

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 7, 2004

Board Members Present: Sandy Moran (Chair)
Nicholas Ambrosia
Dennis Deromedi (*arrived at 4:10 p.m.*)
Philip LaGrow
Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Pam Figge, Principal Planner
Jay Hanson, Associate Planner
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

Roll Call

Chair Moran called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

Approval of Minutes

2.1 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of October 15, 2003

BOARD MEMBER WARD MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER LAGROW SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

Regular Agenda

3.1 ARB 03-47 (Sicke/McAmis) 621 Country Drive, APN 005-580-018 - *Proposed construction of a 4,000 square foot single-story warehouse building as the second phase development of a construction business*

Associate Planner Hanson distributed color samples for the Board's review and presented the staff report for this project, which proposes the construction of a warehouse as the second phase of a project, the first phase of which was initially reviewed by the Board at its August 6, 2003 meeting. The warehouse will be a one-story metal building finished in a combination of bone white walls and tundra grey trim. Metal roll-up doors, painted to match the trim, will be located on the north elevation. Mechanical equipment is not indicated on the plans and should be verified with the applicant. Lighting will consist of wall packs; the location and choice of fixtures should be verified with the applicant. Since the warehouse will be well-hidden by the office building, no new landscaping is proposed. A six-foot chain link perimeter fence with privacy slats and vines was required by the initial approval. Staff is recommending approval of the project subject to the findings set forth in the staff report and resolution of the discussion items.

Board Member Ward asked if the color samples are representative of the color of the office building. Associate Planner Hanson responded that the office colors are more earth tones and beiges.

Board Member Ambrosia asked if there is a problem with the warehouse being right on the property line. Associate Planner Hanson answered that there is no setback required as long as the applicant meets the fire wall requirements. Applicant Steve Sicke said there will be a one hour fire wall.

Board Member Ambrosia asked whether the wrought iron fence will be affected. Associate Planner Hanson responded negatively.

Board Member Ambrosia asked why a landscape strip is not required around the perimeter. Associate Planner Hanson replied that if the adjacent properties were affected by the construction of the warehouse, a landscape strip would be required. He reminded the Board that the landscape plan had already been discussed and approved at the August 6, 2003 meeting. Principal Planner Figge added that the off-street parking has a strip around it; however, the zoning for industrial does not usually require it. There being no further questions for staff, Chair Moran invited the applicant to make a presentation.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 7, 2004
Page 2 of 3

Mr. Sicke presented a revised elevation for the Board's review, and pointed out that the building has been moved. Associate Planner Hanson noted that the door previously indicated on the west elevation has been removed; it did not work because it faced the office building.

Mr. Sicke said that an additional issue was the wall pack lights. He said that he plans to put them equidistance apart between the bays, and pointed out that the adjacent properties will not be encroached upon. Board Member Ambrosia asked if the wall packs will be shielded. Mr. Sicke replied that they will shine down rather than out.

As to the matter of mechanical equipment, Mr. Sicke said there will be none. He said that he will probably insulate the building for noise; however, there will be no HVAC.

Board Member Ambrosia expressed concern that the colors proposed for the warehouse are not consistent with the office building. Mr. Sicke responded that the colors were chosen off of a chart from the steel building manufacturer. He said that the trim will coordinate with the office building.

Chair Moran asked about the roof. Board Member Ambrosia explained that the roof will not be visible.

Board Member Ambrosia said that although he likes the proposed colors individually, he is worried that they will not coordinate with the adjacent buildings. Mr. Sicke replied that the metal buildings in the area are made by different manufacturers; although they are all similar, they do have different lines.

There being no comments from the public, Chair Moran opened the floor for Board discussion.

Board Member Deromedi said it seems that the applicant has done the best he can with what is available to match the color of the office. Board Member Ambrosia disagreed, saying he believes there will be a more suitable color available. Board Member LaGrow asked whether the trim is pre-finished. Mr. Sicke answered that it all comes in a package and reiterated that the proposed building is similar to others in the area.

Board Member Ambrosia stressed that he still wants more of a beige color. Board Member LaGrow pointed out that the bone color goes with everything; it is just the grey that should be rethought. Board Member Ambrosia said that perhaps the applicant could find something in a darker beige. Mr. Sicke said he will check with the manufacturer to see if something else is available.

Board Member Ambrosia said he knows that the owner's heart is in the right place, since this building is so much nicer than the others in the area. He said he is aware that there are trees that will eventually hide the elevation from the street; however, from Highway 99 these buildings are pretty prominent.

Chair Moran suggested that perhaps staff could approve the final colors. Board Member Ambrosia asked whether there would be additional cost to the applicant to come back to the Board for final approval. Associate Planner Hanson said there would not be.

Board Member Ward said he would like the applicant to come back to the Board with the colors for both buildings. He said that the colors selected for the office seem to be flamboyant, while the colors chosen for the warehouse are neutral. He said he wants the Board to be able to visualize both buildings, since they are so close together.

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT SUBJECT TO THE FINDINGS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. THERE WILL BE NO MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THE WAREHOUSE BUILDING.**
- 2. THE WALL PACK LIGHTS WILL BE DOWNLIT AND OF A TYPE APPROVED BY STAFF FOR A WAREHOUSE BUILDING.**

3. THE APPLICANT WILL RETURN TO THE BOARD WITH COLOR SAMPLES FOR BOTH BUILDINGS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW AND FINAL APPROVAL OF THE COLORS FOR THE BODY AND TRIM OF THE WAREHOUSE BUILDING.
4. THE APPLICANT WILL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 03-47.

BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Moran adjourned the meeting at 4:25 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of January 21, 2004.

February 18, 2004
Date of Approval

Jay Hanson, Associate Planner

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of January 21, 2004

Board Members Present: Sandy Moran (Chair)
Nicholas Ambrosia
Dennis Deromedi
Philip LaGrow (Vice-Chair)
Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Pam Figge, Principal Planner
Jay Hanson, Associate Planner
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

Roll Call

Chair Moran called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Chair Moran opened the floor for nomination of officers for the coming year. Board Member Ward said that since the present officers have done such an excellent job, he nominates Sandy Moran as Chair and Phil LaGrow as Vice-Chair for an additional term. Board Member Ambrosia seconded the nomination, which passed by a unanimous vote.

Regular Agenda

- 3.1 ARB 03-47 (Sicke/McAmis) 621 Country Drive, APN 005-580-018** *Reconsideration of exterior colors for a conceptually approved 4,000 square foot single-story warehouse building as the second phase development of a construction business*

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this item, which was conceptually approved at the meeting of January 7, 2004. The Board asked the applicant to come back with alternate colors that would be more consistent with the colors of the office building. Staff recommends that the Board select the colors and approve the project subject to the previous conditions.

There being no questions for staff, Chair Moran invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Applicant Steve Sicke presented a color board from the building manufacturer. He advised the Board that co-applicant John McAmis is agreeable to whatever colors the Board chooses.

Board Member Ambrosia suggested that the "brownstone" color be used for the building trim, with the original color choice "bone white" for the field. By consensus, the Board agreed that those colors would be the most appropriate for the warehouse.

Board Member Ward asked what color the doors will be. Mr. Sicke responded that the doors will be ordered from a different manufacturer, but they can be painted to match the building color if the Board so desires.

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT SUBJECT TO THE FINDINGS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT AND REVISED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS FOLLOWS:

1. THERE WILL BE NO MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THE WAREHOUSE BUILDING.
2. THE WALL PACK LIGHTS WILL BE DOWNLIT AND OF A TYPE APPROVED BY STAFF FOR A WAREHOUSE BUILDING.
3. THE BODY OF THE BUILDING AND ALL DOORS WILL BE "BONE WHITE" AND THE TRIM WILL BE "BROWNSTONE".

4. THE APPLICANT WILL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 03-47.

BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

Information

Board Member Ambrosia updated the Board on the status of the ad hoc committee for public art in private development. The committee has researched which cities have similar programs, and each committee member will be calling five cities to find out how the programs work. The committee is attempting to get a package together that will address all of the issues surrounding development and implementation of an art program such as this, and things are progressing well.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Moran adjourned the meeting at 4:18 p.m. to the regular meeting of February 4, 2004.

February 18, 2004
Date of Approval

Jay Hanson, Associate Planner

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of February 18, 2004

Board Members Present: Sandy Moran (Chair)
Nicholas Ambrosia
Dennis Deromedi
Philip LaGrow
Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Tom Hayes, Senior Planner
Jay Hanson, Associate Planner
Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Moran called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of December 17, 2003

2.2 Minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 7, 2004

2.3 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of January 21, 2004

BOARD MEMBER WARD MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

3.0 REGULAR AGENDA

3.1 ARB 03-30 (Bachman) 163 E. 2nd Street, APN 004-082-001 - *Reconsideration of a previously approved project for an additional restaurant façade and entry located at the rear of the building*

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this project, which is a request for approval of an additional restaurant façade and entry located at the rear of the building. Staff is recommending approval of the project, subject to resolution of the discussion items and making the required findings as outlined in the staff report.

There being no questions for staff, the applicant was invited to make a presentation.

Property owner David Halimi presented a color drawing and photo of the front of the building, assuring the Board that it will look really nice and will be in line with the colors previously approved for Pluto's. He explained that the awning will be off-white, with painted signage, and will not be lighted. He stated that the storefront is already complete, as those plans were approved and permitted without Board review. The need for Board review and approval was brought to his attention when the sign permit application was submitted. He explained that there are additional windows and an entrance to the upstairs office yet to be constructed.

Associate Planner Hanson noted that the building has already been painted a very nice deep plum color.

Board Member Ambrosia asked whether the awning will be canvas, and whether it will be illuminated from behind for signage. Mr. Halimi responded that the awning will be canvas; the lighting under the awning is not meant to light the sign.

Chair Moran asked whether the sign will be painted green. Mr. Halimi responded affirmatively and presented a drawing of the proposed sign for the Board's review.

Board Member Ambrosia asked about the proposed additional windows. Mr. Halimi answered that they will be the windows to the banquet room of the Asian restaurant. He went on to say that there will be an additional recessed entrance with no awning for the office.

There being no public comments, the floor was opened for Board discussion of the project.

Chair Moran observed that the proposed project will be an improvement. Board Member LaGrow agreed that it is tasteful, but wondered whether the white awning will get dirty easily, particularly with the traffic. Board Member Ward said that, as the trees grow, the probability will increase of the awning turning less white. Mr. Halimi stated that he would just have to keep it clean, since the awning is already built and ready to hang. He added that it is in line with the approved colors for Pluto's, meant to blend in rather than stick out.

Board Member Ward commented that there are other materials available that would stain less. Board Member LaGrow added that keeping the awning clean should be a cause for concern and suggested that there might be some material that could be applied to the awning to reduce the likelihood of staining.

Chair Moran asked whether the Board could include a caveat in its approval that the cleanliness be maintained. Associate Planner Hanson replied that there is a code requirement regarding maintenance and that the Board could certainly include it in the approval.

Board Member Ambrosia agreed with Board Member LaGrow's suggestion regarding treatment of the awning with something to reduce staining. Board Member Deromedi said that awnings of this type are durable and cleanable and suggested that the Board simply recommend that it be coated. He pointed out that the applicant will be required by code to maintain it to the City standard with the look that the Board approves.

BOARD MEMBER LAGROW MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT SUBJECT TO THE FINDINGS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS FOLLOWS:

1. THE AWNING WILL BE TREATED WITH A PROTECTIVE COATING FOR STAIN RESISTANCE.
2. THE AWNING WILL NOT BE BACKLIT.
3. THE EXTERIOR LIGHTING WILL BE SHIELDED DOWNWARD.
4. THE APPLICANT WILL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 03-30.

BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

3.2 ARB 04-02 (Drake Homes) Ceres Avenue at Eaton Road, APN 048-430-019 and 020 - Approval of a proposed 4,000 square foot office building as the first phase of the Ceres Professional Plaza

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this project, which will consist of four buildings totaling 18,000 square feet. The exterior walls will be beige stucco with white trim, and the roof will be terra cotta tile. The conceptual landscape plan proposes basic planting including trees, sod, groundcover, and annuals at the entry. Air conditioning units will be ground-mounted. No details for the sign or the trash enclosure have been submitted. Staff recommends that the Board approve the project subject to resolution of the discussion items and to the conditions of approval outlined in the staff report.

Project architect Gary Hawkins, representing the applicant, said he had nothing to add to the staff report and offered to answer any questions from the Board.

Chair Moran asked Mr. Hawkins about adding shrubs at the rear of the site. Mr. Hawkins answered that the applicant does not have a problem with that recommendation; however, she wants to maintain the view toward the airport.

Chair Moran asked about screening for the air conditioning units. Mr. Hawkins responded that the type of screening would depend on the number of units required by future tenants.

