

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 5, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

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

1.0 ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 ORIENTATION OF NEW BOARD MEMBERS

Principal Planner Bishow provided orientation materials to the Board and made a brief presentation.

3.0 ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

Board Member Ward nominated Board Member Ambrosia as Chair and Board Member LaGrow as Vice Chair. Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5-0.

4.0 REGULAR AGENDA

4.1 ARB 03-31 (Fong) 2838 Esplanade, APN 006-230-048

Proposed development of six townhouse apartment buildings, for a total of 23 units, on a 1.2 acre site located in a CC Community Commercial zoning district.

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing at 4:36 p.m. Applicant Howard Fong and builder Pat Conroy provided information and answered questions about the project. Karen Laslo and Melinda Vasquez expressed concern about the perimeter treatment along the Esplanade. There being no further public comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

Chair Ambrosia moved that the Board approve the project based on the required findings and subject to the following conditions of approval:

- 1. Building elevations facing the exterior of the project shall be finished to match those facing the interior of the project with regard to the use of horizontal siding along the gables, wood trim along the windows and doors, and brackets, and shall be painted to match using the same two colors, separated by belly bands.*
- 2. Detailed proposals for overhangs above the sliding doors and for perimeter treatment along the Esplanade, including fencing and berming, shall be submitted for Board review and approval at a subsequent meeting.*
- 3. Signage shall be subject to staff review and approval.*

Board Member LaGrow seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5-0.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of January 5, 2005

4.2 ARB 04-40 (RGA/Russell) 115 Meyers Street, APN 039-430-046

Proposed exterior remodel of an existing building and upgrade of a parking lot located in a CS Service Commercial zoning district.

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing at 5:15 p.m. Applicant Chad Finch provided information and answered questions about the project. Melinda Vasquez spoke in favor of the project. There being no further public comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

Board Member LaGrow moved that the Board approve the project based on the required findings and subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. *Signage, landscaping, and bicycle parking shall be subject to staff review and approval.*
2. *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 04-40.*

Chair Ambrosia seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5-0.

5.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Melinda Vasquez and Karen Laslo addressed the Board concerning the need to weigh the property owner's desire for privacy with the public's right to have pedestrian access along the Esplanade.

6.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

Principal Planner Bishow updated the Board on the current staffing vacancies.

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 5:56 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of January 19, 2005.

Approved: February 6, 2008

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of January 19, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

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

1.0 ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REMARKS/WELCOME TO NEW BOARD MEMBERS

Planning Director Seidler distributed informational material and provided suggestions to assist the new Board members in understanding their roles and responsibilities.

3.0 REGULAR AGENDA

3.1 ARB 04-39 (Murray/Sicke) Eastern terminus of Morrow Lane, APN 002-200-035

Proposed construction of a 50,300 square foot retail showroom and warehouse building on a vacant 2.78 acre site in the CS Commercial Services zoning district.

Board Member Goulart disqualified herself from participating in the Board's review of this project due to a professional conflict of interest.

Associate Planner Summerville presented the staff report. Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Applicant Steve Sicke, landscape architect Brian Firth, and applicant representative Bill Elliott provided information and answered questions about the project. Melinda Vasquez, Karen Laslo, and Jill Cooper provided comments and suggestions. There being no further comment, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

Board Member LaGrow moved that the Board approve the project based on the findings contained in the staff report and subject to the following conditions of approval:

- 1. The shrubs along the Skyway shall be maintained at a minimum height of four feet.*
- 2. The applicant shall provide a colored or textured pedestrian path to the front building entrance, subject to compliance with ADA requirements and final review and approval by City staff.*
- 3. Public sidewalks shall be four feet wide along the Skyway and five feet wide along Morrow Lane.*
- 4. Wall pack lighting shall be high pressure sodium lamps, directed downward, and shall be mounted no higher than four feet.*

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of January 19, 2005

5. *Fountain lighting may be directed upward; however, it shall be low voltage, sufficient to illuminate only the fountain. The applicant is directed to exercise extreme caution to ensure that no light extends into the night sky.*
6. *Lighting for the business signage shall be directed downward.*
7. *Building colors shall be similar to the color rendering received at the meeting, and the roof color shall be rust or terra cotta and shall not be reflective. The final color selections shall be submitted to the Board for approval at a future meeting.*
8. *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 04-39.*

Board Member Ward seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (Goulart disqualified).

3.2 ARB 05-01 (Martinovich) 3104 Esplanade, APN 006-200-011

Proposed construction of a car wash facility on a vacant 0.74 acre site in the CS Commercial Services zoning district.

Associate Planner Summerville presented the staff report. Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Applicant Steve Martinovich, project architect David Rogers, and landscape architect Brian Firth provided information and answered questions about the project. Melinda Vasquez, Karen Laslo, and Jill Cooper provided comments and suggestions. There being no further comment, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

Chair Ambrosia moved that the Board approve the project based on the findings contained in the staff report and subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. *Pole lighting along the south side of the site shall be limited to a maximum height of 12 feet, and the fixtures shall be equipped with side and rear cowls to deflect light away from the back yards of existing single-family residences.*
2. *Neon lighting of any kind on the site is prohibited .*
3. *All lighting for landscaping and signage shall be directed downward.*
4. *Project signage shall be redesigned with a cantilevered canopy to contain its lighting and shall be subject to staff review and approval.*
5. *All exterior lighting fixtures shall use high pressure, low intensity sodium lamps.*
6. *Canopies for the vacuum islands shall be opaque enough to prevent any light seepage from the inside to the outside. Light fixtures under the canopies shall be installed in such a way that they are not visible from the Esplanade.*
7. *The applicant shall place a note on the front page of the building plans indicating that the project will be developed in compliance with the approval of ARB 05-01.*

Board Member LaGrow seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5-0.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of January 19, 2005

4.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

5.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

Principal Planner Bishow updated the Board on the recruitment for an assistant planner.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 6:17 p.m. to the regular meeting of February 2, 2005.

Approved: February 6, 2008

Copies of this Agenda
Available from
Telephone:

City Planning Office
411 Main Street
(530) 879-6800

Agenda Prepared: 01/28/05
Agenda Posted: 01/28/05
Prior to: 5:00 PM

**CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 2, 2005
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, February 2, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. is adjourned to Wednesday, February 16, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1 of the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street, Chico, California.

Distribution:

Board Members (5)
City Manager
CDD Baptiste
ACDD Sellers
Councilor Kirk
Building Official
DPW McKinley
City Clerk
CM/Front Desk
Art Projects Coordinator
Street Address Coordinator

Planning Director Seidler
Principal Planner Bishow
Senior Planner Sigona
Associate Planner Summerville
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

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of February 16, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Ed Palmeri, Associate Planner
Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 2, 2004

Board Member Ward moved that the Board approve the minutes as submitted. Chair Ambrosia seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5-0.

2.2 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 16, 2004

Chair Ambrosia moved that the Board approve the minutes as submitted. Board Member Ertle seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5-0.

3.0 REGULAR AGENDA

3.1 ARB 05-02 (Alliance Chico Energy) 1075 E. 20th Street, APN 005-550-033 - Proposed installation of an auxiliary energy station, consisting of four fuel cell generators and a step-up transformer, at the Sierra Nevada Brewery site located in an ML Light Manufacturing/ Industrial zoning district. The fuel cell units will be screened with a six-foot wooden fence and landscaping.

Associate Planner Palmeri presented the staff report for this project, reviewing the size and location of the proposed fuel cell generators and step-up transformer. He explained that the applicant provided a noise analysis that indicates the noise is within acceptable levels and does not require sound attenuation.

There being no questions for staff, Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing.

Chair Ambrosia asked what type of lighting will be provided for security, etc. Christine Henning, representing the applicant, replied that the existing lighting is adequate and no additional lighting is being provided at this time.

Project architect Don Russell of Russell, Gallaway Associates provided a large site plan for the Board's review and explained in detail the existing and proposed future uses for the area surrounding

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of February 16, 2005

the project site. He requested that the Board allow the 6-foot wood fence around the fuel cell site to be omitted, since the only sight line will be from Franklin Street and will be obscured by shrubbery. Principal Planner Bishow asked whether Mr. Russell had something other than a fence in mind, to which he responded that Sierra Nevada Brewery owner Ken Grossman wants it to be seen, since it is “green” architecture, and added that there are only three buildings that access off of Franklin Street.

The Board then discussed with Mr. Russell the details of the perimeter wall, which was previously approved through the use permit process. Mr. Russell explained that it will be an 8-foot concrete wall with tree wells every 30 feet.

Board Member Ward asked for clarification as to how many pieces of equipment are to be installed. Ms. Henning responded that there will be one transformer and four heat recovery units. In response to further questions, Ms. Henning said that the actual transformer is approximately 4' x 4' and will have a matte finish that will make it barely visible from the sight points. She confirmed for Board Member Goulart that the condenser fans will not face the parking lot.

Ms. Bishow explained that there is a section in the code that deals with special fencing or walls for equipment that requires it to be consistent with other features, subject to Board approval. In response to a question from Chair Ambrosia, Mr. Palmeri stated that staff recommends fencing to provide separation between the parking area and East 20th Street; however, it is up to the Board to determine what would be most appropriate as far as visual impact. He elaborated, saying that if the Board decides to omit the fence, a finding would have to be made something to the effect that the proposed landscaping provides sufficient screening or that it is appropriate for the units to be exposed to provide a visual reminder of Sierra Nevada’s purpose. Ms. Bishow also noted that since there is a very limited space between the parking lot and the fuel cells, omitting the fence would allow more room for vegetation.

Board Member Ward then remarked that the Board is generally involved in reviewing projects which affect other people and surrounding properties; however, in this instance, it is being asked to apply its own regimen in the middle of a piece of property that only affects the property owner. He continued, saying that if the owner wants a fence, fine, and if not, that should also be fine, since these are clean units, low to the ground, that with the landscaping and trees being provided as screening could not possibly be visually offensive. Chair Ambrosia and Board Member LaGrow agreed that Mr. Grossman should be permitted to just build without any interruption from the Board, since Franklin Street has very limited use, and everything he has done in the past has been first class.

In response to further questions from the Board, Ms. Henning stated that there are trees and shrubs planted along Franklin Street that will eventually mature to provide a screen between the project site and the adjacent residential units.

There being no further questions for staff nor any public comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

Board Member LaGrow moved that the Board approve ARB 05-02 as submitted, based on the required findings set forth in the agenda report and the additional finding that no

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of February 16, 2005

fencing is required to screen the auxiliary energy station in that the existing and proposed landscaping will provide a sufficient visual barrier, and subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. *The applicant shall install a minimum of four fifteen-gallon size Zelcova serrata along the northerly project site perimeter.*
2. *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 05-02.*

Chair Ambrosia seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5-0.

4.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

5.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

Principal Planner Bishow advised the Board that two new Planning interns have been hired, one of which will be conducting research on how other jurisdictions regulate lighting, which has been of interest to the Board.

Ms. Bishow then announced that a new senior planner, Claudia Stuart, has also been hired. She provided the Board with an overview of Ms. Stuart's background and qualifications and said that staff is very excited to have her coming aboard.

Ms. Bishow then said that beginning with the upcoming meeting, staff would be mailing rather than delivering the agenda materials. She requested that the Board retain the binders and insert the new material for each meeting.

Chair Ambrosia then remarked that he had been approached by the chair of the Arts Commission regarding concerns about the project at 120-128 West 2nd Street [ARB 04-33 (Herbert/Sheraton Real Estate)]. He said that her stated concerns were (1) that the project is in the downtown area but the buildings do not echo the flavor of their surroundings, particularly the windows and muntins; and (2) that the size of the windows are disproportionate to the building. Principal Planner Bishow commented that once the awning is up, the windows should look more proportionate. She added that the alcove on the side of the building had not been removed, saying that she believes the Board approved rather than required its removal.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 4:56 p.m. to the regular meeting of March 2, 2005.

Approved: September 21, 2005

Copies of this Agenda
Available from
Telephone:

City Planning Office
411 Main Street
(530) 879-6800

Agenda Prepared: 02/23/05
Agenda Posted: 02/23/05
Prior to: 5:00 PM

**CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 2, 2005
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, March 2, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. is adjourned to Wednesday, March 16, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1 of the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street, Chico, California.

Distribution:

Board Members (5)
City Manager
CDD Baptiste
ACDD Sellers
Councilor Kirk
Building Official
DPW McKinley
City Clerk
CM/Front Desk
Art Projects Coordinator
Street Address Coordinator

Planning Director Seidler
Principal Planner Bishow
Senior Planner Sigona
Associate Planner Summerville
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

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of March 16, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart

Board Members Absent: Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Claudia Sigona, Senior Planner
Claudia Stuart, Senior Planner
Ed Palmeri, Associate Planner
Rachel Aviles, Planning Aide
Ron Sisay, Planning Intern
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Minutes of the Meeting of October 20, 2004

Board Member LaGrow moved that the Board approve the minutes as submitted. Board Member Ertle seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (Ward absent).

3.0 REGULAR AGENDA

3.1 ARB 05-04 (Cameo Community/Hawkins) 54 Cameo Drive, APN 007-290-031 - Proposed construction of 13 multi-family residential units consisting of two four-plex buildings, one five-plex building, and associated parking and landscaping as an addition to two existing four-plexes. The subject 1.4 acre site is located at the terminus of Cameo Drive in an R3 Medium-High Density Residential zoning district.

Senior Planner Sigona presented the staff report for the project, reviewing the proposed design and outlining issues that staff believes the Board should address with the applicant. She reminded the Board that staff is recommending conceptual approval only at today's meeting.

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

Michael Kahn, on behalf of the applicant, said that he was satisfied with Ms. Sigona's presentation and that the discussion items listed in the staff report would be easily handled.

Project landscape architect Carl Rottschalk explained the proposed landscape design, noting that there are large trees with broad canopies planned to shade the asphalt and pointing out that some oak

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of March 16, 2005

trees adjacent to the fence and bicycle path will be preserved. He elaborated on the design of the wood fencing around the patios of the new units for inside bicycle parking and said that the walkway recommended in the staff report could be incorporated in the plan.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Rottschalk said that there will be 8-foot pole lights inside the landscaped area, that the trash enclosure will be constructed of concrete block with metal gates, that the fencing along the edge of the parking lot will be screened with an evergreen vine, and that the mechanical units can be screened with shrubs.

Board Member Goulart asked whether the new units will be tied in with the existing project. Mr. Kahn said that the design and shape of the new units are similar to the existing, but are enhanced to make them a "step up", and that the existing units will be repainted to blend with the new. Mr. Rottschalk added that he would like to replace the existing "grape stake" fencing so it will match with the new units, and the Board agreed by consensus. Mr. Kahn confirmed that a laundry facility will also be added to the existing four-plex for consistency.

Chair Ambrosia suggested that the five parking stalls shown in front of the westernmost existing building be moved to the rear so that landscaping consistent with the adjacent properties can be installed along Cameo Drive. Project architect Gary Hawkins explained that the area behind the building is a PG&E utility easement that cannot be used for parking.

In response to a question from Board Member LaGrow, Mr. Hawkins said that the rain gutters, window grids, and front porch posts will match the color of the gables at the entries.

Chair Ambrosia expressed concern that the rear elevations, some of which can be seen from the cul-de-sac, are very plain and should be trimmed to match the front elevations. He also recommended that overhangs be added above the sliding patio doors. Mr. Hawkins agreed to incorporate those changes into the final design.

Board Member Goulart observed that the actual colors shown on the chart do not match the colors on the renderings and said that she prefers the softer colors. Mr. Kahn agreed, and said the colors will be changed to match what is shown on the renderings.

