Signs should be no taller than 3 feet and an aggregate of 2 square feet to comply with requirements.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to continue Item H-1, DRB Permit No. 09-055-DRB, 52 North Fairview Avenue, to August 11, 2009, with comments.

H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-071-DRB

6767 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-450-005)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The Cabrillo Business Park is comprised of a 92.25-acre site in the Manufacturing Research Park (M-RP) and Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL) zone districts. At full build out, the Cabrillo Business Park would total 946,282 square feet, including 704,600 square feet of new buildings and 241,682 square feet of the existing retained buildings. The applicant requests a new Overall Sign Plan (OSP) for the Hollister Business Park. The proposed OSP provides for seven (7) different types of signs: monument signs, directional signs, wall signs, recreation area signs, retail building signs, temporary leasing signs, and miscellaneous signs. The OSP specifies the maximum number of signs of each type and the maximum sign area for each permissible sign area. The project was filed by Troy White of Dudek, agent, on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-071-OSP; -CUP. (Continued from 6-23-09) (Shine Ling)

Sign Subcommittee Review on July 14, 2009:

The plans were presented by Troy White of Dudek, agent, on behalf of Santa Barbara Realty Holding Company, LLC, property owner; Ken Ambrosini, Ambrosini Design, Ltd., project sign architect; and Steve Fedde, property owner. Troy White stated that construction on Building 2 is scheduled to begin on September 1, 2009. With regard to the size of the Project Marketing Sign, he believes the consideration should be given with regard to the scale of the project site because it is 92 acres which is different than an average site. Ken Ambrosini discussed revisions that were made in response to DRB comments and provided replacement sheets G1.0a, G1.0b, and G1.0c. He presented the lighting system plans which were revised to use reverse channel illumination because after much research he was unable to find a LED fixture that would meet City and dark sky guidelines. He stated that there will be no ground-mounted fixtures. The Vehicular Directional Signs and Tenant Identifier Signs were revised to have 3M Reflective Vinyl instead of a single light fixture. The height of the Vehicular Directional Sign was lowered and the total quantity of these signs was reduced to four signs.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling stated that staff recommends one additional Conceptual review by the Sign Subcommittee to review the text for the Overall Sign Plan. The

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

July 14, 2009

Page 7 of 12

project will then be presented to the Zoning Administrator, who will consider the Overall Sign Plan along with the Conditional Use Permit. A special meeting of the DRB Sign Subcommittee for Preliminary/Final review may be scheduled in the interim before the next regular DRB meeting on September 8, 2009.

Sign Subcommittee Comments:

Temporary Marketing Signs:

1. Member Brown commented: a) There needs to be a way, possibly with language in the Overall Sign Plan, to control the number of Temporary Marketing Signs so there will only be signs for particular buildings when needed for marketing purposes; and b) The Temporary Marketing Signs will look much better when the graphics are revised.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) The applicant's plans to set guidelines in the CC&Rs for text and graphics on the Temporary Marketing Signs is a good solution to ensure consistency when there are different brokers.

Sheet G2.7: Type A and Type B Anchor Tenant Building Signs

1. Member Brown commented: a) Expressed concern regarding the size of a sign if a tenant requests all capital letters that have a maximum height of 24 inches; and b) Requested the applicant prepare guidelines with regard to the tenant signage that will allow for flexibility as well as discretion.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) A maximum height of 18" for capital letters and 24" for the logo would be more appropriate; and b) The proposed plan to limit the number of signs to two signs on each elevation is fine; noting it may become problematic in the long-run if there are more tenants in a building who all want their signs on the building.
3. Member Smith commented: a) He agreed with Member Schneider's comments; b) Suggested for consideration, if the name on a sign is all capital letters, the height requirement would be 18", and that the height requirement would be 2 feet if both capital and lower case letters are used.

Sheet G2.17a: Retail Tenant Signage

General agreement: One blade sign will be allowed per tenant per elevation. The proposed armature is nice and the proposed 22 square-foot size on an armature is acceptable.

1. Member Schneider commented: a) Expressed concern that there does not seem to be a need for having so many blade signs in addition to logo signs.
2. Member Brown commented: a) Expressed concern regarding the potential for too many Retail Tenant Signs; b) The proposed armature is attractive, creative and interesting; and c) The proposed size of 22 square feet on an armature is okay.
3. Member Smith commented: a) It's important to control the amount of tenant's signage on the buildings so the signage does not become rampant.

SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote, to continue with comments Item H-2, DRB Permit No. 09-071-DRB, 6767 Hollister Avenue, to August 11, 2009, for Conceptual review, at which time any revisions as well as the text of the Overall Sign Plan will be reviewed.