Chair Moran asked what type of building lights are proposed. Mr. Hawkins replied that there will only be lights along the walkway.

Board Member Deromedi asked about staff's suggestion for a break area. Mr. Hawkins said that the decision regarding the break area will be reserved until after the types of tenants are known.

Board Member Ambrosia said that the Board supports employee break areas on projects, as they help with tenant retention. He went on to say that he likes the overall design, and although the parking lot curve is appreciated, he is concerned about circulation. He explained that there is only one entry, which will require drivers to turn around at the end of each leg of the parking lot, possibly causing congestion. He suggested that the design might be improved by adding a turning circle and some signage. Mr. Hawkins said that the parking ratio is higher than usual, so it would be unlikely that most of the spaces would be full at any given time. Board Member Ambrosia asked whether Mr. Hawkins had used the proposed parking layout in previous projects. Mr. Hawkins answered that although he had not used the same layout, he had used the same ratio. Board Member Ambrosia suggested that the number of stalls be reduced in favor of a new design, perhaps with a decorative element. Mr. Hawkins said that he would prefer not to reduce the number of stalls, as it might risk inadequate parking for tenants. Board Member Ambrosia expressed appreciation for the use of sidewalks to keep pedestrian traffic out of the parking area.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether the parking lot lighting needed to be discussed. Associate Planner Hanson replied that the proposal calls for 10 foot pole lights, which is consistent with Board policy, so there would be no need to discuss the lighting unless the Board wants something particular.

Board Member Ward said that as the project grows, it may be necessary to change the proposed signage. Associate Planner Hanson responded that the Code allows a specific number of ground- and wall-mounted signs, which cannot be exceeded.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether the proposed project will include screening for air conditioning units and metal gates for trash enclosures. Mr. Hawkins responded affirmatively, adding that the walls of the trash enclosures will be constructed of masonry. Board Member Ward pointed out that at some point, there may be a need for a second trash enclosure as a matter of convenience. Mr. Hawkins said that it would not be necessary at this point in the project.

With regard to fencing, Board Member Ambrosia commented that although there are no houses adjacent to the site, there are houses across from it. Associate Planner Hanson said that fencing is only required if the houses are adjacent to the project.

There being no public comments, Chair Moran asked for Board discussion of the project.

Board Member Deromedi asked whether it would be possible to add a second entrance to the parking lot. Associate Planner Hanson responded that an additional driveway on Eaton Road would only allow eastbound travel, and Public Works does not want another driveway there; however, it might be possible to add a driveway onto Ceres Avenue.

Board Member Ambrosia commented that, overall, it is a reasonable project; it seems to comply with the usual Board requirements with parking behind the building. He noted that the parking configuration may present a problem with the possibility of fender benders; however, that is not really for the Board to address. He added that the architecture meets the Board's requirement for addressing visual relief with pilasters and a portico that work well.

Board Member Deromedi said that the landscaping blends well with what exists in the area. Board Member Ambrosia agreed, pointing out that the mounding works very well. Board Member Deromedi said that the Board should address the need for shrubs at the side and rear of the building. Chair Moran agreed, saying that the Board should specify that the shrubs be large enough to screen the mechanical equipment.

Chair Moran then said that the building lighting seems to be fine. Board Member Ambrosia added that the canned lighting under the walkway is also acceptable.

Chair Moran mentioned the area behind the building with regard to staff's recommendation for a patio area. Board Member Ambrosia agreed that it should be included in the Board's recommendation.

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT SUBJECT TO THE FINDINGS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS FOLLOWS:

1. AIR CONDITIONING UNITS ARE TO BE SCREENED WITH LATTICE OR CONTAINER PLANTS LARGE ENOUGH TO PROVIDE IMMEDIATE SCREENING.
2. THE TRASH ENCLOSURE IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED OF BLOCK OR STUCCO CONSISTENT WITH THE BUILDING, WITH METAL DOORS.
3. THE FINAL SIGN AND LANDSCAPE PLANS ARE TO BE SUBMITTED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT PLANS FOR STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
4. SHRUBBERY IS TO BE USED ON THE NORTH AND WEST SIDES OF THE BUILDING AS SCREENING FOR DOORS OR OTHER FEATURES INSTALLED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF TENANTS.
5. TO AVOID WIND OR WATER EROSION, ANY UNDEVELOPED AREAS ARE TO BE GRADED AND HYDROSEEDING UNTIL DEVELOPED.
6. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT SHEET OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-02.
7. AN OUTDOOR BREAK AREA BEHIND THE BUILDING IS RECOMMENDED.

BOARD MEMBER LAGROW SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

3.3 ARB 04-03 (Coffman) 1026 Skyway, APN 002-210-028 - Approval of a façade remodel for an existing commercial building (Fit One)

Associate Planner Hanson distributed photos of the existing building and presented the staff report for this project, which proposes to remodel the existing building façade to include the addition of a new entrance feature. New exterior colors are proposed to be light yellow stucco for the field and black for the trim. The project is subject to the landscape requirements for façade remodels, not to exceed two percent of the project cost. Staff recommends that the Board approve the project subject to the recommended conditions and making the require findings.

Board Member Ambrosia asked which entry is being modified, to which Associate Planner Hanson responded that it is the north entry. Board Member Ambrosia asked whether the two percent landscaping requirement includes the entire project cost or only the construction cost. Associate Planner Hanson replied that the requirement is two percent of the entire project cost.

There being no further questions for staff, Chair Moran invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Project architect Larry Coffman explained that the applicant has been trying to bring the building into the 21st century by installing high-tech equipment, and he is now attempting to bring that idea outside with this remodel, creating an identifiable structure to give the building character. He pointed out that the existing site plan has a long and narrow parking lot with a roadway out to the Skyway, but it is away from the frontage. What he is trying to do is get the attention of traffic by updating the club using successively smaller frames

at the entrance. He said that there are handicapped access issues for the front entry that will be addressed through the addition of a ramp. He related that the long-term plan is to try to build an aquatics facility, so the other sides of the building will eventually be modified. He stated that the sign will be backlit to give a silhouette through the perforated metal frame. The landscaping will be revised across the front of the building; he explained that a landscape plan has been submitted that includes several Italian cypress trees and creates an asymmetrical screen to protect from the hot afternoon sun. A foam and plaster wainscot will be added around the bottom; both the wainscot and the cornice get shorter, depending on the height of the wall. The wainscot and cornice treatment will be wrapped, with the intention that the architectural concept will be extended in the future. The existing metal roof will remain, as will the fence. He stressed that this is a phased project, and said that the applicant would like to have the overall concept approved so he can move toward updating the entire building.

Board Member LaGrow asked about the material and size of the cornice. Mr. Coffman responded that it protrudes approximately 2 feet at the top and will be finished in stucco, with black sheet metal at the top to cap it. He pointed out that the edges of the windows will also have the black metal trim. Chair Moran asked whether all of the black trim will be metal, to which Mr. Coffman responded affirmatively.

Board Member Ambrosia asked whether the expansion joints will also be black. Mr. Coffman answered that they will just be a fairly subtle score line. Board Member Ambrosia remarked that he likes the overall look, which smacks of art deco, appropriate because it started in the 30s with the Olympics. He added that he appreciates the applicant coming to the Board in the preliminary phase of the project.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether the black trim will be high gloss, to which Mr. Coffman answered affirmatively. Board Member Ambrosia said that he likes the asymmetrical shading.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether the parking lot construction will occur at the same time as the façade remodel. Mr. Coffman said it will, due to City requirements regarding occupancy expansion.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether the driveway will line up with the driveway across the street, to which Mr. Coffman responded affirmatively. Board Member LaGrow then asked whether the old driveway will be abandoned. Applicant Tony DeLuca answered that it will be.

Regarding the planned use of ginkos, Senior Planner Hayes remarked that the ginkos used at Raley's across the street died very quickly because of standing water. Mr. Coffman responded that he would check that out before planting.

Board Member Ambrosia remarked that he likes the color choices, and Board Member LaGrow agreed. Mr. Coffman pointed out that the lightest yellow will appear to be white. Mr. DeLuca said that the interior color is nearly an exact match to the gold.

For clarification, Associate Planner Hanson asked Mr. Coffman if he was asking the Board to include the expansion on the east side in its approval today, and planning to return to the Board for future approval of the pool. Mr. Coffman said that was correct.

Board Member LaGrow asked about the parking lot lighting. Mr. Coffman explained that there will be 12 foot poles with shoebox fixtures to prevent encroachment on the neighbors.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether there will be a change to the trash enclosure. Mr. Coffman said yes, explaining that the preliminary plan is to move it to the north side of the parking lot, near the car wash that is on the adjacent property. He added that it will be the same color scheme as the project, since the owner is adamant about doing this project right and providing the best facility in town.

There being no public comments, Chair Moran invited Board discussion of the project.

Board Member Ward commented that this project will be a large improvement. He said that despite the fact

that the project will be phased, the applicant is pointed in the proper direction.

Board Member Deromedi asked at what point the two percent landscaping must be completed. Associate Planner Hanson answered that it will be checked at the time of final approval of the façade remodel, noting that staff will be looking for some improvements in the existing blank parking areas. Chair Moran asked whether the Board felt comfortable with leaving final approval to staff. The Board, by consensus, agreed that staff approval would be fine.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether the irrigation needs to be renovated. Mr. DeLuca said it does, and it will be. He explained that he has already spent money on the inside, and the business has grown; now he wants to work on the outside, to make it stunning, almost like a park. Board Member LaGrow asked about plans for the entry to the parking lot. Mr. DeLuca responded that there will be two large strips of landscaping.

Board Member LaGrow then asked about the signage on Notre Dame Boulevard. Mr. DeLuca said that the property had just been purchased, and the signage will depend on whether the existing poles remain or are removed. He indicated that he would be looking at some type of conservative signage. Board Member Ambrosia asked whether the signage would have to come back to the Board for review. Associate Planner Hanson answered that it would be the Board's decision, explaining that it is possible for staff to review it through the standard sign review process.

Board Member Ambrosia expressed concern about the use of Italian cypress trees, due to the amount of maintenance they require. Mr. DeLuca assured the Board that he has worked with arborists and will manicure them to be tall rather than bushy.

Associate Planner Hanson advised the Board that he did not feel comfortable with including the parking lot expansion in today's approval, since it has not been reviewed by staff for compliance with code and was not included in the public notice. He suggested that the Board give final approval for the façade remodel and conceptual approval for the parking lot.

BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE FAÇADE REMODEL SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE LANDSCAPE MODIFICATIONS IN THE EXISTING PARKING LOT, THE REVISIONS TO SIGNAGE, AND THE NEW LOCATION AND MATERIALS FOR THE TRASH ENCLOSURE; AND THAT THE BOARD CONCEPTUALLY APPROVE THE EXPANSION OF THE PARKING AREA ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY; SUBJECT TO THE FINDINGS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT AND THE CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-03.

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

3.4 ARB 04-04 (Peitz) 995 Nord Avenue, APN 043-290-069 - *Approval of a 10,753 square foot building for commercial use, including a restaurant*

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this project, which proposes a building located at the rear of a currently undeveloped site, with parking adjacent to the street, a configuration required due to the limitation on driveway location because of proximity to the street intersection. Exterior wall colors are proposed to be shades of beige, and the roof will be dark green metal. Mechanical equipment is to be concealed behind the parapet walls on the roof, the trash enclosure is to be located within the driveway landscape planter in the parking lot, and parking lot lighting is to be 14 foot pole lights with shoebox fixtures. Staff recommends that the Board approve the project after addressing articulation on the west wall, proposed signage, wall lighting, and additional landscaping features for curb appeal.

There being no questions for staff, Chair Moran invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Project architect Greg Peitz distributed revised drawings for the Board's review, which he said were the result of both staff comments and the owner's request. He explained that the primary architectural element changed

was the hip roof, which is not as towering as originally submitted. He went on to say that the siting of the building is a result of traffic issues arising from the proximity of the site to the street intersection and that Caltrans has conceptually approved the layout and the parking. He stated that the project is speculative retail, and the plan is for the major anchor tenants to have larger signs than the smaller tenants, with canned downlighting over all entrances.

Landscape architect Mike Hradecky explained that the landscaping is driven by the parking lot design; there is a generous 15 foot strip, and there is sufficient horizontal space to mound. He said that on the west and north sides of the project, there is a mixed grove of established hardwood trees that will screen the wall. He pointed out that there are ornamental tree grates mixed in with the pattern of the walkways and said that it had been a challenge to provide such substantial landscaping while allowing access for the handicapped.

Board Member LaGrow asked if the landscaping would present any problem with line of sight. Mr. Hradecky assured the Board that he would work to make certain it is low enough to avoid that situation.