In response to a question from Board Member Ertle, Mr. Rottschalk said that the fencing around the patios will be board on board with a cap, and perhaps a trim of some kind. Mr. Hawkins added that the wood will not be painted.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, said she is glad that the applicant will not be using the lime green. She stated that the existing trash enclosure looks ragged and needs to be repaired, and she wants the fencing to be kept to a minimum to preserve the park-like feeling of the site. She said that she wants to keep as many of the valley oaks as possible, including the one by the laundry room. She stressed that she wants to see the existing buildings be fixed up, since they are pretty ragged and look awful, and commented that she feels sorry for the people living in them. She then said that if there is not enough room to put all of the required parking to the rear, the number of units should be reduced.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of March 16, 2005

Melinda Vasquez, 260 E. Sacramento Avenue, said that she likes the new project and wishes the original architecture had looked like what is now proposed. She stated that although the new buildings do not really integrate with the other buildings, which look like boxes, this is a step in the right direction. She also expressed concern about the amount of asphalt, and urged the Board to do whatever it could to make landscaping the more dominant feature.

Mr. Kahn explained that the buildings had just recently been purchased, and extensive repairs and renovations are already underway. He said that the purchase took place prior to additional parking requirements being adopted by the City, and that although the PG&E easement cannot be used, he is willing to do whatever he can to make the parking area work. He went on to say that the number of units cannot be further reduced without causing a problem with the required density.

Principal Planner Bishow asked why the parking is being recalculated for the existing buildings, and Mr. Hawkins responded that City staff had advised him it was required.

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

The Board further discussed various aspects of the project until consensus regarding direction to the applicant was reached.

Board Member LaGrow moved that the Board conceptually approve the project with direction to the applicant as follows:

1. *Change the green trim to a lighter, mossier green;*
2. *Provide details on post lighting;*
3. *Clearly indicate any proposed repainting of, and any new fencing for, the existing buildings to tie them in with features of the new buildings;*
4. *Minimize parking to the extent possible, particularly within the front setback area, and provide extensive screening through the use of landscaping;*
5. *Provide adequate screening of mechanical equipment;*
6. *Provide adequate bike parking for each unit;*
7. *Provide details as to how the rear elevations of the building can be enhanced, and include sliding glass door overhangs;*
8. *Add a walkway to Building "A" with access to the street;*
9. *To preserve the "open" feel of the site, avoid using additional fencing;*
10. *Provide details and colors for window grids;*
11. *Provide patio fencing detail, including a drawing; and*
12. *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 05-04.*

Chair Ambrosia seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (Ward absent).

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of March 16, 2005

3.2 **ARB 05-05 (Thomas) 1580 Manzanita Ave., APN 015-500-011** - Proposed construction of a 7,570 square foot child day care center/preschool on a vacant 0.9 acre site in the R1 Low Density Residential zoning district.

Planning Aide Aviles presented the staff report for this project, providing an overview of the proposal and reviewing the recommended conditions of approval contained in the staff report. She also provided color samples for the Board's review.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Aviles stated that although staff believes the proposed cupola is inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood, the Board can certainly discuss with the applicant other ideas such as altering its proportion.

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

Applicant Greg Thomas said that the cupola was added in order to break up the roof line, and project architect Gary Hawkins added that it also provides for roof ventilation. With respect to staff's concerns about landscaping along East Avenue, Mr. Thomas stated that shrubs at least 4 feet high will be included to screen the parking lot from view.

In response to a question from Chair Ambrosia, school administrator Ann Nelson explained that there is no drop-off allowed at preschool; parents must sign the children in and out. Chair Ambrosia further asked whether any parking stalls could be eliminated, and Mr. Hawkins replied that the number of parking stalls just meets the City's minimum standards.

With regard to the cupola, Mr. Thomas said he would like to keep it. After discussing several options, the Board agreed by consensus that it could be retained if the scale is modified.

Melinda Vasquez, 260 E. Sacramento Avenue, commented that she likes the architecture; however, she does not like the parking area in front of the building. She said that the City needs to commit to having a green beltway and let applicants know that it is a requirement in addition to beautiful architecture.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, said that if the field is extended behind the building, she hopes there will be plenty of trees for shade. She also said that one of the existing street trees is dead and needs to be replaced.

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

The Board then further discussed the cupola, the palm trees, and various other aspects of the project until consensus was reached.

Chair Ambrosia 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 cupola shall be removed, enhanced through size, or replaced by one or more dormers, subject to staff review and approval.*

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of March 16, 2005

2. *The applicant shall complete the process of merging the parcels prior to building permit issuance.*
3. *The applicant shall provide additional screening of the parking lot through the use of landscaping, a wall, or both.*
4. *Any signage shall be subject to staff review and approval.*
5. *The sidewalk at the northeast corner of the project shall be extended to the sidewalk at East Avenue.*
6. *The stucco shall be two colors, one "Oatmeal" and the other matching as closely as possible the color represented in the rendering submitted as Attachment "C" to the staff report.*
7. *The window frame color shall be almond.*
8. *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 05-05.*

Board Member Ertle seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (Ward absent).

3.3 ARB 05-06 (Main) 111 Mission Ranch Blvd., APN 006-150-107 - Proposed development of a 10,900 square foot office and restaurant building on a 0.75 acre site located in a CC Community Commercial zoning district. The mission style building will be finished in stucco with parking to the rear.

Associate Planner Palmeri presented the staff report for the project, advising the Board that the information regarding inclusion of a restaurant and its effect on parking should be disregarded. He then reviewed information regarding the parcel situated between the project site and the residential area, which affects the width of the landscape buffer.

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

Jim Stevens, representing NorthStar Engineering, addressed staff's concern regarding screening of the mechanical equipment by explaining that the equipment will only be visible from the sides of the building, and because this is a LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) building, penetrations in the roof should be limited to the extent possible. In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Stevens stated that the units are located roughly in the center of the building and are about 18 inches higher than the parapet.

Regarding the location of the trash facility, Neil Graber, also of NorthStar Engineering, said that moving it away from the residential area as staff recommends will only affect the presentation, not decrease the noise level. Board Member Goulart suggested an alternative location, near the dumpsters on the adjacent property. Mr. Stevens said that he would check that out, since the adjacent parking area mirrors this one.

Chair Ambrosia then briefly discussed with Mr. Stevens the possibility of adding lintels to the windows on the south elevation. Mr. Stevens stated that he would prefer to leave them as they are, since they are recessed 18 inches to 2 feet.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of March 16, 2005

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, said that she was happy to see the parking at the rear of the building. She expressed displeasure with the blue atlas cedars proposed for the finger planters, saying that foliage might get in the way of parking spaces and that it is doubtful they will provide 50% shading.

In response, Mr. Stevens said that the direction given to the landscape architect was to use trees that would not upset the curb and to provide a 35 foot canopy, so these will work. Ms. Laslo countered that there are many other trees that give better shade, pointing out that this parking lot is not for a residence. Mr. Stevens said he would bring it to the attention of the landscape architect; however, he pointed out that the project would require independent certification by LEED for its "green" status, so he will ultimately have to trust the experts. Ms. Laslo then asserted that she wants maples that turn colors, because the cedars will not be very attractive in later years.

In response to concerns from the Board regarding the vibrant colors, Mr. Stevens stated that LEED guidelines require greater reflectivity. Board Member Goulart stated that she would like to see the window trim color be closer to "Pinecone Path" as shown on the color samples, to give the building a more Mediterranean look. Chair Ambrosia said he would also like to see brown rather than grey for the window glazing.

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

Chair Ambrosia moved that the Board approve the project subject to the findings set forth in the staff report and conditions of approval as follows:

1. *Signage type and location shall be subject to staff review and approval.*
2. *Building lighting is approved as submitted.*
3. *Exterior pole lighting shall be subject to staff review and approval.*
4. *The final location of the trash enclosure shall be chosen so as to best mitigate noise, taking the traffic patterns of the trash truck into consideration, and shall be subject to staff review and approval.*
5. *Lintels shall be added on the windows on the south elevation to match other windows.*
6. *The recessed windows on the north elevation shall include a trim element similar to that shown for other windows, which is understood to be a raised foam stucco application painted a different color than the field.*
7. *The proposed field color "Eggshell" shall be changed to more of a cream color and shall be subject to staff review and approval.*
8. *The window frame color, including muntins, shall be brown, similar to the Kelly Moore "Pine Cone" color.*
9. *Window glazing shall be a brown, rather than grey, tone.*
10. *The applicant shall verify with a landscape architect that the proposed cedar trees will provide shade sufficient to comply with City standards.*

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of March 16, 2005

11. *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 05-06.*

Board Member Ertle seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (Ward absent).

4.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

5.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

Principal Planner Bishow introduced Planning Intern Ron Sisay and Senior Planner Claudia Stuart.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 5:59 p.m. to the regular meeting of April 6, 2005.

Approved: June 29, 2005

CITY OF CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 6, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Claudia Stuart, Senior Planner
Bob Summerville, Associate Planner
Ron Sisay, Planning Intern
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 2.1 ARB 04-39 (Murray/Sicke), Eastern terminus of Morrow Lane, south side of Skyway, APN 002-200-035** - Review of final roof color for a 50,300 square foot retail showroom and warehouse that was previously approved by the Board at its meeting of January 19, 2005.

Board Member Goulart disqualified herself from participating in the Board's review of this project due to a professional conflict of interest.

Associate Planner Summerville presented the agenda report for this project and distributed a color chart and color elevations for the Board's review. He explained to the Board that the applicant has proposed two color choices for the roof, "Terra Cotta" and "Cool Terra Cotta".

There being no questions for staff, Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Applicant Steve Sicke said that either of the colors would be acceptable to him. There being no questions for the applicant nor any public comment, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

The Board briefly discussed the proposed colors and agreed by consensus that the darker color, "Terra Cotta", was the better of the two.

Board Member Ertle moved that the Board approve the roof color "Terra Cotta". Board Member LaGrow seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (Goulart disqualified).

- 2.2 ARB 05-07 (RGA/Smith/Lowen), 1016 Skyway, APN 002-210-016** - Remodel of an existing 3,852 square foot office building with a drive-through service window and related porte-cochère structure for use as a new bank facility or speculative retail uses.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of April 6, 2005

Associate Planner Summerville presented the agenda report, highlighting various aspects of the proposed project and reviewing recommended discussion items and conditions of approval.

Mr. Summerville responded to questions from the Board regarding the proposed monument sign, explaining that staff is recommending a six foot maximum height for consistency with surrounding projects.

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

Project architect Chad Finch of Russell, Gallaway Associates said that he plans to keep plantings and the monument sign low, since the desired tenants will be retail establishments. He said he would like to defer review of signage until after tenants have been secured to allow them to participate in the process. With respect to staff's concern regarding the trash enclosure design and materials, he said it will be six foot high plaster in a color consistent with the building and will have metal gates.

In response to a question from Chair Ambrosia, Mr. Finch said the vinyl windows will be a light beige consistent with the storefront and doors.

Chair Ambrosia then asked whether the existing trees will be retained. Mr. Finch responded that he is working around what is there and will be adding planters and trees wherever possible.

Chair Ambrosia remarked that the applicant has done a great job on this project and that he likes the overall design. He said his one concern is the ledgestone at the base of the columns being repeated on the capitals, since that seems like an unnatural place for rock to be located. Mr. Finch said he would take a closer look at that detail.

Board Member Ertle noted that there is no existing parking lot lighting and asked whether additional lighting is being considered for the proposed retail uses. Mr. Finch answered that he believes the building's soffit lighting and the exterior lights on the columns will provide sufficient parking lot illumination. Board Member LaGrow agreed, saying that the proposed lighting would be supplemented by existing lights on adjacent sites.

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

Board Member Goulart commented that she would like to include a condition that on the eastern perimeter of the site, the sweet olive be carried around under the liquid ambers to break up the asphalt between the car wash and the parking lot. Chair Ambrosia agreed, suggesting that the stall adjacent to the trash enclosure at the car wash could be removed and used for additional landscape screening. He then added that because there is parking along the Skyway, he would like to require 3-foot high berming and perhaps relocation of the monument sign to the entry island.

Regarding Chair Ambrosia's earlier remarks concerning the ledgestone capitals on the columns, Board Member Goulart said she does not object to the stone, because in her opinion, the color on the fascia and the gutters helps balance it. Board Member Ertle said that she does like the color change, so if the stone is replaced by stucco, she would like to see it be a darker color similar to the stone.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of April 6, 2005

Board Member Ward said that, generally speaking, this project is an improvement to the existing building. He said he agrees that the capitals should be stucco rather than a repeat of the rock base, and that he believes the colors will be successful. He added that he likes the fact that exterior lighting will be limited to what is on the building.

The Board then discussed parameters within which staff should work for future review and approval of signage. By consensus, the Board agreed that the monument sign should be limited to six feet in height, and that channel lettering on building signs should be no taller than 14 inches, which can be neon only if they are individually lit. No other neon is to be used without the Board's approval.

Chair Ambrosia moved that the Board approve the project based on the findings set forth in the agenda report and subject to conditions of approval as follows:

1. *The monument sign shall be no taller than six feet. Channel letters on building signs shall be no taller than fourteen inches and may be individually illuminated by neon; however, no other neon shall be used on the building. All signage shall be subject to staff review and approval.*
2. *The trash enclosure shall be six feet high, constructed of plaster in colors consistent with the building, and shall have metal gates. The final design shall be subject to staff review and approval.*
3. *The parking stall shown at the southeast corner of the site shall be eliminated, and the area shall be landscaped to provide screening from the adjacent site.*
4. *A three-foot high berm shall be applied to the landscaping strip on the north side of the site.*
5. *The existing birch trees shown on Attachment E to the agenda report shall be retained.*
6. *Sweet olive shall be added to the planter on the eastern perimeter.*
7. *The bicycle parking area shall be located at the north side of the building.*
8. *The ledgestone capitals on the columns shall be replaced by stucco capitals of the same proportion, finished in color #382 "Tamale".*
9. *Building colors are approved as submitted, including those for metal doors and windows.*

Board Member Ward seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5-0.

- 2.3 ARB 05-08 (North Valley Building Systems), 20 & 30 Seville Court, APNs 039-430-142 and 143**
Proposed construction of a 2,940 square foot office and a 3,000 square foot warehouse at 30 Seville Court, as well as a 6,000 square foot warehouse at 20 Seville Court. The 1.52-acre site is accessed by a private easement off Seville Court, in an ML Light Manufacturing zoning district.

Senior Planner Stuart presented the staff report for this project, reviewing building elevations and proposed colors, and site and landscaping plans. She outlined staff's recommendations for discussion items and conditions of approval.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of April 6, 2005

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing, and applicant Andy Wood provided information and answered questions about the project. There being no other public comment, the public hearing was closed.

Board Member Ertle moved that the Board approve the project based on the findings set forth in the agenda report and subject to conditions of approval as follows:

- 1. The applicant shall submit four final revised site plans incorporating the conditions of approval. The applicant shall provide a note on the front sheet of the building plans for each phase on each parcel indicating that the project will be developed in compliance with the approval of ARB 05-08.*
- 2. The lands between Buildings B and C shall be developed for an employee break area with appropriate plantings, subject to staff review and approval.*
- 3. The applicant shall provide an insert of an alternative material to distinguish a walkway between Buildings A and B on 30 Seville Court, subject to staff review and approval.*
- 4. The applicant shall provide a rolled asphalt barrier between the landscaped area and the parking lot along the southern property line at 20 Seville Court, with appropriate irrigation and drainage, subject to staff review and approval.*
- 5. The applicant shall extend sod and trees similar to the existing landscaping on the adjacent property to continue between parking and the private easement at the southeast corner of 30 Seville Court, as submitted.*
- 6. The applicant shall replace the proposed planting of Pistacia chinensis along the site's southern boundary with either the non-invasive variety as specified by the City's Urban Forester or alternative non-invasive species, subject to staff review and approval.*
- 7. The trash enclosures shall be finished with exterior materials and colors consistent with the buildings and shall have metal gates.*
- 8. The applicant shall substitute hoop racks for the bicycle blocks on both parcels and shall mark the bicycle parking area at 30 Seville Court to prohibit car parking.*

Chair Ambrosia seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (Ward absent).