I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR

- NONE

J. FINAL CALENDAR

J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-067-DRB

6550 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-330-006)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 38,000-square foot commercial building on a 3.43-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to remodel the façade of the building's southwest corner. Three new canopies above the main entrance (north elevation) with a total roof area of 562 square feet are proposed. Also, a 395-square foot aluminum canopy with a 20-foot tall entry wall is proposed to partially enclose a courtyard area in front of the main entrance. No changes in building coverage, signage, or floor area are proposed. Materials proposed for the façade remodel include stainless steel for the canopies, and blue reflective glass with white mullions to match existing. Colors would consist of Sherwin Williams "Interactive Cream" SW6113 for the building and Sherwin Williams "Coconut Husks" SW6111 for the entry wall. A new landscape plan is also proposed for the front courtyard, with new plantings consisting of specimen palm trees, lilies, yellow-leaved Calamus, and other plant species. The project was filed by Anthony Molina of Poliquin Kellogg Design Group, agent, on behalf of Alan Grosbard of Park One LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-067-LUP. (Continued from 6-09-09). (Shine Ling)

Site visits: None reported since last review hearing.

Ex-parte conversations: None.

Abstain: Member Wignot stated that he will abstain from commenting and voting at this time because he was not present at the previous hearing on June 9, 2009. He noted that it seemed the project was extensively reviewed at the previous hearing.

The plans were presented by Brian Poliquin and Anthony Molina of Poliquin Kellogg Design Group, agent, on behalf of Alan Grosbard of Park One LLC, property owner. Erin Carroll and Derek Eichelberger, Arcadia Studio, project landscape architects, presented the proposed landscape plan. Brian Poliquin presented the construction drawings and architectural plans, stating that some items have been refined but there are no major changes. The proposed color chip was provided, as well as cut sheets showing the proposed lighting that is recessed and downward lit. Derek Eichelberger clarified that the existing Coral trees at the corner are not part of the scope of the proposed project and that the owner has decided to retain the Coral trees and prune

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

July 14, 2009

Page 9 of 12

them back to allow more light and openness. He stated that the property owner is in the process of studying some additional renovations around the building facade, including landscaping elements and the parking lot area, which may be requested in the future.

Assistant Planner Shine Ling stated that today is the first time staff has seen the final landscape plan. He understands there have been no major changes to the conceptual landscape plan presented by the applicant at the previous review.

There being no objections, the DRB included the final landscape plan in the review.

Comments:

1. Member Schneider commented: a) The plans are very nice and the proposed project will be a good improvement; b) He would like to see attention given to the planters in the parking area, which are in bad shape, and landscaping added, at some point; and c) He understands that the existing Coral Trees will remain in place for the time being.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The plans are great and the applicant has done a great job; b) The colors are fine as proposed; and c) In his opinion, just for possible consideration, he noted that the proposed colors are great, including the greens, and then the glass is a blue color.
3. Member Messner commented: a) The plant selection is very nice with the exception of the *Cordyline stricta* species which should be eliminated and exchanged with another appropriate plant; b) He appreciates that the proposed plantings are low maintenance; c) He appreciated that the proposed plantings are not typical planting materials, which will make the plantings stand out; d) The proposed colors are fine; and e) With the landscaping, the colors will enhance and tie the project together.
4. Chair Smith commented: a) The applicant has done a very nice job; and b) The plans are appreciated.

MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Abstain: Wignot; Absent: Brown, Herrera), to grant Final Approval of Item J-1, No. 09-067-DRB, 6550 Hollister Avenue, as submitted, with the following conditions: 1) If additional landscaping will be added that is not included in the proposed landscape plan, the selection of the species shall complement the proposed plant palette; and 2) If the existing Coral trees will be removed, the proposed plans shall return to the DRB for review.

K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

- NONE

L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 07-182-DRB

130 Nectarine Avenue (APN 071-061-020)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes a 903-square foot, 1-story residence and a detached 462-square foot 2-car garage on a 5,771-square foot lot in the DR-30 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 1,095-square feet in additions, consisting of a 510-square foot first floor addition and the addition of a new 585-square foot second floor. The resulting 2-story structure would be 2,460-square feet, consisting of a 1,998-square foot single-family dwelling and a detached, 462-square foot 2-car garage. This proposal exceeds the maximum allowable floor area guideline for this property, which is 1,831.3-square feet plus an allocation of 440-square feet for a 2-car garage, by 188.7-square feet. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Larry Thompson on behalf of Arturo Perez, property owner. Related cases: 07-182-LUP. (Continued from 6-23-09). (Laura Vlk)

Site visits: Member Schneider stated that he has not visited the site and he did not attend the previous review on June 23, 2009.