Board Member Ambrosia asked whether the tree grates will be large enough to allow for future growth. Mr. Hradecky replied that the grates will allow for growth, adding that once the tree species have been decided upon, the appropriate size of grate could be chosen. He explained that it will depend upon what the Urban Forester wants to do with respect to the street trees, because the plan is to repeat those trees in the parking lot for continuity.

Associate Planner Hanson commented that it appears that most of the existing trees that are onsite will have to be removed to allow for construction of the building. Chair Moran asked whether the existing trees on the back of the site will cover the wall. Mr. Peitz replied that there are established, mature trees in the adjacent apartment complex parking lot that will screen the wall.

Board Member LaGrow pointed out that, without a gutter or drip flash, the stucco will be subject to water stains.

Board Member Ambrosia asked whether the anchor tenants' roofs contain equipment wells. Mr. Peitz answered that the entire building has a parapet wall to shield equipment. Board Member Ambrosia commented that lowering the height of the center unit was a good idea.

Senior Planner Hayes left the meeting at this time.

Chair Moran said that she would like to see articulation added to the back wall, even though there are trees to screen it from view. Mr. Peitz suggested that perhaps a variation in the stucco through the use of expansion screeds and a subtle variation in color might work well.

Board Member Ambrosia asked about the size of the ceramic tile on the columns. Mr. Peitz answered that it will be 12 x 12.

Board Member Ambrosia said that he appreciates the opportunity for the preliminary review of the project, pointing out that it is very important to get the Board's recommendations before the project is developed at great expense.

There being no public comments, Chair Moran asked for Board discussion of the project.

Chair Moran remarked that it is a very nice looking building. Board Member LaGrow agreed; however, he pointed out again that he is concerned about discoloration of the stucco from water dripping.

Chair Moran asked about the use of building lights for the project. Mr. Peitz replied that there will be cans under the canopies by the storefronts, presuming that the signage will be lit. Board Member Deromedi noted that the Board should address lighted signs on the front of the building in its motion.

With regard to landscaping, Board Member Ambrosia said that he agrees with staff's recommendation for mounding to 36 inches, especially since the parking lot will front on the street. Associate Planner Hanson stated that Senior Planner Hayes had suggested the use of a wall or fence behind the mounding. Board Member Ambrosia said that this project can certainly make the site more attractive for the community if it is handled well. Board Member Deromedi said that he would really like to see the corner dressed up. Mr. Hradecky responded that with a 3:1 slope on a 15 foot wide planter, it would be relatively easy to create a mound two to three feet in height.

Board Member LaGrow asked Mr. Hradecky what he thought about the possibility of using a retaining wall at the front. Mr. Hradecky answered that although there might be some sight distance problems, it might be possible to do a low wall with columns responding to the building architecture, or perhaps a retaining wall set back 3 feet with mounding up to the wall.

Chair Moran asked for input regarding the articulation of the rear elevation. Associate Planner Hanson remarked that as proposed, the wall would be a big board for graffiti, particularly because it is adjacent to a parking lot.

Board Member Ambrosia said that he had visited the site and confirmed that the existing trees are fairly mature. He explained that there are no buildings with windows facing the site, and there will be a fence. He recommended that the Board focus more on the primary city view rather than on the rear building elevation.

Board Member Deromedi agreed, particularly because there will be a 6 foot fence, and asked how much of the building will be visible. Mr. Peitz responded that the building will be roughly 18 feet high at its tallest point. Board Member LaGrow asked whether the building will be just one color across the back, to which Mr. Peitz responded that he is considering varying the color. Board Member Ambrosia reiterated that no one will be able to see it except drivers in the apartment complex parking lot.

Board Member Ward suggested that perhaps a solid wall might be better than a fence. Associate Planner Hanson responded that the applicant had originally wanted a wall but had changed his request. A short discussion followed regarding the benefits and drawbacks of different designs and materials with respect to potential damage from graffiti, weather, and tree roots.

Georgie Bellin, from the public, commented that a wood fence would be more forgiving than a masonry wall with regard to the tree roots, and that spray cans are used on walls rather than fences. She went on to say that she thinks the landscaping feature in the front will be very important to this project, particularly with City standards pushing parking requirements to the limit. She stressed that this is a gateway corner, and it would look wonderful to have a little more landscaping if there could be a variance in the amount of parking required.

Applicant Rakesh Joshi said that he would really like the Board to be open to landscaping without walls, because walls say "keep out" rather than "come in". Board Member Ward responded by saying that the Board wants it to function well and look good. He explained that the Board is simply making recommendations rather than giving specific solutions, other than the use of mounds to hide the cars and bushes or shrubs to make the corner look inviting. Mr. Joshi stressed that he thinks it will look more attractive if it is left open.

Board Member Ambrosia said that he appreciates the concern with regard to not having a wrought iron fence or retaining wall and asked Associate Planner Hanson what the landscaping requirements for this project are. Associate Planner Hanson responded that the only requirement is the shade quotient. Board Member Ambrosia said he thinks the tree grates are a good way to go about the shade and landscaping to offset the massive building.

Chair Moran asked whether it would be feasible to have a planter in front of the building. Associate Planner Hanson answered that it would not be feasible with this building design. Board Member LaGrow suggested the possibility of using landscaping with cactus and prickly pears at each end of the fence to keep people from going behind the building. Board Member Deromedi said that people would simply climb the fence if they wanted to tag the building.

Board Member Ambrosia said that he can see that the revisions presented at tonight's meeting will make the project more affordable, and although he has no problem with the hip roof, it bothers him that on the north elevation the roof changes from a hip roof to a parapet roof. Mr. Joshi reminded the Board that the north elevation is not visible from the street, and Board Member Ambrosia agreed.

Chair Moran then asked the Board to summarize the points it would like to address in its motion. She mentioned paint color variation on the rear elevation to provide articulation, suggesting that the Board leave it to the applicant to choose two complementary colors.

Chair Moran then asked whether the Board was agreeable to canned downlighting on the building, and the Board agreed by consensus. Board Member LaGrow said that the parking lot lighting should be limited to 12 foot pole lights with downlit shoebox fixtures. Board Member Ambrosia asked whether the rear of the building will be lit. Mr. Peitz replied that, at most, there will be minimal service lighting. Chair Moran suggested that the Board include a stipulation that any signage be channel lit rather than cabinet style.

Regarding landscaping, Chair Moran then asked whether the Board would like to see mounding up to 2 feet. Board Member Ambrosia said he would prefer to say at least 30 inches. Chair Moran asked what types of plantings will be in the mounding. Mr. Hradecky replied that there will be relaxed groupings. Board Member LaGrow agreed with Board Member Ambrosia's suggestion that the Board require not less than 30 inches. Board Member Deromedi noted that, along West Sacramento Avenue, the landscape buffer appears to be less than 15 feet. Mr. Joshi explained that the width is dictated by Caltrans, and it is conservative because of potential plans to expand Highway 32. Mr. Hradecky pointed out that there will be some setback issues to work out, as well; it has to be kept below 30 inches in height. Board Member Ambrosia recommended that the Board specify a 3:1 ratio that will cover both frontages.

Chair Moran said that it would be easier to create berming if there were something along the back side, such as a wall, and Board Member LaGrow agreed. Board Member Ambrosia disagreed, pointing out that it will simply be a place to collect litter as the wind blows, as well as a maintenance issue with drivers backing into it. He went on to say that in his opinion, the same thing can be accomplished with berming, which will look more natural and not give the impression that people are not invited in. He added that it will also be less expensive. Board Member Ward suggested the use of an 8 inch curb on both sides. Chair Moran observed that there are benefits and drawbacks to both options. Board Member LaGrow recommended that the Board give the applicant an option to do either the mounding or the wall.

Board Member Ambrosia said that any recommendation regarding landscaping should be subject to final review and approval by staff. Associate Planner Hanson responded that the applicant will be required to submit a full landscape plan, and he assured the Board that he will work with Mr. Hradecky to get mounding and good shrub content to ensure interest on the corner and block the view of the parking area.

Regarding the issue of the rear fence or wall, Board Member Deromedi said that he agreed with Ms. Bellin that the fence is the better option, and Chair Moran expressed her agreement as well.

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT SUBJECT TO THE FINDINGS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT AND THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. THE REAR BUILDING ELEVATION WILL BE PAINTED IN AT LEAST TWO COLORS TO PROVIDE ARTICULATION AND INTEREST.
2. THE DRAWINGS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH ALTERATIONS TO THE FRONT BUILDING ELEVATION AND ROOF ARE ACCEPTABLE TO THE BOARD.
3. THE FINAL SIGN AND LANDSCAPE PLANS WILL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT PLANS FOR STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.

4. THE CORNER BETWEEN NORD AVENUE AND WEST SACRAMENTO AVENUE WILL HAVE MOUNDING WITH A 3:1 RATIO.
5. PARKING WILL BE PROVIDED IN COMPLIANCE WITH CMC SECTION 19.70 (PARKING AND LOADING STANDARDS) BASED ON THE ULTIMATE USE OF THE BUILDING. AT THE TIME OF BUILDING PERMIT PLAN CHECK REVIEW, THE APPLICANT WILL SUBMIT A PARKING ANALYSIS BASED UPON THE FLOOR PLAN OF THE BUILDING FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY STAFF.
6. A WOODEN FENCE OR WALL WILL BE INSTALLED ALONG THE PROPERTY LINES ADJACENT TO THE APARTMENT COMPLEX, ACCORDING TO CODE.
7. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-04.

CHAIR MORAN PRESENTED THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION:

8. PARKING LOT LIGHTING WILL BE LIMITED TO 12 TO 14 FOOT POLES WITH DOWNLIT SHOEBOX FIXTURES.
9. ANY SIGNS WILL BE CHANNEL LIT OR INDIRECTLY LIT ONLY AND SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.

BOARD MEMBER LAGROW SECONDED THE MOTION AS AMENDED, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Moran adjourned the meeting at 5:52 p.m. to the regular meeting of March 3, 2004.

June 2, 2004
Date of Approval

Jay Hanson, Associate Planner

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 7, 2004

Board Members Present: Sandy Moran (Chair)
Nicholas Ambrosia
Philip LaGrow
Lorrin Ward

Board Members Absent: Dennis Deromedi

Staff Members Present: Kim Seidler, Planning Director
Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Brendan Vieg, Senior Planner
Jay Hanson, Associate Planner
Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Moran called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 REGULAR AGENDA

2.1 ARB 04-07 (Gillis) 2499 Bruce Road, APN 002-210-027 - *Conceptual review of a proposal to construct a retail building*

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this project, which is a proposed 6,000 square foot commercial building adjacent to a resource management area containing wetlands habitat subject to flooding. The building will be positioned on the south side of the triangular shaped parcel adjacent to the Skyway, with the parking area on the north side of the building adjacent to Bruce Road. The exterior of the building will be finished with shades of green stucco. Plans call for a split level roof and awnings over the entry doors. The conceptual landscape plan provides 65 percent shade coverage for the parking area, and landscape planters are proposed along the Skyway and Bruce Road frontages. The proposed location of the building will necessitate a variance to the required 10 foot setback from the adjacent R3 zoning district. The parking presents difficulty for vehicle maneuvering. The trash enclosure is proposed for the east side of the parking lot, but no details have been provided. The lighting and mechanical equipment have not been defined. A six-foot perimeter fence will be required along the easterly boundary. Staff is recommending that the Board provide conceptual review of the project based upon discussion of the issues outlined in the staff report.

Planning Director Seidler commented that, with regard to the issue of the required variance, staff does not know whether or not it can be approved. He stressed that it is not automatic, and explained that the matter would have to be heard by the Planning Commission and specific findings related to hardship would have to be made.

Board Member Ambrosia asked about City standards regarding an additional entry to the parking area. Associate Planner Hanson responded that there are requirements as to the minimum distance between a driveway and an intersection. Board Member Ambrosia noted that an additional entry would also reduce the number of parking stalls, and Associate Planner Hanson concurred.

Chair Moran then invited the applicants to make a presentation.

Dan Hays, representing the applicants, said that with respect to the comments on the variance, there is a hardship due to the unique design of the lot itself. He stated that it is a very difficult design with which to work, and that although the applicants do have another piece of property in escrow that is a mirror image of this lot, there has been a big argument about wetlands on the property adjacent to it involving the EPA, the Fish and Wildlife, and the Army Corps of Engineers. He commented that the property does not contain meadowfoam or fairy shrimp; however, the adjacent property does. The question is whether or not the applicants will be able to acquire the second lot; this building has been designed around what the applicants have now.

As to the comments regarding the parking configuration, Mr. Hays said that the driveway approaches have been discussed at great length with Senior Development Engineer Matt Johnson. He stated that he had asked for an approach coming through the raised median, but he was informed that staff would not support it, since the doctors across the street from the site had already had the same request denied by the Planning Commission. He went on to say that the Code requires 23 spaces, and the proposed configuration contains 26. He stressed that this was a tough parking lot to design, as many of the applicants' customers drive pickups with trailers. He stated again that the applicants will be applying for a variance because they have been unable to get the federal agencies to release the second lot.