2.4 Overview of Lighting Standards

Planning Intern Sisay provided a display board and presented the staff report for this item, after which he responded to various questions from the Board. The Board discussed various examples of sites where the exterior lighting does or does not work well, and then expressed interest in receiving more detailed lighting standards information in a future packet, particularly with respect to factors that might affect height limitations and preferred lighting type. Principal Planner Bishow said that staff will do additional research to provide the Board with specific questions regarding its preferences on issues frequently raised, with the goal of assisting staff in providing helpful direction to applicants prior to submittal of projects for Board review.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of April 6, 2005

3.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

4.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

None.

5.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 6:17 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of April 20, 2005.

Approved: February 6, 2008

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of April 20, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
 Ellen Clifford Ertle
 Marci Goulart
 Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
 Claudia Sigona, Senior Planner
 Claudia Stuart, Senior Planner
 Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
 Ronald K. Sisay, Planning Intern

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff present were noted as shown above.

2.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 2.1 ARB 05-03 (Hawkins/McCarthy) Northwest corner of E. Lassen Avenue and Joshua Tree Road** - Consideration of nine additional two-story four-plex buildings and two 1600 square foot single story accessory storage buildings for tenant use to be constructed as an addition to an existing 105 unit multi-family housing complex located on 10.73 gross acres at the northwest corner of E. Lassen Avenue and Joshua Tree Road (476 E. Lassen Avenue), identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 007-060-076, and zoned R2 Medium Density Residential.

Senior Planner Sigona presented the staff report for this project, highlighting key aspects of the project site features. She reported that the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) had found the the project consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). Staff also brought to the attention of the Board items that needed to be discussed by Board Members, including turning around Building No. 28 to face Joshua Tree Road to create a positive street orientation as recommended by General Plan Policy. Staff is recommending that the Board approve the project subject to the recommendations that were made in the staff report.

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing.

Gary Hawkins, architect for the project, said he would prefer to leave Building No. 28 the way it is and not re-orient it 180 degrees, because it would not be consistent with other buildings and he wasn't sure if it would be possible given the amount of space available.

Board Member Ertle had a question for Mr. Hawkins in regards to the bicycle parking issue. Mr. Hawkins replied that bicycle parking will be located below the stairways for the second floor units.

Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing. The Board discussed different aspects regarding the project, re-opening the public hearing to obtain overall acceptance of the applicant to particular conditions.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of April 20, 2005

Chair Ambrosia moved, seconded by Board Member Ward, that the Board approve the project subject to the findings set forth in the staff report and conditions of approval as follows:

1. *Building No. 28 shall be re-oriented 90 degrees or 180 degrees.*
2. *The parking area landscaping shall meet shading requirements in the CMC section 9.70.060 for the new parking areas.*
3. *All electrical and utility boxes shall be painted to match the body color of the buildings, or fully screened by landscaping where located in landscaped areas. All site and building electrical and utility boxes shall be indicated on building plans.*
4. *No new fencing shall be required as a condition of approval.*
5. *The site plan shall be modified to provide landscaping on the north end of the easterly storage building or remove the segment of sidewalk adjacent to that end.*
6. *Landscape planter shall wrap around the rear of Building Nos. 29, 33, and 34.*
7. *The applicant shall provide a note on the front sheet of the building plans that the project shall be developed in compliance with ARB 05-03.*
8. *Prior to building permit submittal, the applicant shall submit four (4) final revised plans incorporating the above conditions of approval.*

2.2 ARB 05-04 (Cameo Community/Hawkins) 54 Cameo Drive - Final review of 13 new multi-family residential units to be constructed on 1.4 acres in addition to 8 existing units located at 54 Cameo Drive, identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 007-290-031, and zoned R3 Medium-High Density Residential.

Senior Planner Sigona presented the staff report for this project, pointing out key details that were conditions for final review and providing the Board with revision to details that were noted on the original site plan. Staff is recommending that the Board approve the project subject to the recommendations in the staff report.

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing.

Michael Kahn, part owner of the Cameo Community, stated that he was happy with the staff report and recommendations and would be glad to answer any questions that the Board might have. He also said that this project was approved by ALUC.

Karen Laslo, a member of the public, stated she had some concerns in regards to the oak groves that are located at the project site. She was wondering if the trees were going to be left untouched or be removed. She also suggested using crushed granite rock instead of asphalt or concrete for the rear bike path to help save the oaks.

Carl Rothchalk, project landscaper, informed her that they will try to save as many trees in the oak grove as possible, but most of the trees are located in a PG&E easement, and PG&E encourages the removal of the valley oaks. He also stated that the use of crushed granite for the rear bike path would enhance preservation of the nearby trees.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of April 20, 2005

Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer, mentioned to the Board and staff that they should look into the new accessibility legislation to avoid future applicant expenses, because as of July 1, 2005, a minimum of 10% of all residential units in multi-story buildings will need to be handicapped accessible.

Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing. The Board further discussed the project.

Chair Ambrosia moved, seconded by Board Member Goulart, that the Board approve the project subject to the findings set forth in the staff report and the following conditions of approval:

1. *In order to preserve the "open" feel of the site, no additional fencing is required along the south and southwest property lines.*
2. *The title page of all building plans shall include the following note: This project shall be developed in conformance with approval of ARB-05-04.*
3. *All electrical and utility boxes shall be painted to match the body color of the buildings or fully screened by landscaping where located in landscaped areas. All site and building electrical and utility boxes shall be clearly indicated on building plans.*
4. *The window grids shall be eliminated and the brown paint that is used on the entry doors shall be used on the fascia and gutter. The windows on rear elevations shall be trimmed to match the windows on the front elevation.*
5. *On the gable ends of the buildings, the upper boards and battons shall be extended to the roofline.*
6. *Existing grape stake patio fencing associated with existing units shall be replaced to match the patio fencing for the new units (both in color and design) as shown in attachment G of the approved ARB plans.*
7. *Provide a minimum 4-foot wide decomposed crushed granite path around the rear of Buildings B and C for use by bicycles and pedestrians to reach rear patios. Planter areas adjacent to patio fencing (identified as note 17 on the landscape plans) may be narrowed in some places if necessary to accommodate the path.*

3.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

4.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

Principal Planner Bishow and Board Member Goulart reported on the joint meeting between the Planning Commission and the City Council. Board Members expressed interest in providing comments to the Planning Commission and City Council regarding any proposed changes to the standards for second dwelling units.

In response to a request from Chair Ambrosia, Ms. Bishow and Senior Plan Check Engineer Kotysan provided an overview of how building permits are reviewed by staff for compliance with ARB approved plans.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of April 20, 2005

5.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 4:56 p.m. to the regular meeting of May 4, 2005.

Minutes recorded by: Ron Sisay

Approved: May 18, 2005

**CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
& AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 4, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1**

Board Members Present: Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Board Members Absent: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair

Airport Commissioners Present: Damon Gustafson
Al Silva

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Claudia Stuart, Senior Planner
Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Board Member LaGrow called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members, Airport Commissioners, and staff were present as noted.

2.0 AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE AGENDA

2.1 ARB 05-12 (Harrison) East side of Fortress Street between Lockheed and Piper Avenues, APN 047-560-063 - A proposal to construct a 10,000 square foot warehouse and supporting office on a vacant parcel for use in a metal studs and drywall business. The property is zoned AM Airport, Manufacturing/Industrial.

Principal Planner Bishow provided an overview of the architectural review process for airport projects. Senior Planner Stuart then presented the staff report, correcting an error in the report indicating that revised site plans are needed for the project, and she distributed a handout with a proposed motion deleting condition #5 in the staff report, which is no longer necessary. She then reviewed standards and criteria for airport projects, required findings for approval, and staff's recommended conditions for approval of this project.

Commissioner Silva asked for clarification of the number of bicycle spaces required, since the site plan shows only two. Senior Planner Stuart explained that the plan will be revised to reflect the correct number of spaces based on conditions of approval set forth at today's meeting.

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

Project engineer Neil Graber said that the applicant has no objections to staff's recommendations. The southern property boundary and its landscape buffer were briefly discussed, and in response to a question by Board Member Goulart, Mr. Graber presented an aerial photo of the site for clarification.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD & AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Regular Meeting of May 4, 2005

There being no further questions or comments, Board Member LaGrow closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Silva moved that the project be approved subject to the findings and recommended conditions of approval numbers 1 through 4 as set forth in the staff memorandum. Commissioner Gustafson seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

Commissioners Silva and Gustafson left the meeting at this time.

3.0 REGULAR AGENDA

3.1 ARB 05-10 (Vinsonhaler/Granicher) 1277 East Avenue, APN 015-430-085 - Proposed construction of a 2,600 square foot office shell on a vacant site on the corner of East Avenue and Sunflower Court.

Senior Planner Stuart presented the staff report for this project, after which Principal Planner Bishow commented that the report format had been revised to facilitate the Board's review and to provide an opportunity for the applicant to respond to conditions that are set forth in clear language. She explained that with this new format, the Board could make its motion by simply adding or eliminating conditions.

There being no questions for staff, Board Member LaGrow opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Project architect Greg Peitz clarified that this project is a mirror image of one across the street, with the exact same design. He said that although he appreciates staff's comments about repetition or canned design, the owners purchased the two properties with the intent to create a sort of "mini-development". He pointed out that the design is simple and on a residential scale to blend in with the adjacent residential properties. He stressed that in his opinion it would be a mistake to approve a similar but not identical building, saying that if it can't be identical, he would prefer it to be significantly different. He urged the Board, however, to keep in mind that the applicant originally requested review of both buildings as one project but was advised by staff that separate applications with review at separate meetings would be required.

In response to questions from Board Member LaGrow regarding staff's recommendations, Mr. Peitz said that using one large window on the East Avenue elevation would prevent the building from being divided into separate offices, that there will be low bollard lights at each shade tree, and that a vine-covered trellis is not part of the theme the applicant had in mind.

After further discussion regarding alternate ways of differentiating between the two buildings, applicant Clifford Vinsonhaler said that he would be open to color changes and landscaping ideas; however, he does not want to change the building itself. Board Member Goulart asked whether Mr. Vinsonhaler would object to adding rock on the East Avenue elevation. Mr. Vinsonhaler said he liked the idea, and Mr. Peitz said that the ideal place to add it would be at the center gable. Board Member Ward suggested using a subtle color change in the building recesses to emphasize them.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD & AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Regular Meeting of May 4, 2005

With respect to staff's recommendation that the Raywood ash trees be replaced, Mr. Vinsonhaler said that although he likes them, he would be willing to replace them if the ones the Board approved at the adjacent site could also be replaced. Principal Planner Bishow said that staff can approve an alternate selection.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, said that although she understands why the applicant would want the two buildings to match, she thinks what is unfortunate is that the first one was ever approved, since it is dull. She said that she does not like the back of the building facing the street and thinks that the least that could be done is the addition of rock trim, although what she would prefer is a brick wainscot to give it more interest, because it is dull. She then said she is glad it is a small building, and urged the Board to require a lot of landscaping to cover it up, including the trellis with vines, which is not expensive. She concluded by saying that she is very disappointed and reiterating that the project is dull.

There being no further questions or comments, Board Member LaGrow closed the public hearing.

Board Member LaGrow then said that he disagrees with the staff report. He said that he likes the idea of identical bookends, particularly since East Avenue is such a hodgepodge. He said the project would provide class, color, and continuity, and added that if this one is changed, the other one should be altered to match it.

Board Member Goulart said she agrees to some extent, although she said it would have been better if the original building had not been approved with such a simple rear elevation. She said that specimen plants could add a lot by defining windows, and a trellis or pergola over the center section on the East Avenue elevation could be a very narrow Mediterranean design that would complement the building. She said she would also like to see stone added to the base of the windows.

Board Member Ward said he would add two stone columns or pilasters at the gable, similar to those on the front, which would provide a reason for the pergola.

Board Member Ertle said that in order to attempt to follow the City's design guidelines, she would like to see some features such as stepping stones that would give a feel of an entrance from the street, and that she definitely wants to see some differences between the two buildings.

Board Member Ertle moved that the Board approve the project subject to the findings set forth in the staff report and conditions of approval as follows:

1. *Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit four (4) final revised site plans incorporating the following applicable conditions of approval. The applicant shall provide a note on the front of the building plans that the project will be developed in compliance with ARB 05-10.*
2. *Consistent with General Plan and Planning Division guidance, the applicant shall increase the individuality of the proposal, and its visual interest when viewed from the public right-of-way. The applicant shall:*
 - a) *provide subtle color variation within the recessed areas of the building elevations and provide rock on the face of the rear gable, similar to that proposed for the front elevation;*

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD & AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Regular Meeting of May 4, 2005

- b) *provide denser and mixed landscaping of shrubs and herbaceous plants in all areas of the planting beds around the building; and*
- c) *provide a vine-covered pergola on the East Avenue side of the building that covers the gabled section of the elevation.*
- 3. *Bicycle parking shall be provided along the main facade of the building, no more than forty feet from its entrance, in accordance with CMC 19.70.080.*
- 4. *Signs shall be subject to the Planning Division Director's approval (CMC 19.70.040 Sign review). The approved sign shall be consistent with traffic safety. The sign shall be consistent in color, materials, and style with the building according to direction from the Board.*
- 5. *Consistent with CMC 19.70.060 (Fencing and screening), shrubs maturing to between two and three feet shall be provided between the parking area and Sunflower Court. Metal gates shall be provided for any trash enclosure, which will be constructed of colors and materials that are consistent with the building.*
- 6. *Consistent with CMC 19.68.050 (Landscape standards), approved street trees shall be substituted for the Raywood ash in the parking area.*
- 7. *Parking lot fixtures shall consist of six bollard-type fixtures between three and four feet in height.*

Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (Board Member Ambrosia absent).

4.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, said she wants to make sure someone relays to Chair Ambrosia that she has concerns about the landscaping at the Mangrove and Vallombrosa project. She said that she and her friend had suggested at a previous meeting that the flowering plum trees on the corner be continued; however, when the project went to the Planning Commission, the plum trees were not included on the landscape plan. Principal Planner Bishow explained that unless it was included as a condition in the Board's motion to approve, it would not be a requirement in the landscape plan submitted to the Planning Commission. She said she would review the file to determine what landscape plan had been approved.

5.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

None.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Board Member LaGrow adjourned the meeting at 5:32 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of May 18, 2005.

Approved: June 15, 2005

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of May 18, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Claudia Stuart, Senior Planner
Steve Betts, Associate Planner
Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of April 20, 2005

Board Member Ertle moved that the Board approve the minutes as submitted. Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed by a unanimous vote.

3.0 REGULAR AGENDA

3.1 ARB 05-11 (Peitz/Callen) 3015 Esplanade, APN 006-270-029 - A proposal to expand an existing veterinary office facility on the Esplanade between West Shasta Avenue and Amber Grove Drive on property zoned CC Community Commercial.

Senior Planner Stuart presented the staff report for the project, providing the Board with an overview of the site characteristics, project design, required findings, and recommended conditions of approval.

In response to a question from Board Member Goulart, Senior Plan Check Engineer Kotysan said that he feels uneasy about the proposed design for handicapped accessible parking. He explained that the loading zone should be on the passenger side, and that either a curb line or a 3-foot wide loading zone edged by truncated domes must be provided. He recommended that the ADA entrance be moved to the west side of the building, pointing out that it would simplify incorporation of those changes and would also create a shorter distance between the parking area and the building entrance. Chair Ambrosia agreed, adding that a wheel stop is required in a handicapped accessible stall, and when incorporated into the proposed design would force vehicles to back out onto the Esplanade. Board Member Ward suggested reversing the traffic flow as an alternative to moving the parking stall.