The revised plan was presented by agent Larry Thompson on behalf of Arturo Perez, property owner. He stated that the revised plan is within the floor area ratio guideline and that the house is now considerably compact on the site. He noted that the open space of the project has been increased considerably. He presented a photograph taken from where the proposed deck would be on the east elevation, stating that there is only one small dirt area that would be visible and that the applicant proposes a hedge screen if there are concerns. He presented a solar study showing that the neighbor's property would not be negatively impacted by the second story addition in terms of installing solar panel technology. He stated that only one door is proposed onto the deck on the west elevation, which would be from the master bathroom, along with two windows. With regard to the windows on the south elevation, he stated that there is a need for passive solar light and some kind of view. The property owner proposes placing a flower bed in front of the windows and would be willing to raise the sills or do what the DRB considers appropriate to address privacy concerns. He noted that there is a point where raising the sills would not be appropriate because it would become prison-like. From the photograph he presented from the deck on the south elevation, he believes privacy concerns from the view would be minimal. He stated that code requirements will need to be met to provide lighting if there is an exterior door on the deck. The proposed color scheme will match existing colors and includes a proposed accent color. A more detailed landscape plan will be provided for Final review.

Speakers:

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, stated that the size of the proposed project is much better with the revisions and it fits the site better. He recommended that screening methods other than landscaping need to be in place if the privacy of the neighbors is to be protected, stating that buildings will outlive landscaping. He believes the

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

July 14, 2009

Page 11 of 12

neighborhood is moving in the direction of more additions to homes. He expressed concern that the proposed windows on the south elevation are oversized and suggested raising the window sills so that light, and possibly mountain views, would still be provided, and so the neighbors would have some feeling of their backyards not being on display

Comments:

1. Member Wignot commented: a) The applicant has addressed a number of his comments; b) He still believes that the second story will work in this location; c) The proposed deck on the east elevation will be relatively innocuous and does not appear to be looking down on anything much except the backyard area; d) The windows on the south elevation are over-large and could be reduced and placed higher so there is no significant view looking towards the neighbor's property to the south; e) It appears from the solar study that the second story addition will not negatively impact the neighbor's ability to install solar panel technology; and f) Consideration will need to be given with regard to how the deck on the west elevation will drain, noting that the shape of the deck is box-like.
2. Member Branch commented: a) The reduction of the size of the project is appreciated; b) Overall, the plan is more proportional to the site and there is now some more use of the yard; c) Agreed with Member Wignot's comment regarding the deck on the east elevation, stating that the photographs show the privacy concerns were addressed quite significantly; d) From a privacy standpoint, consider perhaps raising the sills of the upper windows slightly, with the understanding that some advantage should be taken of the sun on the south elevation; e) On the west elevation, he would prefer the element that appears more cottagey, similar to the overall style, rather than the element that feels more contemporary; g) He appreciates that the neighbor's concern regarding the solar access to the north was addressed; and h) Consider installing downward lights in the wall of the deck on the second floor, which would not throw light into the neighborhood, if that would meet the code requirements.
3. Member Messner commented: a) Agreed with comments from Member Wignot and Member Branch regarding the proposed decks; and b) With regard to planting trees and hedging for the purpose of screening and blockage, it is important to choose a species that would not become a burden for the neighbors to maintain (such as requiring weekly or monthly maintenance). He recommended selecting species that are more narrow and tall, and not so wide-spreading.
4. Chair Smith commented: a) The reduction in the size of the project addressed the concern very well; b) The west elevation is appreciated, noting that the design fits together well and he understands the door and window arrangement. The west elevation will not be seen that well from a perspective standpoint; and c) From a privacy standpoint, consider raising the sill of the windows slightly on the south elevation, with the understanding that some sunlight is needed from the south.

MOTION: Branch moved, seconded by Messner, and carried by a 4 to 0 vote (Abstain: Schneider; Absent: Brown, Herrera), to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 07-182-DRB, 130 Nectarine Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) The applicant shall address the DRB comments concerning the

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

July 14, 2009

Page 12 of 12

windows on the south elevation; 2) The applicant shall provide a fully-detailed landscape plan; and 3) The applicant shall provide the lighting details; and to continue Item No. L-1, DRB Permit No. 07-182-DRB, to August 11, 2009, for Final review.

M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

- **NONE**

N. ADVISORY CALENDAR

- **NONE**

O. DISCUSSION ITEMS

O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS

Chair Smith requested discussion regarding the public comment by Gary Vandeman suggesting possibly revisiting and encouraging consideration of the DRB's recommendations to the City Council with regard to the Sign Ordinance and Lighting Standards Guidelines.

Member Schneider stated that the DRB recommendations with regard to the Sign Ordinance have been forwarded but have not yet been considered by the City Council. He commented that while it may be helpful to rewrite the Sign Ordinance, it will not necessarily move the process forward.

Chair Smith agreed with Member Schneider's comment.

Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz stated that an issue that may be related to the Sign Ordinance is the funding to implement the new Sign Ordinance. He stated that he will provide the DRB members with a copy of the Lighting Standards Guidelines that were prepared by the DRB.

O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Chair Smith announced that he will be absent from the DRB meeting on August 11, 2009.

Member Wignot announced that he had the opportunity to meet with Senior Planner Scott Kolwitz to view the Approved Vs. Built Slideshow which was very interesting and informative.

P. ADJOURNMENT: 4:11 P.M.

Design Review Board Minutes - Unapproved

July 14, 2009

Page 13 of 12