Planning Director Seidler asked whether the proposed building is the minimum suitable size for the occupancy. Mr. Hays said it is, and explained that originally the applicants had wanted a one-story building, but they needed more space. He said that if the applicants are successful in acquiring the additional lot, the building will be "popped out" another 30 feet.

Mr. Hays then said that there will be no mechanical equipment on the roof; the cooling units on the east side are fenced in, and the one on the west side will be screened with wooden lattice and shrubbery. He pointed out that there is no restaurant proposed.

Mr. Hays described the proposed colors as complementary to the area, particularly during the spring and summer months. He concluded his presentation by stating that the site will be very heavily landscaped and that the shading coefficient vastly exceeds Code requirements.

There being no public comments, Chair Moran opened the floor for Board discussion.

Chair Moran commented that it seems very early for the Board to be reviewing this project, adding that it will require significant changes.

Board Member Ward pointed out that the elevations are incorrect as drawn, as they do not measure up laterally. As a second matter, he said that although green is a nice color, in this particular location the applicants should consider three different colors rather than three shades of green. He elaborated, saying that a building this size will be very prominent on its small lot, and it should attempt to be a part of the community, complementing rather than interfering. He reiterated that the building elevations should be corrected, because the corrections will change the volume indications, which must be considered if the Board wants to make a recommendation for changes. Mr. Hays argued that the elevations are correct as drawn, and Board Member Ward responded by pointing out and explaining the nature of specific errors on Attachment C to the staff report.

Board Member LaGrow asked what the overall height, up to the eave line, of the proposed building will be. Mr. Hays replied that it will be not quite 24 feet at the tallest point, and 4 feet less on the single story.

Board Member LaGrow asked what the pitch of the roof will be. Associate Planner Hanson said that the pitch is shown as 3:12. Board Member Ambrosia said there are several pitches. Mr. Hays answered that there is an eave height change on the back of the building that is a different pitch.

Board Member LaGrow asked for clarification of the three shades of green, and Mr. Hays distributed color samples (Kelly Moore "Jade Mist", "Shrubbery Green", and "Verdun") for the Board's review. Board Member LaGrow asked whether the articulations will be 2 inches thick, to which Mr. Hays responded affirmatively.

Board Member Ambrosia said that he appreciates Mr. Hays bringing the project to the Board for preliminary review. He said that his first reaction is that if indeed this size building is needed, the applicants should probably try to find a different site. He agreed with Mr. Hays' assertion that it is a difficult site, explaining that he is very familiar with it and reiterating that it is just not suitable for a building this size.

Board Member Ambrosia then said that in his opinion, the parking configuration will promote fender benders on a weekly basis. He added that although he can see that a lot of thought went into the plan for the parking

lot, it simply does not work. He observed that the trash enclosure location will make it next to impossible for the trash truck to access it. As for the circulation, the quantity of landscaping coupled with the lack of an additional exit to the parking lot will result in vehicles going all the way into the lot before being able to determine whether or not any parking was available and having to back all the way out if there was none.

With regard to the building itself, Board Member Ambrosia commented that there are several components that do not work together. As an example, he pointed out that some of the elevations have awnings and others do not. He observed that the fenestration on the Skyway elevation has no overhangs, which will result in the absorption of a great deal of heat, and said that in his opinion, it is just not good architectural design. Additionally, he expressed concern that windows of that size would present an opportunity for paper signage that might distract drivers. He recommended that the applicants address those issues with the architect, as well as the two pitches of the roof.

Board Member LaGrow commented that in his view, the design of the building does not seem to be compatible with other buildings on the busy corner, looking up at the foothill views. He said that his expertise is in color design, and asserted that the proposed colors are not greens one would find in nature and are not consistent with the foothills design concept. He suggested that the applicants look at everything that is going on around the site; the buildings are done in coppers, taupes, deep reds, and other earth tones that are complementary with the view of the foothills from the Skyway.

Board Member Ambrosia agreed, and stressed that a lot of thought should go into how that corner is treated.

Applicant Sherry Gillis then voiced her agreement with Board Member LaGrow's observation regarding the building colors, saying that she had been under the impression that the building would be painted to match the Skyway Medical Center colors.

Chair Moran said that the Board would just provide some guidance at today's meeting. Board Member LaGrow agreed, explaining to Mrs. Gillis that there will be another opportunity to come before the Board with changes. Planning Director Seidler assured Mrs. Gillis that staff will be happy to summarize and pass along the Board's comments to assist in making the changes the Board recommends.

Mr. Hays then interjected that he still did not understand what is wrong with the proposed project. Board Member Ambrosia recapped some of what had been discussed, including reduction of the building size and adjustment of the footprint so it fits within the guidelines, reconfiguration of the parking lot, and revision of the fenestration and the roof pitch. Chair Moran added that he should reconsider the architectural style. Board Member LaGrow restated his concern regarding the color choice.

Board Member Ambrosia again urged the applicants to talk to their architect. Mr. Hays countered that he is the architect. Board Member Ambrosia asked Mr. Hays whether he is licensed, and if so, why Robert Heaton's name is on the drawings. Mr. Hays asserted that he has an agreement with Mr. Heaton, who has fully approved the design.

Board Member Ambrosia said that he realized that Mr. Hays had done his best to make this project work, but it will require more land to do that. He again advised the applicants talk to their architect about the concerns he had expressed. Mr. Hays argued that the size of the site is the reason the applicants will be applying for a variance. Board Member LaGrow replied that the variance would be a very key issue, and the Board cannot approve a plan that is dependent on it.

Mr. Hays took issue with that observation, saying that he did not want the applicants to go through the variance process until they got a reading from the Architectural Review Board. He asked whether the Board's position is that the size of the building is unacceptable regardless of whether or not the variance is approved. Chair Moran asked whether that is within the Board's purview, to which Associate Planner Hanson responded affirmatively. Planning Director Seidler clarified that the variance does not relate to the size of the building, only to the setback.

Board Member Ambrosia again encouraged the applicants to consult with their architect, since there are so many concerns with respect to the project. Once again, Mr. Hays stated that he was still not clear about what Board Member Ambrosia meant by that. Board Member Ambrosia again itemized some of the issues previously discussed, including massing, roof pitch, color, and fenestration. He also mentioned an additional concern regarding the site being located in a flood plain.

Mr. Hays argued that the windows on the Skyway elevation are designed that way because the applicants want to display merchandise. Board Member Ambrosia responded that an architect normally would not design that many windows, that large, facing the south without shielding. Planning Director Seidler clarified that the overhang would be intended to shield the sun, not to obscure the window. Mr. Hays retorted that the windows face solar south, and stressed that there are no windows on the west side of the building.

Board Member Ambrosia pointed out that, by law, the architect must be fully responsible for the plans. He again said that the applicants should consult with the architect to address the Board's concerns. Chair Moran agreed, saying that the design needs a lot of work.

Planning Director Seidler suggested that, if the Board Members were all in agreement, they should summarize the points and provide direction. Chair Moran stated that in her opinion, the Board has been very clear; this is not just about changing the paint. Board Member LaGrow recommended that the applicants review the changes with staff before bringing the project back to the Board. Board Member Ambrosia agreed, particularly with regard to the parking lot configuration.

Associate Planner Hanson asked whether the Board would like to include in its recommendation that the applicants complete the variance process prior to bringing the project back. By consensus, the Board decided that would not be necessary, since the variance would not affect the architectural concerns.

Mrs. Gillis addressed the Board regarding the windows facing the Skyway, explaining that their intent is to display merchandise in such a way that when cars stop at the intersection, the drivers will look into the windows. She said that one idea was to display a roll-away tool box with tools on it, with an interior spotlight shining down on the merchandise. She assured the Board that the displays would be tasteful, not garish. She stressed that the idea is to make this building a state-of-the-art tool store.

Board Member Ambrosia said that, because the applicants will not only own but occupy the building, they will definitely want to have further discussion with the architect regarding the type of glass on those windows, because the heating and cooling bills will be extreme. Mr. Gillis said that they would certainly be amenable to looking at putting an awning over the windows, and he echoed Mrs. Gillis' assurance that they do not want to do anything to spoil the view.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether the landscaping shown outside the windows is turf with shrubs. Mr. Hays replied affirmatively, adding that it is the City right-of-way, so the shrubs were chosen by the City. Board Member LaGrow said that the landscape plan should be revised to show further detail before the project comes back to the Board, and noted that the Board would be looking for additional interest, such as berming. He added that details regarding proposed signage should also be included in any future submittal.

Mr. Gillis then asked for further clarification of the issue with the parking configuration. Board Member Ambrosia explained that it is a dangerous lot, because a driver entering the lot to look for a place to park has to back out if there is not one. Additionally, the driver of a car parked in the compact space might not be able to back out at all. He went on to say that the fact that there is a wide entry lane is noteworthy and commendable; however, the other aisle should be further southwest. Mr. Hays rebutted that the City will not allow that.

Board Member Ambrosia summed up the Board's position by saying that this is a very difficult site to work with. He said that the ultimate solution would be for the applicants to work out an arrangement with the City for the sale of the property for open space; however, if the applicants chose to pursue development of the site, it would take considerable thought and planning by a licensed architect. Planning Director Seidler said that the other solution would be to acquire more property.

Mrs. Gillis said that they have been working toward acquisition of additional property. She explained that they are in escrow for the adjacent parcel, but the EPA, the Fish and Wildlife, and the Army Corps of Engineers are holding up the process. She noted that Jody Gallaway has checked the site for biological issues and reported that there are none other than the swale, which can be mitigated. She related that the process had been going on for two years, and they just want to try to get a building on the property. She again assured the Board that the building will not be green.

There being no further discussion, Chair Moran thanked the applicant for the opportunity to review the project. Associate Planner Hanson stated that staff would send a letter to the applicants outlining the Board's recommendations.

2.2 ARB 04-08 (Pacific Properties) 2036 Forest Avenue, APN 002-370-068 - Proposed construction of a multiple-building retail center

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this project, which proposes three single-story buildings totaling approximately 73,000 square feet. The buildings will reflect a Mediterranean Revival theme, featuring a combination of mansard roofs covered with terra cotta tiles and parapet walls with cornice caps. The building exteriors are proposed to be varying colors of stucco, and articulation will be provided by mosaic tile accents on the walls and awnings over the windows and entry doors. Parking will be centrally located in the complex, with dual access from Forest Avenue and Baney Lane. A previous land-use entitlement requires 50 percent more shading for this site than would normally be required. Mechanical equipment will be roof-mounted behind the parapet walls, and conceptual wall signs will be located above the suite entries. Staff is recommending that the Board approve the project after resolution of the discussion items, subject to making the required findings and with conditions of approval itemized in the staff report.

Planning Director Seidler then explained that the guiding principles of the General Plan support the recommendation in the staff report regarding the positioning of Building C as a stand alone on Forest Avenue. He stated that, according to the City's Design Manual, it is generally not advisable to put parking to the front, and adding that Building D alone does not provide sufficient screening.

There being no questions for staff, the applicant was invited to make a presentation.

Robin Matley, representing the applicant, explained to the Board that the preferred clientele for the project are high quality retail types of businesses with downsized formats rather than big box types, stressing that some flexibility will be required in order to attract them. He said that what has been presented to the Board is a "vocabulary" of design elements, and that within those design elements he would like to be able to adjust as necessary once tenants have been established.

With regard to the site design, Mr. Matley said that the major benefit is that there will be two entrances or focal points. He noted that the main entrance on Forest Avenue includes substantial features, including a pedestrian walkway and trees. He added that at the prominent view field in the center, the applicant wants to work something in to give the effect of a village area, which would not be possible if Building C were brought to the front of the site. He went on to say that because the site is detached from residential areas, higher light standards have been requested, which would reduce the number of lights in the parking area while providing a safer environment at night.

As to the proposed colors, Mr. Matley said that he would be willing to tone them down if necessary. He said that the finishes are basically neutral, with the colors used as subtle, tasteful highlights. He pointed out that there is plenty of articulation, adding that the architecture and colors are changed slightly from one building to the next, providing differentiation yet tying the elements together.

Moving on to the landscape plan, Mr. Matley said that the applicant had attempted to incorporate elements of the adjacent properties. He asked that the Board consider allowing a buffer of 20 feet, which would provide for 50 percent shading and be helpful with parking requirements. He said that the net effect of the landscape plan as submitted would be a 25 foot average buffer with berming to provide a landscape shield for the

parking. He again said that the applicant is looking for flexibility, saying that this plan will be attractive and will work well with the City's design elements.