Board Member Ertle expressed concern that the proposed plan does not follow the design guideline regarding buildings being oriented to the street, with access to the street. Senior Planner Stuart

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of May 18, 2005

replied that the design guidelines provide guidance rather than requirements. She explained that in this case, the existing facilities to be retained and the orientation of the building call for a less rigid interpretation of the guidelines.

Board Member Goulart then asked why no trees are being required along the Esplanade elevation. Senior Planner Stuart replied that the applicant has also applied for a use permit, and that as a condition of that project will be required to install trees along that frontage.

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

Project architect Greg Peitz stated that most of staff's recommendations are valid. In particular, he agreed that moving the ADA parking to the west side and adding trees and landscaping to the area where it is currently proposed to soften the Esplanade side would be a good resolution to the parking problem, pointing out that the traffic flow is already established and is constrained by what currently exists on the site.

Chair Ambrosia said he would like to see the sidewalk width on the southeast corner of the building reduced to 4 feet, with additional landscaping. He also said that he would like to see the existing oak tree retained, and Senior Planner Stuart suggested that it could be accomplished by changing stalls 4 and 5 to compact spaces.

Board Member Goulart asked whether the brick and cinder block sections of the wall on the south elevation could be brought together in some way, perhaps creating a transition with creeping fig. Board Member LaGrow asked for verification that the cinder block will be painted to match the brick. Mr. Peitz said that it will be painted to match, and he agreed to add vines to soften the transition.

The Board then briefly discussed lighting, mechanical units, and the trash enclosure. The applicant expressed willingness to comply with staff's recommendations for those items.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, said she is glad the oaks are going to be preserved and asked why part of the building is brick and part is cinder block. Chair Ambrosia explained that the existing building is not brick. Ms. Laslo said that cinder block is not very attractive, especially along the Esplanade.

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

Chair Ambrosia moved that the Board approve the project subject to the findings set forth in the staff report and conditions of approval as follows:

- 1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit four (4) final revised site plans incorporating the following applicable conditions of approval. 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 05-11.*

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of May 18, 2005

2. *The applicant shall provide 15 parking spaces consistent with CMC 19.70.040. Proposed stalls 4 and 5 shall be revised to be compact spaces, in order to protect the existing oak tree.*
3. *The applicant shall provide at least one bicycle parking space with a vertical supporting structure on a marked area between the walkways fronting the building's two north entrances.*
4. *A marked walkway at least four feet in width shall be provided along the south side of the entry driveway between the rear parking area and the main building entry.*
5. *A tree species recommended in "Recommended Street Trees for Chico" shall be substituted for the Raywood ash currently proposed.*
6. *The applicant shall provide one to two light bollard(s) for the front walkway area, and one to two bollard light(s) for the rear parking and entry area.*
7. *The trash enclosure shall be constructed of CMU block, finished in colors consistent with the main building, and shall have iron gates.*
8. *Any ground-mounted condensing units that are visible to the public shall be fully screened with landscaping, using plants of sufficient height and density to provide an immediate visual barrier.*
9. *The handicapped parking stall shall be relocated to the west side of the building, adjacent to the mulberry tree, and shall have access to a minimum 4 foot wide walkway.*
10. *Any new signage shall be subject to staff review and approval. The Board recommends that the existing signage be relocated to ground level, subject to staff review and approval.*
11. *The applicant shall provide a new planting strip at least 5 feet wide on the north side of the site, originating at the Esplanade and continuing beyond the existing black walnut tree.*
12. *Along the exit drive on the south side of the site, adjacent to the CMU fence, the applicant shall provide a new landscape strip at least 2 feet wide, containing at a minimum low-maintenance vines.*
13. *The concrete walk on the south side of the proposed flax landscaped area along the Esplanade shall be reduced to 4 feet in width.*
14. *The proposed handicapped parking area at the northeast corner of the building shall be replaced with additional landscaping separating the entry drive from the walkway.*

Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed by a unanimous vote.

- 3.2** **ARB 05-13 (Minto/Burnap Gardens) SE corner of Lassen and Burnap Avenues, APNs 007-170-071 and -072** - A proposal to construct five new apartment buildings within an existing apartment complex on property zoned R3 Medium-High Density Residential.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of May 18, 2005

Senior Planner Stuart presented the staff report for the project, providing the Board with additional information regarding an opportunity to connect to the existing bicycle path and a recommendation to increase the number of street trees along Lassen and Burnap Avenues. She advised the Board that the project had been approved earlier in the day by the Butte County Airport Land Use Commission.

In response to questions from the Board regarding connecting to the existing bike path, Senior Planner Stuart explained that the City would provide an 8-foot opening, and the applicant would have to pay for a bollard to block vehicular traffic and access. Principal Planner Bishow added that the Board can choose to recommend rather than require the connection.

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

Project architect Greg Peitz explained that this project is being developed to cover an old leach field left over from the previous septic system. He advised the Board that the old carports will be replaced, a hammerhead turnaround for the Fire Department will be installed, and some of the existing asphalt will be replaced with landscaping. He then said that the applicant does not want to attach to the bike path, since doing so could present safety issues.

In response to a question from Board Member LaGrow, applicant Preston Minto said that the existing buildings will be painted to complement the new buildings and the roofs will be replaced; however, due to cash flow limitations, the improvements will be phased over the next few years.

Board Member Goulart suggested that vegetation be added to the walls of the existing buildings to screen the meters showing along the Burnap Avenue elevation and asked that the graveled area between the two existing units on the northwest corner be landscaped to be consistent with the others.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, asked why the valley oaks are being removed. Mr. Peitz responded that the only trees being removed are within or close to the building footprints. Ms. Laslo said that in other communities, the buildings would have to be built around the heritage trees, and stated that Chico needs to strengthen its tree ordinance to protect the urban forest. She said that planting new trees is not the same as preserving the old trees. Mr. Minto responded that the few trees being removed are small and wimpy.

Ms. Laslo then said that she wants the Board to require the entrance to the bike path. Applicant Caroline Minto replied that the path is easily accessible at Burnap Avenue, and she urged the Board not to require it, since it could easily become a safety issue by encouraging bicyclists to use the parking lot at unsafe speeds. By consensus, the Board agreed with the applicant's concern. There being no further comments or questions, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

The Board then discussed the various aspects of the project, including access to the bike path, landscaping of the graveled area, location of the trash enclosures, and preservation of the trees. Board Member Ertle stressed that the Board is concerned about heritage trees and does want to protect them whenever possible.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of May 18, 2005

Board Member Goulart moved that the Board approve the project subject to the findings set forth in the staff report and the following conditions of approval:

- 1. Prior to or concurrent with the submittal of a building permit application, the applicant shall submit four (4) final revised site plans incorporating the following applicable conditions of approval. 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 05-13.*
- 2. The southernmost new building shall be repositioned closer to the neighboring building to the north, as a means of meeting the required 15-foot rear yard setback from the property line between APNs 007-170-071 and 007-170-072.*
- 3. The southern trash enclosure shall be moved at least 75 feet south within the parking lot, out of the line of sight of the Burnap Avenue Entryway. The northern trash enclosure shall be moved south into the next parking area so as to best serve the largest number of tenants in the complex.*
- 4. The pedestrian walkways along the entry drive from Burnap Avenue shall be widened to at least five feet.*
- 5. Individual bicycle supports shall be provided in the entry area to each new dwelling unit. Bicycle spaces shall be two feet by six feet in ground area, with at least seven feet of overhead clearance, and shall allow proper placement of a bicycle.*
- 6. At least four bicycle parking spaces shall be provided where proposed, near the clubhouse and pool.*
- 7. Bollard lighting shall be provided along the walkways bordering the parking area.*
- 8. Trash enclosures shall be constructed of materials and finished in colors compatible with the site's proposed and existing buildings.*
- 9. To the extent practical, the graveled area between the two existing units on the northwest corner shall be replaced with vegetation.*

Board Member Ertle seconded the motion, which passed by a unanimous vote.

4.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, asked whether there is a way to follow up to make sure conditions of approval are enforced. Principal Planner Bishow said that this issue will be included as a topic for discussion on a future meeting agenda, at which time staff will attempt to illustrate how the program is currently being administered and how staff deals with exceptions, as well as to discuss with the Board to what degree staff does or does not have flexibility in certain matters. She then advised Ms. Laslo that the fastest way to get a response to a particular concern is to call staff directly.

5.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

Principal Planner Bishow advised the Board that the meeting of June 1, 2005 will be canceled, and that the CEQA workshop will be moved to a future meeting date.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of May 18, 2005

Board Member Goulart asked that the application checklist be reviewed and amended to include additional items such as type and location of lights, trash enclosures, etc. Chair Ambrosia said he would also like to see catalogue cuts when possible, as well as electrical drawings. Board Member LaGrow added that it would also be helpful to have details on fencing. Principal Planner Bishow responded that staff is currently working on a checklist of standards and suggested that it be included on the same agenda with the discussion of compliance review.

Chair Ambrosia then thanked Senior Plan Check Engineer Kotysan for attending the meetings and sharing his considerable knowledge on ADA issues.

Principal Planner Bishow reminded the Board that the City's employee workshop is scheduled for Friday, June 3, and invited the Board Members to attend. She then introduced Associate Planner Betts and invited him to speak to the Board. Associate Planner Betts gave the Board an overview of his past experience, and the Board welcomed him and thanked him for attending today's meeting.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 6:05 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of June 15, 2005.

Approved: June 15, 2005

Copies of this Agenda
Available from
Telephone:

City Planning Office
411 Main Street
(530) 879-6800

Agenda Prepared: 06/01/05
Agenda Posted: 06/01/05
Prior to: 5:00 PM

**CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

REGULAR MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2005
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, June 8, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. is adjourned to Wednesday, June 15, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1 of the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street, Chico, California.

Distribution:

Board Members (5)
City Manager
CDD Baptiste
ACDD Sellers
Councilor Kirk
Building Official
DPW McKinley
City Clerk
CM/Front Desk
Art Projects Coordinator
Street Address Coordinator

Planning Director Seidler
Principal Planner Bishow
Senior Planner Sigona
Associate Planner Summerville
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

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 15, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Board Members Absent: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle

Staff Members Present: Claudia Sigona, Senior Planner
Claudia Stuart, Senior Planner
Steve Betts, Associate Planner
Matt Kelley, Planning Intern
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Vice Chair LaGrow called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 4, 2005

2.2 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of May 18, 2005

Board Member Ward moved that the Board approve the minutes as submitted. Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 3-0-2 (Ambrosia and Ertle absent).

3.0 REGULAR AGENDA

3.1 ARB 05-16 (BCM/S&S Enterprises) Lots 4 & 5 Mission Ranch Boulevard, APNs 006-150-111 and 006-150-112 - Proposed construction of a 4,050 square foot shell building on the north side of Mission Ranch Boulevard between the Esplanade and Terra Blanca Drive. The proposed shell is the first building of a five-building commercial complex.

Senior Planner Stuart presented the staff report for the project, reviewing the site location in relation to adjacent businesses, pointing out the existing trees to be preserved, and explaining that a parcel merger may be required. She provided a materials and color board and said that staff believes they are consistent with or complementary to the Mission style of architecture that is prevalent in the area. She then reviewed the site plan and proposed landscaping, expressing concern regarding the request for chain link fencing, which staff believes is not consistent with the theme. She concluded her presentation by outlining the required findings and recommended conditions of approval contained in the staff report.

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

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 15, 2005

Project architect Matt Gallaway, representing the applicant, reviewed the theme and design elements of the project, including the tower feature on the rear building designed to call attention to that area of the site and the parapets on the front elevations used to break up the long line and to blend in with other buildings in the immediate vicinity.

With respect to staff's concern about the proposed chain link fencing, Mr. Gallaway explained that the day care center will need a visual barrier immediately to protect the children playing in the area, which cannot be accomplished with immature vines over a wrought iron fence.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Stuart answered that the building at the rear of the site and the parking and landscaping design for the entire site are included for review at today's meeting, clarifying that additional buildings will require separate review at a future meeting.

When asked about the proposed lighting, Mr. Gallaway said that he plans to use shoebox lighting with two heads that can be turned on and off independently for the parking lot, and soffit lights with perhaps some uplighting for the building. He pointed out that any style of decorative lighting would be based purely on imagination, since there were no lights on buildings "back then".

Board Member Ward said that in his opinion, the tower feature should be larger in proportion to the building, perhaps extended horizontally to align with the outside edge of the pilasters on either side of the entrance. Matt Bowman, of BCM Construction, explained that there are structural constraints that limit the size of the tower.

Board Member Goulart said that although she likes the color combination, she would prefer the darker color to be slightly darker, but still in the warm family of colors. Mr. Gallaway responded that when considering the color scheme, it had been a close call between the proposed color and one a shade darker, so there would be no problem with using the darker of the two.

The Board and Mr. Gallaway then discussed the proposed location and materials for the trash enclosure, and further discussed the width of the proposed tower feature.

Regarding the chain link fence, Mr. Gallaway said that the applicant does not want to install any permanent fencing, because if the day care center does not work out, the 5,000 square foot area could be used to expand the building or build an additional building. The Board and Mr. Gallaway discussed several options, including steel fencing screened with vines, vinyl fabric, black vinyl chain link to be more consistent with the Mission style, and wood fencing. Applicant Walt Stile III stated that wood fencing presents a maintenance problem, but more than that, the supports could not be located on the inside of the fence since the day care center is not allowed to have a fence that can be climbed by the children, and locating the supports on the outside of the fence would allow someone to climb into the play area. Mr. Gallaway stressed that his goal was to downplay and hide the fence rather than calling attention to it.

Lenn Goldman, from the public, said that the entases on the arches seem too narrow, which gives more of an impression of medieval architecture than Mission style. He suggested thickening the legs on each side to allow the upper tower to be expanded, and reducing the size of the windows. Mr. Gallaway asked whether that change could be incorporated without additional Board review, and by consensus, the Board agreed that it could be approved by staff.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 15, 2005

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

The Board then discussed the various aspects of the project, including the fencing, the parking lot lighting, the trash enclosure materials, the color scheme, and widening of the tower element.

Board Member Goulart moved that the Board approve the project subject to the findings set forth in the staff report and conditions of approval as follows:

1. *Prior to or concurrent with the submittal of a building permit application, the applicant shall submit four (4) final revised site plans incorporating the following applicable conditions of approval. 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 05-16.*
2. *The fence around the play yard shall be green vinyl chain link with matching slats, and vining material shall be planted and maintained such that it screens the fence from view.*
3. *At least two bicycle parking spaces shall be provided at the southwest corner of the building, consistent with the requirements of CMC 19.70.*
4. *Plaster color "C" shall be changed to a slightly darker shade in a warm tone.*
5. *The legs on the sides of the archway on the front elevation shall be widened, and the size of the tower element shall be increased to be more in proportion with the building, subject to staff review and approval.*

Board Member Ward seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 3-0-1 (Ambrosia and Ertle absent).

4.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Lenn Goldmann introduced himself as the architect for a project located at 111 Mission Ranch Boulevard (ARB 05-06), which was reviewed and approved by the Board at its meeting of March 16, 2005. He requested that the Board approve a modification of the colors for the project, saying that in order to qualify as "green", the project is subject to final approval by LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design), and that both the field color and the window glazing are not acceptable under LEED's guidelines. Staff advised Mr. Goldmann that the Board could not act on any item not listed on the agenda, and Vice Chair LaGrow directed staff to include the request for modification on the consent agenda for the next meeting.

5.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

None.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Vice Chair LaGrow adjourned the meeting at 5:01 p.m. to the meeting of June 29, 2005 at Sierra Nevada Brewery.

Approved: June 29, 2005

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 29, 2005
Sierra Nevada Brewery "Big Room" - 1075 E. 20th Street

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart

Board Members Absent: Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Claudia Stuart, Senior Planner
Ed Palmeri, Associate Planner
Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
Scott Arcoraci, Combination Inspector II
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of March 16, 2005

2.2 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 15, 2005

Board Member Ertle moved that Items 2.1 and 2.2 be approved as submitted. Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (Ward absent).