Board Member Ward commented that one concern with the plan is the distance people would have to walk from the farthest parking spaces. Mr. Matley explained that the plan is very effective for stacking parking.

Board Member LaGrow asked for an example of the applicant's idea of a desirable tenant. Kent Hallen, representing the applicant, said that this project is being designed as the "Chico Specialty Center", and desirable tenants would include stores along the lines of the Pottery Barn.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether there would be room to put an additional small building at the front of the site and still meet parking requirements, pointing out that the reason the Board allowed the center across the street to build at the back of its site was to allow room for the pad for a building at the front. Board Member Ambrosia noted that, based on the square footage shown, there would be room for another small building.

There being no further questions for the applicant, Chair Moran invited comments from the public.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, said she hopes the Board opts for the site plan with the parking at the back and requires the colors to be toned down.

There being no further public comments, Chair Moran opened the Board discussion by saying that she likes the articulation on the buildings. Board Member LaGrow agreed, adding that he also likes the colors.

Board Member Ambrosia added his agreement, saying that the massing and the change in texture materials are also very good. He noted that although he does like the colors, he thinks they are perhaps a little too dense and could be lightened up a shade or two without adversely affecting the look.

Board Member Ambrosia then expressed concern with the lighting height, saying that although taller lights would be more efficient, lower lights would result in the more "homey" feel of the village theme. Mr. Hallen responded that there are prototype parking lots for most major tenants that require certain types of lighting. He stated that if the required lighting cannot be provided, it would adversely affect the ability to draw tenants. He then produced a letter dated June 26, 2000 from the City Planning Division to Rich Development Company outlining the final conditions of approval for the retail shopping center (Pheasant Run) on the southeast corner of Forest Avenue and East 20th Street. He pointed out the condition allowing 25 foot pole light fixtures in the front parking area and said that he is not asking for special treatment, only for what was approved across the street. The Board then discussed the height of parking lot lighting in various neighboring projects.

Board Member Ambrosia commented that he would like the signs to either contain self-illuminated letters or be back-lit, to provide a rich and inviting look rather than a synthetic one. Mr. Hallen agreed, saying that it would soften the look.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether the applicant planned to back-light the awnings, saying that the Board would not support that. Mr. Matley replied that the material for the awnings has not yet been chosen, and Mr. Hallen added that they would be looking for a better way to light them. Board Member Ambrosia then explained how the awnings on the Hotel Diamond had been designed and suggested that it might be a good way to handle these. Mr. Hallen said that if there is a better way, he wants to look at it.

Chair Moran then asked for the Board Members' thoughts on the location of Building C. Board Member LaGrow asked Mr. Hallen whether there would be substantial landscaping and berming at the front if the building were not sited there, to which Mr. Hallen responded affirmatively. Board Member Ambrosia commented that he does not have a problem with moving the building under those circumstances, noting that part of the reason the plan works is that it adds another dimension of a bend in the site, providing both aesthetics and increased pedestrian safety. Chair Moran agreed, but stressed that she would expect some very nice landscaping up front if the building is not sited there. Board Member Ambrosia said that mounding has been an effective

solution in the past, adding that a fence would not be appropriate at this location.

Board Member LaGrow asked about the signage for the project. Mr. Matley explained that a monument sign compatible with the Pheasant Run shopping center is planned for each of the two entrances.

BOARD MEMBER LAGROW MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE PARKING LOT LIGHTING STANDARDS SHALL BE COMPARABLE TO THOSE AT THE PHEASANT RUN SHOPPING CENTER, BUT IN NO CASE SHALL BE MORE THAN 25 FEET.
2. EXTERIOR LIGHTING THAT WASHES THE BUILDING SHALL BE ELIMINATED; HOWEVER, DECORATIVE WALL LIGHTING IS ACCEPTABLE.
3. EITHER OF THE BUILDING CONFIGURATIONS PRESENTED IS ACCEPTABLE; HOWEVER, IF BUILDING C IS NOT LOCATED AT THE FRONT OF THE SITE, LANDSCAPING SHALL BE MAXIMIZED TO HIDE THE PARKING AREA.
4. THE BUILDING COLORS ARE ACCEPTABLE AS SUBMITTED; HOWEVER, THE INTENSITY OF THE COLORS SHALL BE REDUCED.
5. ALL BUILDING SIGNS SHALL HAVE INTERNALLY LIT CHANNEL LETTERS AND SHALL BE SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
6. MONUMENT SIGNS SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THOSE OF THE PHEASANT RUN SHOPPING CENTER AND SHALL BE SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
7. THE FINAL LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL BE SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
8. TREE PLANTING HOLES SHALL BE EXCAVATED SUBJECT TO THE DIRECTION AND APPROVAL OF THE CITY URBAN FORESTER.
9. SUBSTANTIAL BICYCLE PARKING IS RECOMMENDED.
10. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-08.

BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI ABSENT.

Mr. Hallen thanked the Board and complimented its members on their ability to evaluate the quality of projects and make solid decisions.

3.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

4.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

Board Member Ambrosia commented that the awnings at Pluto's were not being built according to the ARB approval and asked staff to keep an eye on the Board's projects, since there is no other policing. Additionally, he asked whether the new Butte College site would be built to conform to the City's lighting standards. Planning Director Seidler replied that the college is not going through the City's use permit process; however, City staff could certainly phone the appropriate staff members at the college to let them know, as a courtesy, what the City's standards are.

5.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Moran adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of April 21, 2004.

August 4, 2004
Date of Approval

Jay Hanson, Associate Planner

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of April 21, 2004

Board Members Present: Sandy Moran (Chair)
Nicholas Ambrosia
Dennis Deromedi
Lorin Ward

Board Members Absent: Philip LaGrow

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Tom Hayes, Senior Planner
Jay Hanson, Associate Planner
Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

ROLL CALL

Chair Moran called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 2.1 ARB 04-09 (Piret Enterprises) Forest Avenue at Parkway Village Drive, APN 002-370-071 -**
Proposed development of two retail commercial buildings totaling 9,975 square feet and containing five suites, one of which will house a bank with a drive-through facility. The two buildings will front on Forest Avenue, with parking at the rear. A promenade with outdoor seating is proposed from Forest Avenue between the buildings to the parking area.

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this item, reviewing the proposed site plan and access, wall and roof colors and materials, landscape plan, signage, and trash enclosure. He stated that the project will be compatible with the adjacent Pheasant Run center and recommended that the Board approve the project subject to resolution of the discussion items and the conditions of approval set forth in the staff report.

There being no questions for staff, the applicant was invited to make a presentation.

Chad Finch of Russell, Gallaway, Associates explained that the intent is to make the building flow, taking in colors and some of the tower features from other buildings in the surrounding area. He said that it will be the nicest looking building possible within the owner's budget. He stated that the owner is unsure about future tenants, so additional parking has been included in the plan to accommodate a potential restaurant.

John Lawrence of Land Image presented new landscape drawings for the Board's review and made a brief presentation. He explained that the new plan ties in the sidewalk from Java Juice, and that plantings around the trash enclosure and crape myrtles in front of the building had been added.

Board Member Deromedi asked what kind of mounding will be used. Mr. Lawrence responded that there is none planned for the turf; however, it could be raised by 15 inches or so by the sidewalk. Board Member Ambrosia asked what types of shrubs are proposed for the front of the building and how tall they will grow. Shawn Rohrbacker of Land Image responded that they are razzleberries, which are an intense green with nice pink blooms, that will grow to approximately 3 feet tall.

There being no further questions of the applicant, the public was invited to comment.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento, said that she likes the proposed landscaping and she is glad to see this exciting project.

There being no further public comment, Chair Moran asked for Board discussion of the project.

Board Member Deromedi said he thinks this will be a good building and that he likes the landscaping, particularly the potted plants and the cross hatching on the sidewalk accents on the east side of the building.

Chair Moran agreed that it will be a nice building.

Board Member Ambrosia said that he likes the parking lot landscaping and the fact that the two buildings are separated, giving a somewhat European appearance and a sense of drawing people in. He added that he likes the details on the sidewalk and that the massing is good.

With regard to the choice of materials, Board Member Ambrosia asked how the transition between the top of the stone facing and the tile will be handled. Mr. Finch responded that it is a pop-out and that every termination is in a soffit.

Board Member Ambrosia asked whether Mr. Finch had considered continuing the foam band above the windows around the rest of the building. Mr. Finch replied that he believes that will be too busy, as there is already substantial definition. Board Member Ward agreed with Mr. Finch.

Board Member Ambrosia then asked what the frames above the stone wall are. Mr. Finch answered that they are metal tube steel painted the same as the storefront, added to give the appearance of windows where there are none. Board Member Ambrosia complimented Mr. Finch on the creative solution to adding interest, but asked whether he had considered using real windows. Mr. Finch explained that the wall is the back of retail spaces, where there are primarily bathrooms and storage areas. Board Member Ambrosia asked whether Mr. Finch had used this idea on other locations, and Mr. Finch said that the Quizno's and Hollywood Video on 20th Street had successfully used a similar idea. Mr. Lawrence then reminded the Board that there will also be crape myrtles along the wall.

Board Member Ambrosia said that the rest of the building looks very nice, but asked whether the Board thought that the colonial red roof would work with all of the adjacent green roofs. Board Member Ward pointed out that there are only two tower-like structures that would be seen, so the effect would be minimal. Board Member Deromedi and Chair Moran both agreed that it would be acceptable.

Board Member Deromedi asked whether the 14 foot lights shown as #23 on the landscape legend should be lowered. Associate Planner Hanson said that the lights should be limited to 12 feet in height.

Board Member Ambrosia suggested that the Board limit the size of the lettering on the wall signs. Chair Moran agreed, saying that it could be added as a condition of approval. Board Member Ward pointed out that there will also be signage in the parking areas, and Board Member Ambrosia said that those signs should be subject to the same limitations.

The Board then discussed the details of the proposed monument sign with Mr. Lawrence, who indicated that it will only list the name of the building. He explained that it will be a seat wall, perhaps 3 feet high, with a stone face.

Board Member Ambrosia then asked whether there are any lights proposed, other than recessed, that the Board should know about. Mr. Finch responded that all of the lights will be in soffits.

BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED AT THIS MEETING, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. **BUILDING SIGNS SHALL UTILIZE CHANNEL LETTERING, LIMITED IN SIZE TO 18 INCHES FOR CAPITAL LETTERS AND 14 INCHES FOR LOWER-CASE LETTERS AND SHALL BE SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.**
2. **FACILITY IDENTIFICATION SIGNAGE SHALL BE SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.**
3. **ANY LIGHTING OTHER THAN WHAT WAS PRESENTED AT THIS MEETING SHALL BE SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.**

4. POLE LIGHTING SHALL BE EQUIPPED WITH SHIELDED FIXTURES USING HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM LIGHTS TO ENSURE THAT NO LIGHTING SPILLS OVER INTO THE ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL YARDS AND SHALL BE LIMITED TO 12 FEET IN HEIGHT.
5. THE TRASH ENCLOSURE SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED WITH METAL GATES AND 6 FOOT HIGH CMU WALLS FINISHED WITH MATERIALS AND COLORS CONSISTENT WITH THE BUILDING.
6. THE FINAL LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL BE SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
7. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-09.

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER LAGROW ABSENT.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Moran adjourned the meeting at 4:32 p.m. to the regular meeting of May 5, 2004.

July 21, 2004
Date of Approval

Jay Hanson, Associate Planner

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 5, 2004
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Sandy Moran, Chair
Nicholas Ambrosia
Dennis Deromedi
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair (*arrived at 4:08 p.m.*)
Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Mark Wolfe, Senior Planner
Jay Hanson, Associate Planner
Bob Summerville, Associate Planner
Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Moran called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 CONSENT AGENDA

- 2.1 ARB 04-10 (Bruno) 85 Declaration Drive, Philadelphia Square, APN 006-210-094** - *Proposed development of a two-story office building containing 4,200 square feet, located in an OC Office Commercial zoning district. The proposed building is located at the rear of the Philadelphia Square office complex, adjacent to State Highway Route 99, and will follow the colonial design theme of the complex. The "Williamsburg Farmhouse" style building will be most prominent from Declaration Drive and will include shuttered windows, roof dormers, gabled roofs, and covered walkways.*

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE ITEM 2.1 AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER WARD SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER LAGROW ABSENT.

3.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 3.1 ARB 97-09 (McHale Sign Company) 2036 Forest Avenue, APN 002-370-067** - *Reconsideration of a previously approved project to change the signage and paint colors for the existing Shell gas station building, gas canopy, and car wash. The proposed paint colors include white finish with red and yellow signage. The property is located at the northwest corner of Baney Lane and Forest Avenue in a CC Community Commercial zoning district.*

Associate Planner Summerville presented the staff report for this project, reviewing the proposed modification and noting that the original approval required the colors to be subdued, for compatibility with foothill viewsheds to the east. He provided the Board with a supplemental staff report containing draft motions for approval or denial of the requested

modification. He then circulated a chart that displayed the existing colors for the Board to compare with the proposed colors and explained that the applicant wants to change the colors to be consistent with Shell's corporate image. Additionally, the applicant is requesting modifications to the existing gas-pricing monument sign and the channel lettering on the canopy sign.

Board Member LaGrow arrived at this time.

There being no questions for staff, Chair Moran opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Finis Jeffers of McHale Sign Company, representing the applicant, explained that Shell has initiated a program called Retail Visual Identification (RVI) to change its old image and enhance the use of the corporate logo.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, asked that the Board not approve the colors as submitted by the applicant, saying that they are "nursery school" colors, inappropriate for sites at the base of the foothills.

There being no further public comments, Chair Moran closed the public hearing.

Chair Moran commented that she cannot see any element of this proposal that is an improvement, noting that the station is currently one of the better looking ones in Chico.

Chair Moran then pointed out that the propane tank needs to be addressed by the Board. Board Member Deromedi asked staff whether the tank could have been placed in an alternate location, to which Associate Planner Summerville responded that it was placed in that location by the applicant without approval from the Planning Division. Board Member Ambrosia asked whether it would be possible to screen the tank, and Associate Planner Summerville replied affirmatively.

Board Member Ambrosia commented that one improvement in the current plan is that the size of the lettering on the sign is smaller than what currently exists, so it is more subtle and attractive. He went on to say that the harsh white and the vibrant colors are too much for what the Board has been attempting to do on Forest Avenue, explaining that the surrounding building colors are more calm and serene. He expressed an additional concern about the lettering on and the illumination of the canopies, which cause them to be more like billboards than shelters.

The Board then briefly discussed with staff the possibility of working with the applicant to find middle ground so that the proposal would not have to be denied or approved as submitted today. Because the Board wished to ask the applicant an additional question regarding the location of the propane tank, Board Member Deromedi moved to reopen the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Board Member Ambrosia, and passed by a unanimous vote.

In response to the Board, applicant Monty Bhogal explained that the propane tank had been placed in its current location due to requirements that it be a certain distance from the building. Chair Moran asked for clarification that the tank could not be placed anywhere else, and Mr. Bhogal confirmed that.

There being no further questions or comments, Chair Moran closed the public hearing.

BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO ARB 97-9 TO ALLOW NEW SIGNAGE AND BUILDING COLORS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE COLORS SHALL BE REVISED TO PROVIDE MORE OF A SUBTLE APPEARANCE.
2. THE PROPOSED MONUMENT SIGN SHALL BE REDUCED TO MEET CODE REQUIREMENTS.
3. THE ILLUMINATION AND LETTERING ON THE CANOPY SHALL BE REMOVED.
4. THE EXISTING PROPANE TANK SHALL EITHER BE RELOCATED TO A LESS CONSPICUOUS PORTION OF THE SITE, WHILE STILL MAINTAINING SAFETY STANDARDS, OR SHALL BE SCREENED EITHER BY A BLOCK WALL OR BY LANDSCAPING SUFFICIENT IN SIZE AND QUANTITY TO HIDE IT WITHIN 2 YEARS' TIME.

BY FRIENDLY AMENDMENT, BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI REVISED CONDITION NUMBER 4 AND ADDED CONDITION NUMBER 5 AS FOLLOWS:

4. THE EXISTING PROPANE TANK SHALL EITHER BE RELOCATED TO A LESS CONSPICUOUS PORTION OF THE SITE, WHILE STILL MAINTAINING SAFETY STANDARDS, OR SHALL BE SCREENED BY A BLOCK WALL AND LANDSCAPING.
5. THE REVISED PLANS SHALL BE REVIEWED BY THE BOARD FOR FINAL APPROVAL AT A SUBSEQUENT MEETING.

BOARD MEMBER WARD SECONDED THE MOTION AS AMENDED, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

- 3.2 ARB 04-11 (BCM Construction Company, Inc.) 183 E. 8th Avenue, APN 003-394-002 and 003** - *Proposed partial façade remodel and construction of a 2,953 square foot addition to an existing 7,078 square foot medical facility. The project includes a new entry, additional parking, and relocation of a fenced patio. The property is located in an OR Office Residential zoning district.*

Senior Planner Wolfe presented the staff report for this project, which proposes to remodel and expand an existing medical office building and parking area. Additional improvements proposed include sidewalks, planter strips, curb, gutter, and partial street section. Staff believes that this is an improvement to the site and recommends that the Board approve the project subject to direction and conditions as set forth in the staff report.

There being no questions for staff, Chair Moran opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Scott January, representing applicant BCM Construction, introduced himself to the Board and said he would be willing to incorporate the changes recommended in the staff report and would be happy to answer any questions.

There being no questions for the applicant, nor any public comments, Chair Moran closed the public hearing and invited Board discussion of the project.

Board Member Ambrosia said he was glad to see an outdoor eating area for employees. Chair Moran agreed, and said that this proposal will represent an upgrade to the existing site.

Board Member Ambrosia expressed an aesthetic concern regarding the size of the new stone relative to the existing stone and said that he would like the existing railing to remain, since it gives the building a nice, rustic look. Board Member LaGrow agreed, adding that the colors look good.

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE EXISTING BUILDING SHALL BE PAINTED TO MATCH THE ADDITION. THE PROPOSED COLORS ARE SATISFACTORY AS PRESENTED.
2. THE EXISTING ROOF MATERIALS WILL EITHER MATCH THE PROPOSED MATERIALS OR BE REPLACED.
3. THE TWO PARCELS FORMING THE SITE SHALL BE CONSOLIDATED PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT.
4. THE EXISTING CHAIN LINK WITH SLATS TRASH ENCLOSURE SHALL BE REPLACED WITH A NEW ENCLOSURE MADE OF STUCCO MATERIALS WITH TRIM TO MATCH THE MAIN STRUCTURE. THE NEW TRASH ENCLOSURE SHALL BE INCLUDED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND ITS DESIGN SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING DIVISION.
5. A DETAILED LANDSCAPE, IRRIGATION, AND LIGHTING PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION AND SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING DIVISION.

6. THE EXISTING 8" X 8" POSTS SHALL REMAIN, WITHOUT THE ADDITION OF THE STONE/STUCCO WORK AT THEIR BASES, AND THE EXISTING RAILINGS SHALL REMAIN.
7. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT SHALL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-11.

BOARD MEMBER LAGROW SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

Discussion regarding existing damage to the posts and rails followed, after which the Board agreed by consensus that if the applicant is unable to comply with Condition 6 of the approval, the project must be brought back to the Board for reconsideration.

3.3 ARB 04-12 (D. H. Slater and Son) Northwest Corner of Hegan Lane and Huss Drive, APN 039-060-125 - *Proposed development of an industrial/business park composed of six single-story buildings, each averaging 28,500 square feet and consisting of 18 to 20 suites. The first phase consists of two buildings containing 27,000 square feet and 30,000 square feet respectively. The project is located on property zoned ML Light Manufacturing/ Industrial.*

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this project, reviewing the proposed exterior materials, landscaping, and site plan. Staff recommends that the Board approve this project, subject to providing direction on the discussion items and to the conditions set forth in the staff report.

There being no questions for staff, Chair Moran opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation.

David Lupton, representing the applicant, first addressed staff concerns about treatment of the interior parking island by explaining that he had originally planned to landscape the island and have compact parking spaces where the finger planters are currently shown; however, due to City Engineering's requirement that the site have 100% retention, it is now a drainage swale. He went on to say that if the shading percentage works out to be less than what is required, it would be possible to alternate the finger planters on the strip.

Mr. Lupton then stated that the trash enclosure will be constructed of CMU block and will be buffered by landscaping, including vines. With regard to the monument sign, he said that it will meet all code requirements and will match the building.

Mr. Lupton then explained that visual relief is provided for the building by the use of split-face block, as well as awnings, except where they would cause a hazard to vehicles in the drive lane. He said that he was open to any ideas the Board might have.

Board Member Ambrosia commented that he hopes the monument sign will be very nice, saying it could be a piece of art. He pointed out that the project immediately across the street to the north used extensive berming to make the buildings almost disappear and asked whether the applicant had considered such an approach. Mr. Lupton responded that there is none proposed at this time and that berming would present a difficulty because the separated curb and sidewalk reduces the usable area to 10 feet in width.

Melinda Vasquez, 260 E. Sacramento, said she appreciates the attempts to make the building more than a box; however, she would like to see the parking area in the back, to make a beltway. She explained that it would provide the employees with a lunch/break area, and the public could also access it. She said that this design tries to make a building that is a box look like it is not a box.

Mr. Lupton responded to Ms. Vasquez's comments by explaining that this site is in an ML Light Manufacturing zone, and that with the buildings double-loaded back to back, the roll-up doors, and the 9 driveways, it would be very difficult to provide such an area.

The Board then discussed with Mr. Lupton the opportunities to use additional split-face block or paint accents to provide more interest on the Hegan Lane elevation and landscaping with mounding to help screen the parking/loading area. In response to a question from Board Member Ambrosia, Mr. Lupton confirmed that the wall pack lights will be shielded downward to keep them from shining on the street. Board Member Ambrosia said that he would like to see columns painted on the Hegan Lane elevation, and Mr. Lupton agreed to provide them.

There being no further comments or questions, Chair Moran closed the public hearing.

BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE TRASH ENCLOSURES SHALL BE FINISHED WITH MATERIALS AND COLORS CONSISTENT WITH THE BUILDING, SHALL HAVE STEEL GATES, AND SHALL BE LANDSCAPED WITH CLINGING VINES.
2. PARKING STALLS AND LANDSCAPING SHALL BE PROVIDED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF CODE SECTION 19.70. THE FINAL PARKING DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL BE SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
3. BERMING SHALL BE PROVIDED ALONG BOTH HUSS LANE AND HEGAN LANE, UTILIZING THE FULL 10 FOOT WIDTH OF THE LANDSCAPE AREA, TO PROVIDE MAXIMUM SCREENING FOR THE PARKING AREA.
4. METAL ROOFING USED FOR THE CANOPIES SHALL BE APPLIED IN A VERTICAL FASHION ABOVE THE FENESTRATION ON THE HEGAN LANE

ELEVATION, AND 2 PAINTED CHARCOAL COLUMNS SHALL BE ADDED TO MATCH THE OTHER ELEVATIONS.

5. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-12.

BOARD MEMBER WARD SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

- 3.4 ARB 04-13 (Herrera/MCG Architects) Northwest Corner of Mangrove Avenue and Vallombrosa Avenue, APN 003-210-004, 006, 011, 015, and 017** - *Proposed development of a retail shopping center containing three buildings totaling 19,850 square feet. Building 1 will contain four suites with a total of 8,600 square feet, Building 2 will contain three suites with a total of 5,950 square feet, and Building 3 will contain two suites, including a proposed drive-through facility, for a total of 5,300 square feet. The proposed drive-through facility will require a separate hearing for a use permit. The property currently contains four buildings that will be demolished prior to the development of the proposed project. The majority of the project is located in a CC Community Commercial zoning district, with a portion located in a PQ Public/Quasi-Public zoning district.*

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this project, reviewing the building design features, conceptual landscaping, parking lot lighting, and parking design. Staff recommends approval of the project, subject to making the required findings, resolving the discussion items outlined in the staff report, and the recommended conditions of approval.

Board Member Deromedi commented that the required revision to the parking design could dramatically alter the landscape plan. Associate Planner Hanson replied that the numbers are not very far off, but agreed that if the plan were to change significantly, it could be brought back to the Board for review.

There being no questions for staff, Chair Moran opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation.

David Blair, of MCG Architects, stated that the conditions of approval outlined in the staff report are acceptable. He added that he does not anticipate that adjusting the parking design to add the two additional required spaces will cause significant changes to the landscape plan.

Board Member Ward asked about monument signs. Associate Planner Hanson replied that there were no monument signs proposed and suggested that the Board discuss with the applicant any concerns with respect to size and location. Board Member Ward said that the multiple occupancies in the building might lend itself to the use of monument signs for the purpose of indexing the occupants, pointing out that the elevations already seem a little busy.

Chair Moran asked project landscape architect Jason Bisho to provide additional detail regarding the landscaping of the site's front corner. Mr. Bisho explained that a parkway strip and seat walls are proposed along the frontage to make it pedestrian friendly and usable, with landscaping used to separate pedestrians from traffic. He pointed out that the existing purple leaf plum tree will be retained. Chair Moran commented that she wants to see very heavy landscaping in that area. Mr. Bisho responded that although the landscaping will be kept low, it will provide visual relief to break up the asphalt, and he pointed out that the landscaping is not intended to screen the building, since it is attractive.