3.0 REGULAR AGENDA

3.1 ARB 05-06 (Main) 111 Mission Ranch Boulevard, APN 006-150-107 - Proposed modification of colors for an office building on a 0.75 acre site located in the CC Community Commercial zoning district. The project was previously approved by the Board at its meeting of March 16, 2005.

Associate Planner Palmeri presented the staff report for this project and provided a color board and a 12" x 12" sample of the proposed glass. He explained that if the Board approves the requested change, the decision would be reflected by revising the original conditions of approval as shown in the staff report.

Board Member Ambrosia noted that the applicant is also requesting a different window frame color and asked whether the Board would be able to consider that change. Mr. Palmeri responded that any or all colors can be reviewed and changed by the Board at this meeting.

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

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 29, 2005

Applicant Michael Main said that he would also like to discuss a revision to the site plan regarding some concrete benches. Mr. Palmeri said that although the Board could certainly weigh in if it desired, the change could be reviewed and approved at the staff level since the benches are accessory structures rather than architectural features.

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

Board Member LaGrow moved that the Board approve the modification as submitted, so that the original conditions of approval are revised to read as follows:

7. *The field color shall be Sherwin Williams X-524 Alamo (Base 200).*
8. *The window frame color shall be Milguard Almond-Tan.*
9. *Window glazing shall be Low E Gray.*

Board Member Ertle seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (Ward absent).

- 3.2 ARB 05-18 (Sierra Nevada) 1075 E. 20th Street, APNs 005-450-020, -029, -031, -032, -036, and -037; and 005-550-005, -023, -033, -034, and -035** - Proposed Sierra Nevada Master Plan, including a 520 square foot carbon dioxide recovery facility; a 6,659 square foot expansion of the former Netco warehouse; a new 45,780 square foot facility for relocation of the brewery's bottling systems; a 15,727 square foot expansion of the existing cold-storage warehouse; a new 14,630 square foot point-of-service warehouse; and expanded parking facilities. The project is located on over 20 acres on the south side of East 20th Street between Whitman Avenue and Fair Street. The project site is zoned ML Light Manufacturing/Industrial.

Senior Planner Stuart explained to the Board that after presentation of the staff report, there would be a brief tour of the site to show the proposed changes. She advised the Board that subsequent to completion of the staff report, comments were received from other City departments, and she distributed a supplemental report with those comments attached. She clarified that the Board's action today will provide direction to staff to assist in determining whether or not future proposed changes to the plan are in "substantial compliance" with its decision, so that minor changes could be approved at the staff level, with only major changes being brought back for Board review. She reviewed the site layout and proposed buildings, the color scheme with the distinctive blue roof and pale ale colors, the decorative masonry fence that was approved through the City's use permit process last year, and the parking and landscaping plan. She then outlined staff's concerns and the proposed conditions of approval contained in the staff report.

In response to questions from the Board, Principal Planner Bishow explained that the preferred method of planting trees for shade is to use islands rather than areas where the canopies would cross a property line; however, she stated the Code is not specific and that staff generally just tries to figure out how to provide the required 50% shading. She clarified that the large truck turning area on this site is not required to meet the shade quotient.

Ms. Bishow then introduced Combination Inspector II Arcoraci and invited him to address the Board. Mr. Arcoraci explained that he is responsible for the Fire Department plan check, so he will be performing a cursory review of the site with respect to fire hydrants and access.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 29, 2005

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

Project architect Matt Gallaway, representing the applicant, provided an overview of the process, explaining that he is attempting to show the entire project to the Board at one time rather than coming back five different times. He explained that this had originally been an 8-phase project, the first 3 of which were the overflow parking area, the aesthetically pleasing tilt-up wall along the rear of the property for security and privacy, and the modification of Franklin Street.

Property owner Ken Grossman clarified that the purpose of adding a second bottling line is not to increase capacity, but rather to get back to a normal work day of one day shift on two lines instead of all day and all night on one line.

There being no questions for the applicant, the Board, staff, and interested members of the public attended a guided tour of the site.

During the site tour, Karen Laslo, from the public, asked what plantings will be used along the perimeter wall. Mr. Gallaway responded that there will be an evergreen tree and ficus planted in each tree well and more elaborate landscaping provided at the corner of Elm and 21st Streets. She then asked if there are any oak trees on the site. Mr. Gallaway replied that there are four oaks along the perimeter wall that will be retained as required by the conditions of the use permit and four additional large oaks on the site that are protected by CC&Rs.

Upon reconvening in the meeting room, Mr. Gallaway continued his presentation, responding to questions and concerns raised in the staff report and on the tour. With respect to the gate at the Franklin Street entrance, he stated that it would be a rolling, wrought iron gate. He pointed out the planned location for exterior lighting and assured the Board that because the site is over-parked, the elimination of the 7 parking spaces about which staff had expressed concern would not be a burden. He noted that Mr. Arcoraci's comment regarding the fire hydrant is the result of an error in the drawing, clarifying that there had inadvertently been two hydrants called out as Hydrant #4.

The Board then discussed with Mr. Gallaway and the applicant proposed parking lot lighting, marked pedestrian walkways, trash enclosure materials, and bicycle parking. Mr. Grossman pointed out that Sierra Nevada already provides interior bicycle parking for its employees, distributed throughout the site, that is double what the City requires.

Elizabeth Devereaux, from the public, asked Mr. Grossman whether there are showers provided for employees, to which he responded affirmatively.

Ms. Laslo said that this is a nice project and thanked Mr. Grossman.

Chair Ambrosia suggested to Mr. Grossman that some public art be considered for the project. Board Member LaGrow commented that the entire project is artistic, considering the old equipment and photographs displayed throughout the building and the way the entire site is designed to showcase rather than hide its function. Mr. Grossman added that there are also existing murals, but agreed to keep Chair Ambrosia's suggestion in mind.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 29, 2005

There being no further public comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing. The Board discussed staff's recommended conditions of approval until consensus was reached as to how they would be revised and incorporated into the motion.

Board Member Goulart moved that the Board approve the project as submitted, subject to the required findings set forth in the staff report and conditions of approval as follows:

1. *Prior to or concurrent with the submittal of a building permit application, the applicant shall submit four (4) final revised site plans incorporating the following applicable conditions of approval. 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 05-18.*
2. *The applicant shall provide two decorative wrought iron light fixtures similar to those on the water purification plant on the north face of the point-of-service warehouse, close to Franklin Street.*
3. *The applicant shall provide wall pack lighting around the west and south sides of the bottling plant and former Netco warehouse. The applicant shall provide lighting not to exceed 12 feet in height in the parking lot planters adjacent to the perimeter of the proposed parking area. All lighting shall be shielded and directed downward.*
4. *The applicant shall plant Parthenocissus tricuspidata "Veitchii" (Little-leaf Boston Ivy), or a similar dense vining plant, on the chain link fencing adjoining Franklin Street.*
5. *The applicant shall remove the seven parking spaces to the west of the exterior fuel cells and shall landscape that area.*
6. *The applicant shall extend the ten foot landscaped setback between the proposed parking area and Franklin Street as far as the gateway opening.*
7. *The applicant shall provide marked pedestrian walkways from the existing curbed walkway on the east side of the Netco warehouse to Sierra Nevada Court, between the point-of-service warehouse and bottling facility to Franklin Street, and across the Franklin Street gateway to the parking aisles along the northwest perimeter of the site.*
8. *The applicant shall provide bicycle parking spaces needed for the site consistent with CMC 19.70.080 (Bicycle parking and support facilities).*
9. *Any additional trash receptacles on the site shall be finished in materials and colors consistent with the decorative scheme of the buildings.*
10. *The applicant shall provide a rolling, decorative wrought iron gate for the Franklin Street entrance.*

Chair Ambrosia seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (Ward absent).

4.0 AD HOC COMMITTEE REGARDING SECOND DWELLING UNITS

Principal Planner Bishow provided an update on recent City Council discussions regarding second dwelling units. The Board discussed the role of an ad hoc committee to further examine second dwelling unit guidelines and standards. Karen Laslo, from the public, said that if the committee is open to citizen participation, she believes that Ken Fleming (from the Chico Avenues Neighborhood Association) would like to be included. Chair Ambrosia agreed and suggested that Melinda Vasquez also be invited to participate due to her design background. The Board agreed by consensus that Chair Ambrosia and Board Member Goulart would be on the committee, with Board Member Ertle serving as alternate.

5.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Chair Ambrosia distributed a checklist for assessing aesthetic impacts that he had received from a mini-workshop, "Judging Aesthetics", presented as part of the APA National Planning Conference in 1999. He said that he had recently contacted the instructor, who has agreed to produce a CD, free of charge, that might be instructive and helpful to the Board and staff.

Architect Matt Gallaway said that he would like to see more administrative-level architectural approval to reduce applicant costs such as architect's time and City fees. He acknowledged that there would have to be tightly defined criteria; however, in his opinion the net result would be a more streamlined process. He suggested that in addition to minor new projects, there might be certain parts of larger projects that staff could review and approve to avoid necessitating repeated submittals to the Board.

Principal Planner Bishow responded that the City Code includes a very broad range of development projects that require site plan and architectural review; in general, all projects other than single-family dwellings. She said that although the Code allows the Planning Director to review and approve architecture on minor projects, as staff and Board members change, the definition of what projects are "minor" will naturally shift. She acknowledged that in the past, many projects were approved administratively as part of the building permit process; however, there are now different staff members interpreting the language in the Code, and any project that could raise public interest or controversy is going to be brought to the Board.

Board Member LaGrow commented that when he repeatedly sees high-quality projects from local professionals, he begins to trust that any new project has already been thoroughly reviewed to ensure that the best possible proposal is recommended to the client and submitted to the Board. He added that for the most part, concerns raised in the staff report are not things that had not been considered prior to making the submittal, but rather they had been addressed in the best way possible according to the architect's professional opinion.

Ms. Bishow then said that conditions of a previous Board approval cannot be modified at the staff level, so when an applicant modifies a submittal to conform to staff's recommendation prior to presenting it at the Board meeting, it is not necessary for the Board to include that condition in its motion.

Mr. Gallaway concluded his comments by complimenting the Board and expressing appreciation for its role. He related that there have been times when a client has rejected something he has strongly recommended, and the Board has required it through conditions of approval.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 29, 2005

Board Member Goulart said she would like to discuss the project on 2nd Street [ARB 04-33 (Herbert/Sheraton RE) 120 - 128 West 2nd Street]. She noted that staff had previously requested that the Board wait until the awnings were up to judge the project, and now that the awnings are up, she still really dislikes it. Chair Ambrosia pointed out that staff had administratively approved a color change on the project. Ms. Bishow said that it had been a minor color change.

6.0 **CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION**
None.

7.0 **ADJOURNMENT**
There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 6:04 p.m. to the regular meeting of July 6, 2005.

Approved: July 20, 2005

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of July 6, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Board Members Absent: Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Claudia Stuart, Senior Planner
Gregory Redeker, Assistant Planner
Mary Gardner, Art Projects Coordinator
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 REGULAR AGENDA

2.1 ARB 04-12 Modification (Slater & Son) Northwest corner of Hegan Lane and Huss Drive, APN 039-060-125 - Request for modification of an approval previously granted by the Board for a proposed 37.5 acre industrial/business park to add an art sculpture and entrance sign.

Assistant Planner Redeker introduced Art Projects Coordinator Gardner and invited project artist Glen Cowan to place a metal model of the proposed sign and artwork at the table for the Board's review. Mr. Redeker explained that the sign portion will be constructed in two layers, with lighting placed between them. He noted that the model differs from the actual proposal in that the artwork portion of the model is straight and the actual artwork will be curved. He displayed a sight-distance drawing of the site to help the Board visualize the location and height of the sign in relation to the street. He reviewed the discussion items set forth in the staff report and stated that staff is recommending approval of the project.

Chair Ambrosia asked for details on the type and location of the proposed indirect and ground-mounted lighting. Mr. Redeker replied that no exact location had been determined, although he elaborated that the ground-mounted light for the sign portion would be shining onto the blue background layer only.

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

Steve Seidenglanz, representing the applicant, said that this is a collaboration between this site and the neighboring site to call both projects "Hegan Lane Business Park" and to make them identifiable. He stated that he is encouraging the owner of the neighboring site to provide a similar project on Otterson Drive to help create a theme, and that he plans to add more artwork to the two additional buildings on his site that have been approved but not built.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of July 6, 2005

Board Member Ward expressed concern about the sign possibly inviting kids to bang on it, and about the potential safety hazard to gardeners or others who might fall on it and injure themselves. He said that in order to reduce the hazard, he would like to see the sign capped, particularly at the bottom, to make it more rigid and acoustically sound. Other than that, he said that he likes it; he thinks it is a tremendous addition to the area and he hopes that the idea can be amplified on other projects.

Project artist Glen Cowan replied that 8 to 10 gauge steel will be used, and there will be significant reinforcement between the two layers of each portion, so the sign and artwork will both be quite rigid. He said that he believes a cap would detract from the sign. Board Member Ward disagreed, reiterating that it would be helpful to have a cap that would steady the sign so that if it were hit on one end, the other end would not move.

Chair Ambrosia said that another way to stabilize the sign would be to raise the brackets up higher and weld them. Mr. Cowan responded that the artwork will act like a truss, stressing that there are several supports, spaced so they cannot easily be seen. He restated his position that a cap would not make the sign more rigid than the struts, but he agreed to try to find a way to place a cap on the lower section. Chair Ambrosia also recommended that 8 gauge steel be used.

Board Member Goulart asked how the lettering will be illuminated. Mr. Cowan replied that the two layers at the bottom will have a large enough gap to have lighting in between them, adding that although no specific locations had yet been determined, he plans to place the lighting in a way that provides uniform illumination. Board Member Goulart commented that if uniform illumination is the goal, a diffused light source such as tube or rope lighting along the entire length of the interior of the sign would be a better choice than numerous discrete flood lights. She then asked Mr. Cowan how many lights he plans to use to illuminate the artwork portion, and he responded that it will likely require 8 to 10. He stated that he intends to mount the lights between the sign and the artwork, so the light fixtures will not be easily seen by the public.

Chair Ambrosia remarked that the Board is very concerned about lighting, and although this is a very nice piece of art and it is understandable that the artist wants it to be brightly lit, he thinks subtle would be better. He added that the Board generally does not allow any uplighting; however, in his opinion it would be justified for this project. Board Member Goulart agreed that less would be better and suggested that Mr. Cowan research what the spread of the lights will be and reduce their number.

Karen Laslo, from the public, said she thinks this is an extraordinary piece of art, elaborating that when she looks at it she feels cool and calm. She thanked the applicant for such a nice project and said she would like to see art included in more projects in Chico.

Chair Ambrosia then asked Ms. Gardner to comment on the project. Ms. Gardner echoed the earlier praise for the project and said this is a great beginning for looking at the industrial park in a different way.

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

The Board then discussed various aspects of the project, including the possibility of providing a pair of benches for pedestrian use and enhanced landscaping. In response to a question from the Board,

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of July 6, 2005

Mr. Redeker explained that staff is looking for guidance so that it might be possible to approve some future aspects of the project administratively. Ms. Gardner agreed and suggested that the Board direct the applicant to consult with the artist to ensure that future art would work well with what is being approved today.

Board Member Ertle 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 applicant shall provide a note on the front sheet of the building plans indicating that the project shall be developed in compliance with the approval of ARB 04-12 (Modified).*
- 2. Minor modifications to the overall site to incorporate elements of the artwork shall be reviewed and approved administratively by Planning staff, subject to the applicant consulting with a professional artist to ensure consistency.*

Board Member Ward seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (LaGrow absent).

Chair Ambrosia requested a 5-minute recess. Principal Planner Bishow and Assistant Planner Redeker left the meeting at this time.