Board Member Ambrosia then asked whether or not the driveway width could be reduced to 24 feet, to which Associate Planner Hanson responded affirmatively.

Susan Mason, P.O. Box 3036, commented that she thinks the proposed palm tree is inappropriate, and that the Chinese pistache is on the Friends of Bidwell Park's list of invasive trees.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, remarked that overall, this is a very nice project; however, with the outdoor seating near the drive-through, it would be an unpleasant place to sit because of the fumes from cars idling. She stated that there should be more parking spaces, the drive-through should be eliminated, the palm tree is inappropriate, and additional plum trees should be planted.

Patrick LeHane, 11 Avante Way, representing the Chico Cemetery, stated that people currently hop the fence to cut through the cemetery and expressed concern that this project might escalate the problem. He asked whether there will be fencing or a barrier of some type to discourage people from using the cemetery as a shortcut. Associate Planner Hanson responded that there will be a line of Carolina laurel cherries (shrubs) that will provide a solid screen within 2 to 3 years. Mr. Bisho confirmed that the shrubs will grow very quickly.

David Wilson, 648 Bryant Avenue, remarked that he agreed with the previous comments regarding the palm trees, saying that he would like the entire corner to be thought of as a "unit" with landscaping similar to adjacent projects.

Melinda Vasquez, 260 E. Sacramento Avenue, spoke against the proposal for a drive-through, stating that it would continue to "stress out" an already congested major intersection. She pointed out that it is the entry to the park, reiterating that the addition of a drive-through would be a gross mistake. Associate Planner Hanson explained that the proposed drive-through will require a separate hearing for a use permit.

Ms. Vasquez then said that she would like to see additional plum trees and the required minimum landscape planters.

There being no further comments, Chair Moran closed the public hearing.

Board Member LaGrow asked for the reasoning behind the use of a palm tree in the landscaping. Mr. Bisho responded that it is classic California landscaping, identifying where the property is located, and cited Bidwell Mansion as another location with palm trees. He then said that because the existing flowering plum has already attained its maximum height, the palm tree would serve to take the visual upward. He added that if the Board does not like the palm tree, an alternative could be entertained.

Board Member Ambrosia said that he thinks the massing works quite well, and that he likes the variations of façades and colors, although the colors themselves may be a bit vibrant. He expressed concern with the signage and said he would like to limit the height of the lettering to 12 inches for all capital letters, or if upper and lower case is used, 18 inches for the upper case letters and 12 inches for the lower case letters.

The Board then questioned safe pedestrian access and ADA requirements. Kenny Cruz, representing the applicant, stated that he would prefer to avoid the main drive through area for pedestrian activity for safety reasons, and he has no plans to use any scoring or special materials to invite foot traffic. Principal Planner Bishow said that Building staff will require a safe pedestrian crossing.

Chair Moran then reviewed the conditions recommended in the staff report, noting that the project architect had agreed to comply with all of them.

Gregg Steele, representing the applicant, asked whether the signage should be brought back to the Board. Associate Planner Hanson responded that the Board typically gives direction to staff to review and approve the signage, with the option to return to the Board if necessary.

The Board then discussed driveway locations and the project's impact on traffic. Chair Moran suggested that those issues be left for the Planning Commission. Board Member Ambrosia said that he would like to have the driveway widths narrowed to 24 feet, because it would be more aesthetically pleasing, it would cause traffic to slow down and increase pedestrian safety, and it would allow more opportunity for landscaping.

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE LOCATION AND DESIGN OF SIGNS SHALL BE REVIEWED BY THE BOARD AT A FUTURE MEETING.**
- 2. POLE LIGHTING SHALL BE LIMITED TO A MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 14 FEET AND SHALL BE SUBJECT TO CITY STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.**
- 3. THE PALM TREE SHALL BE ELIMINATED FROM THE LANDSCAPE PLAN.**

4. THE TWO DRIVEWAYS OFF OF MANGROVE AVENUE SHALL BE REDUCED TO 24 FEET IN WIDTH.
5. THE TRASH ENCLOSURE SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED OF 6 FOOT HIGH CMU WALLS FINISHED WITH MATERIALS AND COLORS COMPATIBLE WITH THE BUILDINGS AND SHALL HAVE METAL GATES.
6. THE CONCRETE WALKWAY WITH DECORATIVE SCORING SHALL BE EXTENDED ACROSS THE PRIMARY DRIVEWAY ACCESS TO PROVIDE A PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION BETWEEN BUILDINGS 1 AND 2.
7. A LANDSCAPE PLANTER ISLAND SHALL BE INSTALLED IN THE MIDDLE OF THE CONCRETE WALKWAY WITHIN THE DRIVEWAY TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC CALMING AND SAFETY FOR PEDESTRIANS CROSSING THE VEHICLE ACCESS BETWEEN THE STORES.
8. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT SHALL APPLY FOR AND OBTAIN APPROVAL OF A USE PERMIT FOR THE PROPOSED DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY, WHICH MAY REQUIRE A TRAFFIC REPORT OR ON-SITE CIRCULATION STUDY.
9. PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT SHALL REVISE THE SITE PLAN TO PROVIDE THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES, THE MINIMUM PARKING SPACE DIMENSIONS, AND THE MINIMUM LANDSCAPE PLANTER WIDTHS REQUIRED BY CITY STANDARDS.
10. PRIOR TO DEVELOPMENT, FOR THE PARCEL CURRENTLY ZONED PQ PUBLIC/QUASI PUBLIC, THE APPLICANT SHALL APPLY FOR AND RECEIVE APPROVAL OF A REZONE TO CC COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL.
11. AS A PART OF THE BUILDING PERMIT PLAN CHECK SUBMITTAL, THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A TREE PRESERVATION PLAN TO ENSURE THAT FUTURE DEVELOPMENT DOES NOT IMPACT THE EXISTING TREES LOCATED ALONG THE NORTHERLY PROPERTY LINE ADJACENT TO THE CEMETERY.
12. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-13.

BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

4.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

5.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

None.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Moran adjourned the meeting at 5:58 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of May 19, 2004.

November 17, 2004
Date of Approval

Jay Hanson, Associate Planner

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of May 19, 2004
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Sandy Moran, Chair
Dennis Deromedi
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Lorrin Ward

Board Members Absent: Nicholas Ambrosia

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Mark Wolfe, Senior Planner
Jay Hanson, Associate Planner
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Moran called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 REGULAR AGENDA

2.1 ARB 04-14 (Vinsonhaler/Granicher) 1281 East Avenue, APN 048-220-086 - Proposed development of a one-story, 2,600 square foot office building in an OR Office Residential zoning district. The proposed office building will be finished with stucco and stone veneer, and will be sited toward the street, with parking at the rear.

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this project, reviewing the proposed building design and materials, vehicle access, fencing and screening techniques, and landscaping and lighting plans. Staff is recommending that the Board approve the project subject to resolution of the discussion items and the recommended conditions of approval set forth in the staff report.

Board Member Deromedi recused himself from participation in the Board's review of this project, due to his personal friendship with the applicant.

There being no questions for staff, Chair Moran opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Project architect Tim Miller, on behalf of the applicant, said that he had nothing to add to the information contained in the staff report and offered to answer any questions from the Board.

Board Member LaGrow asked what type of lighting will be used in the parking area. Applicant Cliff Vinsonhaler responded that he would like to use 3 foot bollards so as not to encroach on the adjacent residential properties. Mr. Miller noted that two additional lights might be needed in the peninsulas for a total of six.

Chair Moran verified that the size of plants used for screening will be at least 5 gallon. Associate Planner Hanson confirmed that it is included in the recommended conditions of approval in the staff report.

Chair Moran then mentioned that the building looks like it will be nice; however, she expressed concern that the rear elevation appears to have very little articulation. Mr. Miller replied that it will be the same style as the rest of the building, with inset windows and 8 inch pop outs. Board Member LaGrow asked whether there will be a color change on the pop outs, to which Mr. Miller responded negatively.

Board Member Ward said that the rear elevation faces East Avenue, which is important, and suggested that the applicant create a false entrance by using plastic columns and a dormer-like shape above it, which would add articulation and continue the theme from the other elevations. Mr. Vinsonhaler said that he liked that idea and asked whether or not he would have to come back to the Board for final review. By consensus, the Board agreed that the revision could be shown on the final building plans, subject to staff review and approval.

Board Member Ward asked about whether or not the monument sign will cause sight distance problems. Associate Planner Hanson answered that staff will look at that during the sign review.

Board Member LaGrow verified with the applicant that the trash enclosure will have metal gates and be constructed of materials consistent with the building.

Mr. Miller then said that the applicant plans to build a mirror image of this project on a lot he owns across Sunflower Court and asked whether or not that project could be approved administratively. Principal Planner Bishow responded that a new application and Board review will be required because of the intervening public right-of-way.

There being no further questions of the applicant nor any further public comment, Chair Moran closed the public hearing.

BOARD MEMBER LAGROW MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. **PARKING LOT LIGHTING SHALL CONSIST OF NOT MORE THAN SIX 3-4 FOOT BOLLARDS.**
2. **THE TRASH ENCLOSURE SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED OF MATERIALS AND FINISHED IN COLORS CONSISTENT WITH THE BUILDING AND SHALL HAVE METAL GATES.**
3. **THE EAST AVENUE ELEVATION SHALL HAVE ROOF ARTICULATION SIMILAR TO THE FRONT ENTRY.**

4. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT SHALL BE SCREENED WITH PLANTS OF SUFFICIENT SIZE (MINIMUM 5 GALLON) TO PROVIDE AN IMMEDIATE VISUAL BARRIER.
5. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT SHALL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-14.

BOARD MEMBER WARD SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A VOTE OF 3-1-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI DISQUALIFIED AND BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA ABSENT.

2.2 ARB 04-15 (Hignell and Hignell) 1512-1606 Mangrove Avenue, APN 003-042-044 -
Proposed façade remodel of an existing shopping center including a new roof design, building color scheme, signage, and details to supporting columns. The property is located in a CC Community Commercial zoning district.

Senior Planner Wolfe presented the staff report for this project, reviewing the proposed changes to the roof arcade, signage, lighting, materials, and colors. He explained staff's concerns regarding the addition of the parapet feature, noting that although it is a better and more durable location for the sign, the manner in which the sign is affixed to the building borders on roof mounting, which is prohibited by City code. Staff is recommending that the Board approve the project subject to resolution of the discussion items and the recommended conditions of approval set forth in the staff report.

In response to a question from Chair Moran, Senior Planner Wolfe replied that the proposed sign will have 14 inch channel letters. Board Member LaGrow asked why no additional landscaping is shown on the submitted plans. Senior Planner Wolfe responded that staff will be working with the applicant on improving existing landscaping rather than adding anything new.

There being no further questions for staff, Chair Moran opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Project architect Don Russell presented the Board with a sample of the proposed signage and said that although the original submittal had shown 14 inch letters, the applicant is now requesting approval for use of letters up to 24 inches tall. Board Member Ward asked why, and Mr. Russell responded that the smaller letters will not be visible enough with the sign placed so high on the building. Eric Martin of Hignell, Inc. pointed out that the letters on the existing sign are up to 24 inches tall.

Board Member LaGrow asked why there is over lighting shown on the sign if the letters are individually channel lit. Mr. Martin explained that both sets of lights will be set on one timer; the letter lights will go off and the accent lights will come on at 11:00 p.m. Board Member LaGrow expressed concern that if the over lighting is too bright, it will show dirt on the parapet and roof.

The Board and staff then discussed what the code allows with regard to the size of the sign and whether it should be categorized as wall- or roof-mounted, after which the Board agreed by consensus that it is wall-mounted. Senior Planner Wolfe noted that the staff report includes a recommendation that the applicant provide a comprehensive sign plan which can be reviewed and approved by Planning staff.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, said that she hopes more trees can be added to shade the parking lot. Mr. Martin replied that part of the 2% landscaping improvement will be the addition of trees in the parking islands.

There being no further questions for the applicant, nor any further public comment, Chair Moran closed the public hearing.

Board Member LaGrow remarked that this project will represent a major improvement to the building, which is over 30 years old. He said that he likes the lighter colors and that changing the roof will modernize the look, and added that even the accent lighting will look sharp as long as it is not too bright. Senior Planner Wolfe suggested that the Board indicate in its approval that it is accent lighting only, not intended to light the building, and direct staff to work with the architect to make sure the final plans comply with the Board's intent.

The Board then discussed the proposed changes to the wall and monument signs, deciding by consensus to direct the applicant to work with staff to prepare a comprehensive sign program which will be brought back to the Board for final review and approval.

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE APPLICANT SHALL REFURBISH ALL EXISTING LANDSCAPE AREAS DISTURBED DURING THE FAÇADE REMODEL PROCESS AND PROVIDE ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING, PARTICULARLY PARKING LOT SHADE TREES TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE, IN COMPLIANCE WITH CMC SECTION 19.68.040(C).
2. THE APPLICANT SHALL WORK WITH CITY STAFF TO PREPARE A COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PLAN INCLUDING HEIGHT, STYLE, AND COLOR, WHICH SHALL BE PRESENTED TO THE BOARD FOR FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL. THE LETTER HEIGHT SHALL BE LIMITED TO A MAXIMUM OF 24 INCHES, WHICH MAY BE REDUCED BY THE BOARD UPON FINAL REVIEW.
3. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE FAÇADE REMODEL SHALL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-15.

BOARD MEMBER LAGROW SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA ABSENT.

2.3 **ARB 04-16 (Peitz/Pierce) 1274 N. Cedar Street, APN 043-142-021** - *Proposed development of an additional single-family residence located at the rear of the site in an R2 Medium Density Residential zoning district. The proposed single-story, three-bedroom structure with attached two-car garage will be 1,181 square feet. Three additional on-site parking spaces are also proposed at the rear of the site.*

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this project, reviewing the proposed building design and materials, parking locations, fencing requirements, and landscaping.

There being no questions for staff, Chair Moran opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Applicant Kevin Pierce provided a revised site plan for the Board's review, saying that the new plan addresses staff's concerns regarding landscaping and pointing out that bike racks had also been added. He advised the Board that the trash container will simply be a wheeled receptacle stored in the garage and that the only exterior lighting will be wall mounted on the house.

The Board and staff then briefly discussed with Mr. Pierce the need to reconfigure the parking area to include the additional three spaces required by City code. The Board decided by consensus to leave the final parking plan to staff for review and approval.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, said that she hopes the existing trees do not get sacrificed for parking.

There being no further questions for the applicant, nor any further public comment, Chair Moran closed the public hearing.

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. **PRIOR TO FINAL OCCUPANCY, THE APPLICANT SHALL INSTALL 6 FOOT SOLID WOODEN FENCING ALONG THE REAR AND SIDE PROPERTY LINES IN COMPLIANCE WITH CMC SECTION 19.60.060.**
2. **THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A LANDSCAPE PLAN, INCLUDING SCREENING FOR GROUND-MOUNTED MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT, AS PART OF THE BUILDING PERMIT PLAN CHECK REVIEW. PLANTS USED FOR SCREENING MUST BE OF SUFFICIENT SIZE TO PROVIDE AN IMMEDIATE VISUAL BARRIER.**
3. **THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A MINIMUM OF TWO BICYCLE RACKS IN A SECURE AREA, THE LOCATIONS OF WHICH SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT PLAN CHECK REVIEW.**
4. **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A PARKING DESIGN WITH A MINIMUM OF THREE PARKING SPACES IN ADDITION TO THE DOUBLE-CAR GARAGE.**

5. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT SHALL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-16.

BOARD MEMBER WARD SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA ABSENT.

2.4 ARB 04-07 (Gillis/Hays) 2499 Bruce Road, APN 002-210-027 - Final review of a proposal to construct a 6,500 square foot building for office/retail/wholesale use. The project also includes an off-street parking area for 25 vehicles.

Associate Planner Hanson presented the staff report for this project, providing an overview of the changes the applicant has made since the Board's initial review. Staff believes that the majority of the Board's concerns have been addressed; however, staff still has concerns regarding the parking configuration, which may present a problem for emergency vehicles due to the shortened turning radius. Staff is recommending approval of the project subject to the recommended modifications and conditions of approval set forth in the staff report.

In response to a question from Board Member LaGrow, Associate Planner Hanson said that the fencing is proposed to be constructed of solid wood.

There being no further questions for staff, Chair Moran opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Applicant Sherry Gillis said that the purpose of the fence is to prevent dumping into the adjacent swale. She went on to say that the building size has been reduced to avoid the need for a variance, new colors have been chosen to blend with some of the surrounding buildings, and the landscaping has been revised to comply with staff's request.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether the applicant has a design in mind for the fence. Applicant Doug Gillis responded that he is open to suggestions. Board Member LaGrow said that the fence will be visible from the Skyway, so it should have an attractive design, and it will also have to be strong to withstand the wind. Mrs. Gillis said that the fence will be temporary, since they are attempting to purchase the adjacent property.

Chair Moran asked what color the awning fabric will be. Mr. Gillis replied that it will be a color that blends with the darker of the building colors. Board Member Ward remarked that it would be nice to have the fence color blend with the building as well.

Board Member LaGrow then asked whether or not there will be any skylights on the building, and Mr. Gillis answered that there will be skylights on the Skyway elevation. Board Member LaGrow remarked that the skylights should be smoke-colored glass with anodized frames painted to match the building, and the Board agreed by consensus to include that condition in its motion for approval.

Board Member LaGrow asked whether the doors are glass, to which Mr. Gillis replied that the front door is glass and that the others will be painted to match the darker of the two building colors. Board Member LaGrow stressed that the doors should blend with the building so as not to stand out at all.

There being no further questions for the applicant, nor any other public comment, Chair Moran closed the public hearing.

BOARD MEMBER LAGROW MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED, SUBJECT TO THE FINDINGS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS FOLLOWS:

1. THE LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL BE REVISED SO THAT (A) AT THE SOUTHERLY PORTION OF THE SITE, A CONTINUOUS PLANTER SHALL BE PROVIDED IN FRONT OF THE BUILDING, ALONG THE FENCE, AND DOWN THE EASTERLY PROPERTY LINE; (B) THE PROPOSED PLANTER THAT WOULD SEGMENT THE LAWN SHALL BE ELIMINATED; AND (C) AN ISLAND PLANTER WITH FLOWERING SHRUBS AND GROUND COVER SHALL BE PROVIDED AROUND THE MONUMENT SIGN VISIBLE FROM THE SKYWAY. THE FINAL LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT PLANS FOR STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
2. THE LANDSCAPE PLANTERS CONTAINING SHADE TREES SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF 6 FEET WIDE, AND ALL TREES WITHIN THE PLANTER AREA SHALL BE LOCATED SO AS TO ALLOW ROOM FOR PROPER GROWTH.
3. THE PARKING LOT DESIGN AND ON-SITE CIRCULATION SHALL BE REVISED (A) TO PROVIDE THE MINIMUM NUMBER AND DIMENSIONS OF PARKING SPACES REQUIRED BY CODE; (B) TO ALLOW TWO-FOOT VEHICLE OVERHANG ONLY OVER PLANTER AREAS WITH HEARTY, LOW-GROWING MATERIALS; AND (C) TO DELETE THE THREE SPACES OPPOSITE THE SOUTH DRIVEWAY AND THE SPACE IN FRONT OF THE BUILDING, CLOSEST TO THE TRASH ENCLOSURE, TO IMPROVE OVERALL INTERIOR CIRCULATION. THE FINAL PARKING DESIGN SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT PLANS FOR STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
4. THE SIX-FOOT FENCE ALONG THE EASTERLY PROPERTY LINE SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED OF REDWOOD OR CEDAR, WITH 2-INCH MINIMUM TRIM BOARD AND A TOP CAP.
5. THE PARKING LOT LIGHTING SHALL NOT EXCEED 14 FEET IN HEIGHT AND SHALL BE DOWNLIT, SHOEBOX-STYLE FIXTURES.
6. BUILDING LIGHTING SHALL BE WASHED DOWN SO AS NOT TO SHINE OUT

7. INTO TRAFFIC OR ILLUMINATE ONTO THE SKYWAY.
ANY ROOF PENETRATIONS SHALL BE PAINTED TO MATCH THE ROOF.
8. SKYLIGHTS SHALL BE OF SMOKE-COLORED GLASS, WITH ANODIZED FRAMES PAINTED TO MATCH THE ROOF.
9. THE STUCCO FINISH ON THE BUILDING SHALL BE SMOOTH OR MEDIUM, NOT HEAVY TROWEL.
10. DOORS SHALL BE PAINTED TO MATCH THE BUILDING.
11. THE AWNING SHALL BE FINISHED IN A COLOR CONSISTENT WITH THE BUILDING.
12. THE TRASH ENCLOSURE SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED OF MATERIALS AND FINISHED IN COLORS CONSISTENT WITH THE BUILDING AND SHALL HAVE METAL GATES.
13. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE BUILDING PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PROJECT SHALL BE DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVAL OF ARB 04-07.

BOARD MEMBER DEROMEDI SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER AMBROSIA ABSENT.

3.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

4.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

None.

5.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Moran adjourned the meeting at 5:34 p.m. to the regular meeting of June 2, 2004.

12/01/2004
Date of Approval

Copies of this Agenda
Available from
Telephone:

City Planning Office
411 Main Street
(530) 895-4851

Agenda Prepared: 08/12/04
Agenda Posted: 08/13/04
Prior to: 5:00 PM

**CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF AUGUST 18, 2004
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1
4:00 P.M.

NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the adjourned regular meeting of the City of Chico Architectural Review Board scheduled for Wednesday, August 18, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. is adjourned to Wednesday, September 1, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1 of the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street, Chico, California.

Distribution:

Board Members (5)

ACM Dunlap

CDD Baptiste

ACDD Sellers

Mayor Kirk

Building Official Purvis

DPW McKinley

City Clerk

CM/Front Desk

Media (6)

Arts Projects Coordinator

Street Address Coordinator

Planning Director Seidler

Principal Planner Bishow

Senior Planner - Current

Associate Planner Hanson

Urban Forester Boza

SPCE Kotysan

Public Counter

Enterprise-Record

News & Review

Post

Utilities

ARB Chrono

Valley Contractors Exchange, 951 East 8th Street, Chico, CA 95928

League of Women Voters, c/o Catherine Carl, P.O. Box 7541, Chico, CA 95927-7541

Cinecon Group, Inc., 775 Entler Avenue, Chico, CA 95928

Conroy Construction, 1161 E. 9th Street, Chico, CA 95926

Robertson & Dominick, 888 Manzanita Court, Suite A, Chico, CA 95926-2369

Copies of this Agenda
Available from
Telephone:

City Planning Office
411 Main Street
(530) 895-4851

Agenda Prepared: 09/10/04
Agenda Posted: 09/10/04
Prior to: 5:00 PM

**CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 15, 2004
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1
4:00 P.M.

NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the adjourned regular meeting of the City of Chico Architectural Review Board scheduled for Wednesday, September 15, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. is adjourned to Wednesday, October 6, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1 of the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street, Chico, California.

Distribution:

Board Members (5)
ACM Dunlap
CDD Baptiste
ACDD Sellers
Mayor Kirk
Building Official Purvis
DPW McKinley
City Clerk
CM/Front Desk
Arts Projects Coordinator
Street Address Coordinator

Post
Planning Director Seidler
Principal Planner Bishow
Senior Planner Sigona
Associate Planner Hanson
Urban Forester Boza
SPCE Kotysan
Public Counter
Enterprise-Record
News & Review
Utilities
ARB Chrono

Valley Contractors Exchange, 951 East 8th Street, Chico, CA 95928
League of Women Voters, c/o Catherine Carl, P.O. Box 7541, Chico, CA 95927-7541
Cinecon Group, Inc., 775 Entler Avenue, Chico, CA 95928
Conroy Construction, 1161 E. 9th Street, Chico, CA 95926
Robertson & Dominick, 888 Manzanita Court, Suite A, Chico, CA 95926-2369

Copies of this Agenda
Available from
Telephone:

City Planning Office
411 Main Street
(530) 895-4851

Agenda Prepared: 10/29/04
Agenda Posted: 10/29/04
Prior to: 5:00 PM

**CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 3, 2004
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1
4:00 P.M.

NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the regular meeting of the City of Chico Architectural Review Board scheduled for Wednesday, November 3, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. is adjourned to Wednesday, November 17, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1 of the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street, Chico, California.

Distribution:

Board Members (5)
CM
CDD
ACDD
Mayor Kirk
Building Official
SPCE
DPW
CM/Front Desk
City Clerk
Post

Planning Director
Principal Planner
Senior Planner Sigona
Associate Planner Hanson
Urban Forester
Arts Projects Coordinator
Public Counter
Enterprise-Record
News & Review
Utilities
ARB Chrono

Valley Contractors Exchange, 951 East 8th Street, Chico, CA 95928
League of Women Voters, c/o Catherine Carl, P.O. Box 7541, Chico, CA 95927-7541
Cinecon Group, Inc., 775 Entler Avenue, Chico, CA 95928
Conroy Construction, 1161 E. 9th Street, Chico, CA 95926
Robertson & Dominick, 888 Manzanita Court, Suite A, Chico, CA 95926-2369