2.2 Discussion of Future Tour of Approved Projects - The Board will discuss and generate a list of potential sites to include on a future tour of approved projects.

Senior Planner Stuart explained to the Board that staff would like to plan a tour in place of one of its scheduled meetings, using the trolley to visit sites of various previously approved projects and give the Board an opportunity to see how those projects have turned out. She said that staff would like the Board members to provide a list of projects they believe would be particularly instructive, and that staff would then gather information on those projects and distribute it prior to the tour.

The Board expressed interest in visiting the following sites:

- Skyway Tools at the corner of Skyway and Bruce Road
- Medical and professional buildings on Skyway between Bruce Road and Notre Dame
- Shopping strip at Shasta and Esplanade
- Chipotle at the corner of Mangrove and Vallombrosa
- Mid-Valley Title parking area at 6th and Main Streets
- Multi-family project near Chico Electric with the fountain feature
- Complex next to the police station, beyond Hignell
- Multi-family project adjacent to the Rice Bowl
- Retail complex at Cohasset and Lassen
- Projects incorporating landscaped mounding for parking lot screening

Staff added the following suggestions:

- Art element at 7th and Salem
- Project mimicking CSUC on Cohasset between the bike path and Esplanade
- Sterling Oaks Apartments
- Land's End building on Bruce and 32

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of July 6, 2005

Ms. Stuart suggested that later in the year, perhaps staff could arrange a second tour after dark to take a look at signage and different types of lighting. The Board liked the idea very much and agreed that it would be very helpful to them.

3.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

4.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

Chair Ambrosia mentioned that the Firestone building at Forest and 32 had recently been purchased and that the new owner is planning to put a mall there, so the Board will have the opportunity to see that project in the near future.

Senior Planner Stuart distributed a development standards checklist for site design and architectural review to the Board members for their information and clarified that its precise use and the method of implementation is still being piloted. She said that it includes the most common Code requirements and will be used for compliance, and staff thought it might be helpful for the Board to have the opportunity to take a look at how the applicant and staff work together to ensure that projects are developed properly.

5.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of July 20, 2005.

Approved: July 20, 2005

CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD &
AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of July 20, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Airport Commissioners Present: Georgie Bellin
Al Silva

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Steve Betts, Associate Planner
Bob Summerville, Associate Planner
Greg Redeker, Assistant Planner
Patrick Race, Planning Intern
Matthew Kelley, Planning Intern
Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia 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 June 29, 2005

2.2 Minutes of the Regular Meeting of July 6, 2005

Board Member Ertle moved that the Board approve Items 2.1 and 2.2 as submitted. The motion was seconded by Board Member Goulart and passed by a vote of 5-0.

3.0 AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE AGENDA

3.1 ARB 05-23 (Faucet Direct) 1330 Fortress Street, APN 047-560-049 - A new 41,868 square foot (sf) industrial building, consisting of an 11,628 sf office and 30,240 sf warehouse, on a 3.08 acre site located at the southeast corner of Fortress and Ryan.

Assistant Planner Redeker presented the staff report, reviewing various aspects of the project and outlining staff's recommended conditions of approval.

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

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD & AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Adjourned Regular Meeting of July 20, 2005

Project architect Lori Stewart of Russell, Gallaway Associates explained that Faucet Direct is a young, rapidly growing company that will be an asset to the airport park. She said that the building design is modeled after Butte College's Chico location, but uses a more earth tone color scheme.

David Lupton of Slater and Sons, representing the applicant, presented a revised site plan and addressed staff's concerns and recommended changes. Regarding bicycle parking, he explained that this is an internet-based business that sells home improvement type products; they neither wholesale nor retail, so there are no customers coming and going. He said that he would prefer to put all six bicycle parking spaces in the employee entrance area, and that he does not think it is necessary to cover them. He said that staff's recommendation with regard to the trash enclosures will be no problem, and he pointed out that the revised site plan incorporates staff's recommended changes regarding berming, planters, and islands, including additional landscaping around the truck turning area.

Mr. Lupton took issue with recommended condition of approval #6, stating that Public Works does not require sidewalks wider than four feet, and this seems to be "plan checking by committee". He said that if Planning staff wants wider sidewalks, they should get together with Public Works staff and change the code. He did say, however, that he had widened the proposed sidewalk along the front of the building. Principal Planner Bishow asked whether the proposed sidewalk from the public sidewalk on Fortress Street to the building entrance is five feet wide, to which Mr. Lupton replied that it is four feet wide.

Mr. Lupton then presented a color photograph of Aero-Union's building that is directly across the street from this project and questioned why staff is requesting additional architectural details and accents on this building, when there is obviously none whatsoever on Aero-Union's. He pointed out that he is already providing 11,000 square feet of high articulation on the office portion of a building that is located in the lowest rent district in the City, and stressed that he is strongly opposed to this recommended condition of approval.

Further discussion regarding articulation followed, after which Mr. Lupton compromised and said that he would be able to provide a contrasting color for the gable on the north and south elevations at no additional cost, but to paint any additional articulation would cost the applicant at least \$1,000 more. Ms. Stewart cautioned that simply changing the gable color would not improve the aesthetics, and that to properly make the changes being discussed could easily add \$20,000 to the cost of the project.

With respect to Mr. Lupton's comments about the sidewalk and bicycle parking, Board Member Ertle said that there is always the possibility that in the future the building might be rented out to a tenant who does have customers coming to and from the site. Mr. Lupton responded that he is not trying to go around City standards, he simply does not want to have to provide things in excess of them. He pointed out that he has already met staff halfway and provided the wider sidewalk along the front of the building, in addition to the 45 feet of landscaping with berming along the street.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, said that employees might want covered bicycle parking since the bike path does go all the way out to the project site and on hot days, they might not want to have to get on their bikes that have been out in the sun all day. Mr. Lupton responded that it is

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD & AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Adjourned Regular Meeting of July 20, 2005

the same as getting into a car with black seats. Ms. Laslo countered that bike seats can get hot and damaged in the heat, whereas cars have air conditioning.

Melinda Vasquez, 260 E. Sacramento Avenue, said she would also like to see public bicycle parking, because people are more health conscious and the City should support designs that assist people in being active and healthy. She said that she does appreciate the 45 foot green belt at the front of the site.

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

Commissioner Silva moved that the Airport Architectural Committee approve ARB 05-23 based on the findings set forth in the agenda report and conditions of approval as follows:

1. *Prior to or concurrent with submittal of a building permit application, the applicant shall submit four (4) final revised site plans incorporating the following applicable conditions of approval. The applicant shall provide a note on the front sheet of the building plans that the project will be developed in compliance with ARB 05-23.*
2. *Six bicycle parking spaces shall be provided (CMC 19.70.080.B.1: Bicycle parking and support facilities) beneath a shade structure architecturally compatible with the building. All bicycle racks shall be of a "hoop" design.*
3. *A solid metal gate shall be provided for the trash enclosure. Materials and colors for the trash enclosure shall blend with the main building (CMC 19.60.060: Fencing and screening).*
4. *A landscaped berm at least three feet in height shall be provided in the landscaped area between the parking area and the street.*
5. *Landscape planters and parking shall be installed as depicted on the revised site plan provided at today's meeting. A final revised landscape plan, in substantial conformance with the revised site plan provided at today's meeting, shall be submitted subject to staff review and approval.*
6. *Walkways shall be installed as depicted on the revised site plan provided at today's meeting.*
7. *The north and south gable ends above the eave line shall be an accenting color (chosen from available pre-coated metal siding colors), and a 4-inch Terra Cotta (Color "C") strip shall be added to the rear corners of the building.*
8. *Signage for the site shall be subject to staff review and approval.*
9. *The truss above the main entrance shall be painted to match the aluminum trim of the windows.*

Commissioner Bellin seconded the motion, which passed 2-0.

Commissioners Bellin and Silva left the meeting at this time.

4.0 REGULAR AGENDA

4.1 ARB 05-21 (Central Development, Inc.) 411 Otterson Drive, APN 039-620-023 - Proposed façade remodel on an existing 36,000 square foot tilt-up warehouse shell.

Due to a conflict of interest, Board Member LaGrow recused himself from participation in the Board's review of this project and left the meeting room.

Associate Planner Betts presented the staff report for this project, outlining various aspects of the project and reviewing the recommended discussion items and conditions of approval. He advised the Board that staff had administratively approved a change in paint color, which is what is currently on the building.

Chair Ambrosia said that upon review of the minutes of the 2001 meeting at which the project was initially approved, it appears that the applicant did not comply with the Board's direction to continue the architectural treatment around all four sides of the building, excluding the parapet. Project architect Lori Stewart of Russell, Gallaway Associates explained that there are actually two abutting buildings, only one of which was included in the original submittal, but both of which are included in this submittal. Principal Planner Bishow remarked that the second building was not included in the public noticing, but the Board can direct staff to approve it administratively.

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

Chair Ambrosia moved that the Board approve ARB 05-21 based on the findings set forth in the agenda report and subject to the following conditions of approval:

- 1. The applicant shall provide a note on the front sheet of the building plans stating that the project will be developed in compliance with ARB 01-13 for site plan (landscaping, lighting, and parking) requirements and ARB 05-21 for the building façade remodel.*
- 2. The color scheme is approved as shown on the color board submitted at today's meeting.*
- 3. The canopies are approved as indicated on Attachment "H" to the agenda report.*
- 4. Staff is directed to review the colors for the adjacent building and, if found to be consistent with those approved at today's meeting, to provide administrative approval.*
- 5. Signage shall be subject to staff review and approval.*

Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed 4-0-1 (LaGrow disqualified).

4.2 ARB 05-24 (Atmore) - 725 W. 4th Avenue, APN 043-150-004 - A proposal to construct 12 two-bedroom townhouse apartment units on a 1.02 acre site currently developed with two duplex apartment buildings, which will remain.

Board Member LaGrow returned to the meeting at this time.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD & AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Adjourned Regular Meeting of July 20, 2005

Associate Planner Summerville presented the staff report for this project, outlining various aspects of the project and reviewing the recommended discussion items and conditions of approval. He indicated that this will be a substantial improvement to the property, some of which is deteriorating and some of which is currently vacant. He mentioned that some of the current tenants have vegetable gardens they would like to retain, and said that staff supports that request.

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

Applicant Tom Atmore reviewed the list of recommended conditions of approval one at a time and provided responses to each. He indicated that there would be no problem complying with recommended conditions #1-5, and he presented a revised drawing that includes lawns behind the units as indicated in recommended condition #6. Associate Planner Summerville noted that according to the code all ground cover must be living, so unless the Board approves the walk-on bark shown on the revised drawing, it will have to be replaced. Mr. Atmore said he would have no problem replacing it. With respect to requiring improvements to the existing units, Board Member Goulart suggested providing gabled entrances to mimic the proposed new units. Mr. Atmore said he would prefer not to do that, saying that cosmetic improvements such as paint, trim, and roofing should be sufficient to tie the old units to the new.

Regarding recommended condition #7, Mr. Atmore explained that it is a pecan tree, not a hemlock tree, and that he would like to remove it because not only is it old and dilapidated, but it is also extremely messy and detrimental to cars due to droppings and sap. He pointed out that there are three Oregon grapes and some shrubs planned for that area. He also indicated that the oak tree mentioned in the condition is actually several small trees rather than one large tree, and that he would be happy to retain both the oaks and the redwood as long as he can build the fence around them. Board Member Goulart asked whether the two existing almond trees in the right-of-way could be removed and replaced, since they seem to be in very poor condition. Associate Planner Summerville said that the Board can include in its motion a recommendation to the Urban Forester that they be replaced.

Mr. Atmore then said that recommended conditions #8-10 will present no problem, but asked whether it would be necessary for him to specify exactly how the HVAC units would be screened. The Board agreed by consensus that Mr. Atmore can work with staff to determine appropriate screening.

Board Member Goulart expressed concern regarding the color scheme, saying that other buildings with similar color schemes seem to fade and become dingy and dirty. Board Member LaGrow agreed that it can be a problem with some finishes; however, he said that the proposed colors are medium rather than pastel, and he believes that as long as the applicant uses a low sheen finish that rejects dirt, the color scheme should work out fine.

Board Member Goulart then said she would like to see the planters at the entrance be bermed in order to better conceal the parking area. Associate Planner Summerville said that it should be possible to provide a three-foot high berm, and suggested that the Board might also consider wrapping the wall around the west side of the parking lot and placing a sign there, too. After discussing that option, the Board agreed by consensus that berming would be sufficient.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD & AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Adjourned Regular Meeting of July 20, 2005

Board Member Goulart asked Mr. Atmore whether he intends to remove the old pine tree that is leaning into the walkway of one of the existing units. Mr. Atmore replied that the tenants love that tree for the shade it provides.

Melinda Vasquez, 260 E. Sacramento Avenue, said that the existing duplexes should be upgraded so that the architecture integrates, stressing that paint is not adequate to tie the old to the new. She said that because the front duplex faces 4th Avenue, it should be in itself a sign of what to expect from the rest of the project, and she added that the landscaping should be dense and lush, incorporating trees and shrubs both to camouflage the parking area and to create a park-like entrance. She noted that the yard in front of the duplex on 4th Avenue has been demolished due to the tenant using it for parking, and she hopes some landscaping, such as boulders or a wall, will be included to eliminate that possibility. She then said that perhaps the 6-foot wall should be detailed with brick until it can be covered with greenery, reiterating that the important thing to her is the park-like atmosphere. She pointed out that this site is only a few blocks from the SD-4 overlay zoning district and said that the Board should be sensitive to doing whatever it can to maintain the integrity of the area.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento, echoed Ms. Vasquez's concerns and asked questions regarding the windows and the single family house at the front of the site.

Board Member Goulart restated her earlier suggestion to add gables above the doorways to the existing units. Board Member LaGrow agreed that substantial improvement does need to be made to the front building, and Chair Ambrosia added that it would be a shame to hide the very attractive new construction behind the old buildings.

Board Member Goulart then asked whether the driveway cutout on the sidewalk in front of the duplex will be filled in to discourage parking in the yard, and Associate Planner Summerville said that the Board can include in its motion a recommendation to Public Works.

There being no further questions for staff nor any further public comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

Board Member Goulart moved that the Board approve the project based on the findings set forth in the staff report and subject to conditions of approval as follows:

- 1. Prior to or concurrent with the submittal of a building permit application, the applicant shall submit four (4) final revised site plans incorporating the following applicable conditions of approval. 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 05-24.*
- 2. The applicant shall provide improvements to the existing duplexes, consistent with the cosmetics of the new townhouses, including a gable overhang at each entrance, new exterior paint with matching detail, new roofing, new fascia trim, and screening of roof-mounted HVAC units.*
- 3. The applicant shall indicate on all revised site plans a centrally located, secure bicycle parking facility.*

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD & AIRPORT ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Adjourned Regular Meeting of July 20, 2005

4. *The applicant shall amend the landscape plans to include creeping vines planted along the perimeter masonry fence as outlined in the staff report.*
5. *The applicant shall provide calculations for fifty percent shading and five percent interior landscaping of all parking areas on all landscape plans submitted with building plans.*
6. *The applicant shall revise the landscape plan submitted at today's meeting to extend lawn areas to the rear and sides of all new apartment units, to provide ground cover rather than walk-on bark in the areas at the southeast and southwest corners of the site, and to retain the existing gardens in the rear of the duplexes.*
7. *The pecan tree centrally located near the west property line may be removed as noted on the revised landscape plan submitted at today's meeting. The 14-inch oak tree located close to the south property line and the mature redwood tree also located close to the south property line shall be preserved and incorporated into the final landscape plans. The applicant is directed to work with the City's Urban Forester with regard to the possibility of removing and replacing the almond trees and the dead walnut tree located in the parkway strip along W. 4th Avenue. All other existing trees noted on the current landscape plan shall be preserved on the final landscape plans.*
8. *The applicant shall provide stucco finish and brick detail on the proposed perimeter masonry fence, consistent with the existing fence on the west side of the property, and shall indicate on all site and landscape plans submitted with building plans that it extends behind the existing duplex units.*
9. *The applicant shall indicate approved screening around HVAC units on all site and landscape plans submitted with building plans.*
10. *The applicant shall provide wood siding with approximately 1/2-inch deep x one-inch wide grooves to accentuate vertical detailing.*
11. *The two grass planters at the entrance to the property shall be bermed to three feet high to camouflage the parking area, and vegetation shall be added in front of the existing duplex at the front of the complex.*
12. *With the exception of specific changes included in these conditions of approval, the revised landscape plan submitted at today's meeting is approved, and all landscape plans shall be revised accordingly.*
13. *The applicant is directed to work with the City's Department of Public Works with regard to the possibility of removing the existing easterly driveway apron on W. 4th Avenue.*

Board Member LaGrow seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

5.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

6.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

6.1 Meetings and Procedures

Planning Intern Kelly presented an overview of the material attached to the agenda report, which was excerpted from the *Planning Commissioner's Handbook* and *Rosenberg's Rules of Order: Simple Parliamentary Procedures for the 21st Century*.

Chair Ambrosia thanked Mr. Kelley, saying the information will be very helpful. He asked whether the Board should be providing an opportunity for applicants to respond to public comments, as is outlined in the handout. Principal Planner Bishow explained that although it is appropriate to allow applicants an opportunity to respond to comments provided during the public hearing, the response should be limited to rebuttal comments rather than allowing additional information to be presented on which the public has not had an opportunity to comment.

Chair Ambrosia then asked whether applicants should be allowed to respond directly to a citizen commenting on the project, and Ms. Bishow said that in order to encourage members of the public to freely voice their opinions, all comments should be directed to the Board.

Board Member LaGrow said he would like to begin enforcing the time set aside for Board discussion only. Ms. Bishow said that even when the public hearing is closed, the Board can reopen it at its discretion to hear additional information; however, she cautioned that if it reopens the hearing to the applicant, it must reopen to the public as well.

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 6:06 p.m. to the regular meeting of August 3, 2005.

Approved: September 21, 2005

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 3, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart

Board Members Absent: Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Kim Seidler, Planning Director
Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Dennis McLaughlin, Housing Officer
Steve Betts, Associate Planner
Renee Schreindl, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 REGULAR AGENDA

2.1 ARB 05-19 (Peitz/McCrea) Northeast corner of Cohasset Road and Glenbrook Court, APN 048-400-008 - Proposed construction of a single story, 3,680 square foot dental office.

Associate Planner Betts presented an overview of the project which included the location, zoning, size of the parcel, and description of the site. He reviewed the characteristics of the site and the design of the project. He explained that there is no signage proposed at this time and requested the Board to discuss the following items:

- 1 The addition of more fenestration or other architectural features on the west (Cohasset Road) side of the building;
2. Use of masonry block units or other appropriate material for the trash enclosure; and
3. The style, colors, materials, and location of signage.

He advised that staff recommends approval of the project subject to the recommended conditions of approval. He also advised that Kovak Court is a private road and does not know if there is any landscaping along the fence that was constructed with the subdivision to the east of the project, in response to questions by Board Member Goulart.

Chair Ambrosia stated that there is no breakup or interest to the wall on the south elevation and was wondering why the staff were recommending that the bike racks be a hoop design. Principal Planner Bishow drew an illustration of the hoop design and explained that it creates a secure locking device on the center of the bike and helps prevent the wheels from being ruined.

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing and welcomed the applicant to speak.

Matt Amaro, representing the applicant, explained that Dr. Kremer has some special needs which is why the building is the size it is and he would probably like it a little bigger. The size of the

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of August 3, 2005

building prevents anything from being done in the rear and the ten foot parking lot setback caught them by surprise, which left nonstructural columns. He also explained they are hoping the trees along Cohasset Road will shield some of the bareness of the walls and if not, using some trellises and planting climbing vines might help break up the wall. He advised that everyone likes the project, it is compatible with the neighborhood, and it is a nice contemporary design along Cohasset Road.

Mr. Amaro showed where the location of the trash receptacle would be and advised there will be no problems with it blocking the gates, in response to a question by Board Member LaGrow.

Board Member Goulart asked if a block wall with a nice cap that can be seen from the public right-of-way could be constructed as it would look better than fencing. She also asked if the landscaping would be flat or would there be berming. Mr. Amaro responded by explaining that there are nice assisted living facilities with nice landscaping towards the end of Kovak Court, and that constructing a block wall might shield it off from future development. He advised he would like to discuss constructing a block wall with the owner but explained that some day they could possibly do away with the fence and just have landscaping. Chair Ambrosia stated that he thought that made sense.

Chair Ambrosia congratulated the applicant for attempting to deal with the side of the building facing the street even though it will function as the rear of the building. He also expressed that he likes the proposed enclosure/screen wall and asked the applicant about what he is proposing for the windows.

Mr. Amaro explained that the windows will have one large, clear pane of glass as the doctor likes for the patients to see out. He also explained that the windows along Glenbrook Court will have eyebrows for a nice visual effect as you are coming down Cohasset Road. Chair Ambrosia stated that based on the applicant's comment of possibly having no fencing some day, that he would like to see arched windows and another window to balance out the west elevation. Mr. Amaro explained that the doctor is not excited about another window on the west side and discussed putting smaller windows up high.

Chair Ambrosia stated that he would like to see some relief in the stucco. Mr. Amaro explained they would put up some type of trellis and possibly put in some air conditioning units with a low wall, and shield the wall with growing vegetation.

Mr. Amaro explained that the doctor prefers a composition roof as he feels it has more of a contemporary look than a terra cotta roof, in response to a question by Chair Ambrosia.

In response to a question by Vice Chair LaGrow concerning adequate space in the front of the building, Mr. Amaro explained that the building is pushed as far forward as possible and still allows for the required ten foot setback from the sidewalk on Cohasset Road.

Mr. Amaro explained that the third window on the west elevation is smaller as it is connected to a smaller consultation room, but he is agreeable to making it the same size as the other windows, in response to a question by Board Member Goulart.

Chair Ambrosia stated that there is no space in the parking lot area to pop out the elevation the other way. He asked if the lobby size could be reduced by a couple of feet to recess the wall to get shallow relief in the rear and allow for a little overhang for the columns.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of August 3, 2005

Mr. Amaro explained that the purpose of the large lobby which includes a fireplace, is to give a very comfortable, home feeling. The applicant's business centers around cosmetic dentistry.

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

Vice Chair LaGrow suggested a stucco wall for the air conditioning units along Cohasset Road. Board Member Ertle suggested putting an opening or gate along the stucco wall to break it up and add interest. Board Member Goulart expressed concerns with a wall that is 4 feet in height being too tall from the public side.

Vice Chair LaGrow suggested that the rock on the windowsills and columns be the same color and stated that it is a good color combination.

The Board discussed recessing the wall for the columns or adding a pergola to give some dimension along the rear elevation, the height of the wall to shield the air conditioning units, and concerns with the north elevation.

Principal Planner Bishow encouraged the Board to provide options which will allow staff to work with the applicant to achieve what they desire for the project.

Board Member Ertle moved that the Architectural Review Board adopt the findings contained in the staff report and approve the project (ARB 05-19) subject to the recommended conditions of approval and the additional conditions as follows:

5. *The applicant shall resubmit a drawing showing a change to the west elevation of the building utilizing one or more of the following:*
 - a. *A wall in front of the blank wall that does not exceed 4 feet in height, is capped, has vegetation growing over the wall, and includes a gate feature;*
 - b. *A window added to the elevation to match the window on the other wall on the west side of the elevation; or*
 - c. *A pergola feature on each side of the building or in the center of the columns and greenery with the addition of a corner cap stucco wall on either side of the building.*
6. *The three eyebrow windows on the west elevation shall be the same size.*

Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed 4-0-1. (Ward absent).

2.2 ARB 05-20 (North Valley Building Systems/Davidson) 631 Country Drive, APN 005-580-019 - Proposed construction of a 7,200 square foot warehouse/light manufacturing structure.

Associate Planner Betts presented the staff report which included a description of the existing and new building. He advised that the existing building was reviewed and approved by the ARB several years ago. He explained that the new building will be used for industrial and warehousing purposes and reviewed the landscape plan and parking. He also explained that there is a barbed wire fence along the west side which was installed by the City to prevent access into the storm water detention

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of August 3, 2005

basin and staff is not requesting that the applicant replace it. There is no pedestrian circulation shown on the site and a limited amount of vehicle circulation. He advised that staff requests that the Board review the discussion items recommended by staff which include (1) painting the trim and doors the same color (terra cotta) as the existing structure, and (2) on-site pedestrian circulation from the parking lot to the buildings and between the two buildings.

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing.

Andy Wood, applicant from North Valley Building Systems, stated he agreed with painting the doors and trim the same color as the existing building. He addressed the issue of circulation by explaining they do not want a pedestrian path as they do not want the public to have access to the new building due to the use of the new building. He also stated he does not feel they should be required to remove the barbed wire fence as it was put in by the City and that they are not proposing to put a fence there.

Mr. Betts added that the applicant has already started moving dirt for the project. Mr. Wood explained that they went ahead and graded the site as they had checked with Senior Development Engineer Johnson who had advised them that the site improvements, including drainage, had been approved by the City.

Board Member Goulart asked why there is more parking spaces than required. Mr. Wood explained that the extra parking spaces will be utilized to store the vehicles until the customers pick them up.

Chair Ambrosia expressed his biggest concern is with the visibility of the south elevation along Fair Street. He questioned the height of the open canopy which is 60-feet by 120-feet attached to the west side of the building, suggesting that the main roof should be lowered to the height of the canopy and installing a pony wall along the open area on the west elevation to hide equipment and other items that will be stored under the open canopy. Mr. Wood explained that the west side is their access point and that the height is to help shield the sun and allow access for the fork lift. He suggested that there might be a way to skirt it down and lower it. Board Member Ertle questioned as to whether trees, shrubs, or berms could be employed to block the wall. Mr. Wood responded, saying that there was no way to berm because of the detention elevation. He stated that tree and shrub shielding would be most effective and most attractive. It was determined that the canopy could not be sloped due to low end clearance.

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

Chair Ambrosia noted that there was a lack of pedestrian sidewalks. Board Member Goulart pointed out that this was not a public space, and a lack of pedestrian pathways would discourage the public from going back into the space. Board Member Ertle expressed concern that there was no pedestrian access from the parking lot to the existing building, but it was determined that pedestrians would not be crossing heavy traffic areas.

Board Member Goulart suggested that shrubs be added amongst existing trees along the south side of the new building. Board Member Ertle reminded the Board that this area could not be bermed because of storm drainage requirements.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of August 3, 2005

Board Member Goulart moved that the Board adopt the findings contained in the staff report and approve the project (ARB 05-20) subject to the recommended conditions of approval, with the added condition that: 5-gallon shrubs be planted among the existing trees along the south side of the building, and that, to the extent possible, a minimum three-foot berm be installed to provide further screening along the south.

Vice Chair LaGrow seconded the motion, which passed 4-0-1. (Ward absent).

- 2.3 ARB 05-25 (Jarvis Gardens) Southeast corner of East 20th Street and Notre Dame Boulevard, APN 002-220-005** - Conceptual review of a proposed two-story, 39,094 square foot senior housing facility that would contain forty-nine one-bedroom units for senior citizen residents and one manager's unit.

Associate Planner Steve Betts presented the staff report which included an overview of the senior housing facility design, landscape plan, and site plan. He advised that the City of Chico is processing a Rezone from OS2 (Secondary Open Space) to R3 (Medium-High Density Residential) and a General Plan Amendment from Parks to Medium-High Density Residential, and both must be approved by the City Council. He explained that Public Works has advised the applicant that the driveway will have to be moved which will have an impact on parking and drainage. The applicant will resubmit a revised site plan. He expressed concerns regarding the massive size of the building, the colors are not very attractive, and there are few architectural features. He recommended that the Board discuss the following:

1. Addition of a walkway extending from the brick terrace/rose garden area to East 20th Street to facilitate pedestrian access.
2. Relocation of the driveway encroachment to the south and its impact to the overall site design.

Mr. Betts advised that staff is recommending the Board conduct a conceptual review of the project.

Board Member Ertle asked what the widths of the sidewalks are on East 20th Street and Notre Dame Boulevard. Principal Planner Bishow advised that the sidewalk on East 20th Street is 4 feet in width and Mr. Betts advised that the sidewalk on Notre Dame Boulevard is 5 feet in width.

Vice Chair LaGrow stressed the importance of the conceptual review to address concerns such as the issue of the location of the driveway along Notre Dame Boulevard.

Principal Planner Bishow explained that the conceptual review would allow the applicant a chance to look at the financial impacts that any proposed changes would have on the project. She advised that staff was not able to confirm with Public Works how far the driveway would need to be moved.

Mr. Betts reviewed what kind of materials would be used to make the walkways and advised he did not think there is any bike path proposed, in response to questions by Board Member Ertle. Housing Officer McLaughlin advised that there is a bike lane scheduled for Notre Dame Boulevard and that the plan for the park will include consideration of a bike path along the park site with an extension to Notre Dame Boulevard.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of August 3, 2005

Mr. McLaughlin explained that the City has requested a General Plan Amendment and Rezone to create an affordable housing site as part of the City's commitment to the State. The wetland issues have been incorporated to the site very well, but the design of the project is constrained as to not impact the wetlands around the project. At this time, it is the City's property which will be sold to the Chico Redevelopment Agency who will in turn sell it to the developer. The applicant has no discretion as to the choice of the site due to their limited funding from one funding source; and any additional funding will come from the Chico Redevelopment Agency. He also explained that the design of the project is significantly influenced by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Chair Ambrosia stated that this is a very high visibility location for a project that has little funding and asked if there are other properties in the City that can accommodate this project. Mr. McLaughlin explained that due to the economics of the community, sites are very limited. He also explained that this facility will be for very low income senior citizens.

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing.

Larry Mayers, architect for the applicant, addressed the issue of building mass and scale, saying that colors are always negotiable. He also stated that building placement and orientation was carefully considered, ending with an "L" shaped building to help hide parking and protect significant wetland features. Mr. Mayers indicated that he would prefer a smaller site, as it would be easier to maintain. He also stated if the existing driveway is moved south it could impact the large drainage swale. It was indicated that a large drainage swale would be a more natural way of dealing with parking lot run-off. Mr. Mayers expressed hopes that the City would undertake a traffic study. Mr. McLaughlin stated that the traffic study would be completed by Public Works.

Mr. Mayers questioned why the pedestrian walkway needed to extend to East 20th Street indicating it was a safety issue for residents. He also expressed interest that the project be started as soon as possible. Mr. Mayers exhibited color and material selection and stated that he was willing to change colors. It was also determined that more roof ventilation was needed to compensate for radiant barrier installation. A condenser was to be placed in the ventilating corner and simple roof forms were examined and investigated for ventilation potential.

Vice Chair LaGrow asked for the size and material choice of the fascia. Mr. Mayers responded that it was 10 inches of white trim with dark olive. Mr. LaGrow asked for clarification. Mr. Mayers responded saying that the field color was to be used for the cement board, green for lapsiding and painted stucco.

Board Member Ertle asked if it was possible to have a walkway around the outside of the structure. Mr. Mayers responded that the pathway would be really long and the connection to East 20th Street would not be used by the elderly residents. Ms. Ertle clarified, saying that she was referring to the bike bath being connected to the pathway linking to the building entrance. Mr. McLaughlin stated that the bike path would come in and around the pump station. Ms. Ertle stated that pathway access for seniors would be beneficial.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that staff can work with the Planning Division to connect the project with the bike path. Mr. Mayers responded, saying that pedestrian and bicycle access was designed to

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of August 3, 2005

connect to Notre Dame Boulevard and that the extension of a path to East 20th Street would be a security risk.

Board Member Ertle questioned whether Mr. Mayers had thought of pedestrian access for cars parked near the Notre Dame entrance to the parking lot. Mr. Mayers responded, saying that the parking design allowed parking as close to the entrance as possible, and allowed the drop-off area to be close to the community room and office.

Vice Chair LaGrow asked if all dwelling entrances were internal. Mr. Mayers confirmed that all dwellings had internal entrances, with the recreation room, community room, and two required emergency exits being the only exterior access points.

Vice Chair LaGrow commented on the project's lack of fencing. Mr. Mayers confirmed that no fencing was present.

Mr. LaGrow asked which parking was covered. Mr. Betts informed the Board that the City's code mandates that half of the parking spaces need to be covered.

Mr. Mayers expressed reservation regarding the trellis entrance, saying that it would be very expensive. He suggested that the columns could be dressed up by matching the other wood columns.

Board Member Goulart questioned whether the design could be altered to break up the long "row" effect along East 20th Street. Mr. Mayers responded that the previous design incorporated facade indentation, but proved to be too costly.

Chair Ambrosia expressed his pleasure that the site was being used in this way, but pointed out that the building was massive. It was suggested that the applicant offset every two units to break up the visual mass of the building. Mr. Ambrosia suggested that cost might be cut elsewhere. Mr. McLaughlin stated that the project would be returning to the City's finance committee, whereupon more funding might be granted to accommodate such a redesign. Chair Ambrosia, who works with HUD, stated that their time frames could be extended if the committee agrees.

Bobbi Sawtella, Christian Church Homes, stated that this project is time sensitive because of the demonstration grant that specifies the project be completed within 18 months. Chair Ambrosia questioned whether they would consider the project compete if "significant progress" was achieved. Ms. Sawtella stated that the project would be deemed incomplete, and that HUD would most likely be unsympathetic. Mr. Ambrosia stated that if there was to be conceptual approval, then the architectural changes would require more time. Ms. Sawtella informed the Board that May 6th, 2006, was the 18 month deadline. Principal Planner Bishow asked whether the planned construction date could be met if the Board didn't take action today. Ms. Sawtella said she believed the Board needed to act or it would impact the schedule.

Chair Ambrosia asked Mr. Mayers as to whether he had another design that met all of the concerns, citing that more funding may be available. Mr. McLaughlin explained that the City Council would be notified of the Board's concern and allow them to evaluate whether more money would be approved to fund the desired design features.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of August 3, 2005

Vice Chair LaGrow expressed interest in gingerbread colors, saying that paint colors could easily change the building design. Chair Ambrosia stressed the importance of an attractive building, citing that the building would be around for at least 50 years.

John Anderson of New Urban Builders expressed concern that there was a better way to utilize the available open space and increase site density. He suggested alternatives, including relocating the building to allow a more attractive building on the corner itself and providing a street connection along the south side of the project from Notre Dame to the future park. Mr. McLaughlin responded, saying that there are always alternatives to every project, citing that the park issue would take five years to resolve.

Chair Ambrosia asked if the project could be flipped. Mr. Mayers questioned whether building more towards the east would allow them to go three stories.

Board Member Ertle asked about flipping the building. Mr. Mayers responded, saying that one of the requirements was to have parking close and would necessitate building an access road to the south. Mr. Anderson stated that this could be reconfigured, but Mr. Mayers rejected the idea, saying that this would require a complete reconfiguration.

Planning Director Seidler acknowledged the difficulty of the Board's decision, and he said that the issue could be sent to City Council with recommendations under the rationale that as this is a City-sponsored project, the City Council would have the final word. Chair Ambrosia expressed his frustration that the Board's decision would be conceptual and if not made today, the project would die. He is not sure as to whether the Council can adequately address the aesthetic aspect of the project.

Ms. Bishow asked Mr. McLaughlin as to whether the matter could be deferred for two weeks. Mr. McLaughlin responded saying that an August 24, 2005 finance meeting was scheduled, whereupon a recommendation could be made to the Council along with the presence of a Board member. Alternatively, the issue can return to HUD for additional funding. Planning Director Seidler stressed the importance of not postponing the issue for two weeks.

Chair Ambrosia suggested that the Board recommend options to the City Council.

Board Member Ertle stated that the building design doesn't fit in the location.

Board Member Goulart was concerned that the building would start to look like a hotel as it aged.

Chair Ambrosia complimented the architect on creating such a building with such a tight budget, but thought that changes to some of the design details would be worth the cost.

Board Member Goulart praised the color choice, saying that it blends nicely with the foothills.

Chair Ambrosia moved to create and list options in order of priority and present those options to the City Council for consideration and a final determination.

Option 1: Improve North and East elevation through: undulating the walls and roof and varying the color of materials more often. Additional mounding along the north side would aid to decrease the perceived scale.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of August 3, 2005

Option 2: Relocate the building to a less visual part of the site by either flipping or rotating it.

Option 3: Create a mixed use site as proposed by New Urban Builders. Create a use for frontage buildings (hide building).

Option 4: Redesign with minor treatments: color, texture, pergola.

Chair Ambrosia moved to request that the project come back before the Board for material and color consideration. The motion passed 4-0-1. (Ward absent).

3.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Principal Planner Bishow stated that the Board Project Tour scheduled for August 31, 2005 will be moved to September 28, 2005, and will not be a regular Board meeting.

Board Member Goulart stated that Board meetings are not being posted in the Enterprise Record or the calendar.

4.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

Planning Director Seidler explained that the Condons will come back at the next Board meeting and will be first on the agenda.

5.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of August 17, 2005.

Approved: September 21, 2005

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of August 17, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Board Members Absent: Ellen Clifford Ertle

Staff Members Present: Kim Seidler, Planning Director
Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Dennis McLaughlin, Housing Officer
Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
Greg Redeker, Assistant Planner
Patrick Race, Planning Intern
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 2.1 Correspondence Regarding Screening Vegetation - Eaton Village Apartments** - The Board will conduct a discussion and receive public comments relating to correspondence received from Janice Condon. No action will be taken at this meeting. Should the Board determine that action is required, the item may be included on a subsequent posted agenda.

Planning Director Seidler reviewed Mrs. Condon's correspondence and the attached photographs showing the view over her fence. He explained that the City's Urban Forester has looked at the existing trees and determined that there is already some good growth, predicting that it will not take a full ten years to provide a reasonable screen. The Urban Forester also indicated that when larger trees are planted, they are usually overtaken by the smaller ones, which tend to adapt better. Mr. Seidler advised the Board that there is not a way to provide full screening immediately without planting something like dense cypress; however, the existing trees will serve to at least break up the view until they mature and provide screening.

In response to a question from Board Member LaGrow, Mr. Seidler said that the area is irrigated and is required to be maintained. Board Member Ambrosia added that the trees were required to be planted a year ahead of construction. Board Member LaGrow said that the area is overgrown with weeds and needs maintenance, and suggested that perhaps the trees should be pruned at the bottom to encourage upward growth. Board Member Ambrosia then mentioned that he had discussed this with a landscape architect who advised him that although 15 to 20 foot centers are good, there are better species than redwoods for providing a screening wall.

There were no public comments.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of August 17, 2005

- 2.2 **ARB 03-41 (Peitz/MBD) Cohasset Road between Eaton Road and Lassen Avenue, APN 007-016-027, 028, 029** - Request for clarification of a condition of approval regarding signage. This project was originally reviewed by the Board and approved with conditions at its meeting of November 5, 2003.

Planning Director Seidler presented the staff report for this project, saying that staff had recently been asked to review and approve a sign for the site which may or may not be consistent with the original condition of approval, depending on the Board's interpretation of the language in the approved minutes. He went on to say that a similar sign had already been approved by staff, perhaps in error, because staff interpreted the condition to apply to the entrance sign only, which was the subject of discussion included in the minutes. Assistant Planner Redeker then produced color drawings of both signs for the Board's review. Board Member Goulart mentioned that the sign has already been installed at the location.

Board Member Ward said that when he made the motion, it was intended to encompass all signs at the site. He added that at this point, the only option is to turn off the signs' internal lighting and install indirect light for illumination, pointing out that the error was not in the Board's motion.

Board Member LaGrow mentioned that the Board does not generally approve internally lit signs. Chair Ambrosia agreed, but reminded everyone of the opaque cabinet sign at Trucker, which is an example of how the Board tries to work with applicants who request internal illumination. Board Member LaGrow cautioned that approving this particular sign could set a precedent to allow the entire project to "go neon".

Mr. Seidler clarified that the Board's direction to staff would be to allow internal illumination only if the cabinet is opaque, giving the appearance of channel letters. Chair Ambrosia and Board Member LaGrow agreed that would be a workable solution. Board Member Ward said he would agree in this instance, as a compromise; however, he does not want staff to interpret it as a blanket approval for additional internally lit cabinet signs.

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing. The applicant was not present, and there were no comments from the public, so Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing and invited Board discussion.

The Board further discussed illumination of the sign and agreed by consensus that the applicant could place an opaque layer over the negative area of the sign to produce a channel lettered effect. Chair Ambrosia said that he would like to ask the applicant to alter the existing sign in a similar fashion, since it had been a mistake to approve it, and the Board agreed by consensus.

Chair Ambrosia moved that the Board (1) require the applicant to provide an opaque background for the sign to produce the effect of channel lettering; and (2) recommend that the applicant modify the existing, approved sign in a similar fashion. Board Member Ward seconded the motion, which passed 4-0-1 (Ertle absent).

- 2.3 **ARB 05-27 (Community Housing Improvement Program) 1290 Notre Dame Boulevard, APN 002-180-108** - Proposed construction of 86 multi-family residential units and a community building totaling 91,950 square feet of building floor area, on 4.7 acres located on the west side of Notre

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of August 17, 2005

Dame Boulevard, across from Hank Marsh Junior High School. The proposed density of the project is 18.3 units per acre, and the property is zoned R4 High Density Residential.

Due to a conflict of interest, Chair Ambrosia recused himself from participation in the Board's review of this project and left the meeting room. In his absence, Board Member LaGrow served as acting Chair.

Principal Planner Bishow presented the staff report for this project in Senior Planner Sigona's absence. She explained that this project had already been approved by the City Council and had been referred to this Board for final design revisions and finesse. She then introduced Housing Officer Dennis McLaughlin, Community Housing Improvement Program's (CHIP) Executive Director Dave Ferrier, and members of the applicant's design team.

There being no questions for staff, Board Member LaGrow opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Mr. Ferrier presented a brief history of the project and explained to the Board that this would be the final step in the review process before work begins in early December.

Project architect Dave Schleiger provided detailed drawings and read from the narrative provided in the agenda packets as he pointed out various features of the project. In response to a question from Board Member LaGrow, Mr. Schleiger stated that the doors will be constructed of painted metal, noting that staff has requested fan windows rather than slits and explaining that the slits were originally conceived to allow children to look outside before opening the door. He said that the issue has been resolved by incorporating a low peep hole under the windows.

Board Member LaGrow then asked about screening of the air conditioning units. Mr. Schleiger responded that the only visible units will be between the backs of the buildings and will be fenced and screened with vines.

In response to additional questions from Board Member LaGrow, Mr. Schleiger pointed out the proposed locations of the trash enclosures and said that they will be constructed of block with metal gates. Board Member Goulart said she would like them to be located more "inside" the complex, to which Mr. Schleiger replied that he is trying to keep them segregated from the living areas as much as possible. Nan Jones, from the public, commented that garbage trucks will not go through the site, which would also present a problem in relocating the trash enclosures.

With respect to exterior lighting, Mr. Schleiger explained that there will be two levels of pole lights, one for parking illumination and the other to define the open space, as well as bollards.

Responding to a question from Board Member Goulart, CHIP Housing Specialist and Project Manager Kris Zappettini presented a revised color chart for review and stated that the roofing material had also been changed in response to the recommendation from staff.

Project landscape architect Carl Rottschalk then made a presentation to the Board, describing proposed plantings and indicating their location on a large drawing displayed on the wall. One particular feature he described in detail was the proposed plant containers on top of basalt crusher

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of August 17, 2005

dust that will be used to prevent plant material from being trampled by pedestrian activity. He pointed out the extensive use of trees including maples and two species of oaks and explained that although shrubbery around the perimeter will be 4-6 feet in height, some view penetration will be necessary for security. He assured the Board that the trash enclosures would be heavily screened with 6-8 foot shrubbery, making them virtually invisible even from the street. He then described in some detail the issues with site drainage due to the presence of volcanic conglomerate and a lava cap. In response to a question from Board Member LaGrow, Mr. Rottschalk indicated that the cyclone fencing would be covered with vines, probably star jasmine or English ivy.

Regarding concerns that funding for landscaping and adequate drainage might be cut, Mr. Ferrier assured the Board that he is fully aware that short changing those areas will cause costly problems in the future.

Board Member Goulart then asked whether the planting on the street side will be bermed to hide the parking areas. Planning Director Seidler echoed her concern about the unrelieved view of the parking lot from the street and suggested that perhaps a low landscape wall or fence might be helpful. Mr. Rottschalk replied that there is a slight 3:1 slope down into the parking lot, which will be difficult to berm; however, he explained that there will be significant upslope screening where the right-of-way widens, fairly heavily landscaped with bottle brush and manzanita.

In response to an inquiry about the width of the sidewalk along Notre Dame Boulevard, Mr. Schleiger explained that it is an existing 4-foot wide city sidewalk. Board Member Goulart asked whether it would be reasonable to request that the sidewalk width be increased to 5 feet, to which Principal Planner Bishow responded that although wider sidewalks are beneficial to the community, the Board should limit its consideration to proposed new sidewalks. Mr. Ferrier then reminded the Board that the pedestrian/ bike path runs along the property line and will probably be the preferred method of travel.

There being no further questions of the applicant or comments from the public, Board Member LaGrow closed the public hearing and invited Board discussion.

Board Member Ward commented that although the site presented significant problems, the applicant's team addressed them admirably and produced a very good result. Board Members Goulart and LaGrow briefly discussed the new colors and the revised door design and agreed that the changes improve the project. Board Member LaGrow mentioned that although he does not like the light colored roof, he understands the reasoning behind it. Board Member Goulart suggested that the look of Building Type "A" would be improved by extending the overhang over the door in both directions above the windows to make it more consistent with the other buildings, and Board Members Ward and LaGrow agreed.

Board Member Goulart moved that the Board approve ARB 05-27 as presented at today's meeting, based on the required findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval set forth in the agenda report and additional conditions of approval as follows:

3. *Approved colors are Kelly-Moore 26 "Oyster", Kelly-Moore 213 "Lemongrass", Kelly-Moore 196 "Villita", Sherwin-Williams 6663 "Saffron Thread", and Sherwin-Williams 6327 "Bold Brick".*

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of August 17, 2005

4. *Additional landscaping, including climbing or clinging vines, shall be provided to conceal the trash enclosure walls.*
5. *For Building Type "A", the roof over the door on the rear elevation shall be extended in both directions above the windows.*

Board Member Ward seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 3-0-1-1 (Ertle absent; Ambrosia disqualified).

- 2.4 ARB 05-28 (Ritchie Construction/RCA) West side of the Esplanade, north of Eaton Road, APN 006-690-030** - Proposed construction of several buildings totaling 41,171 square feet for neighborhood commercial, retail, and office uses on 4.98 acres zoned PMU Planned Mixed Use and designated for development according to the CN Neighborhood Commercial zoning district by the Brentwood Planned Development Permit.

Chair Ambrosia returned to the meeting at this time.

Principal Planner Bishow presented the staff report for this project, calling the Board's attention to the revised report distributed prior to the meeting that clarifies which buildings are being submitted for final approval and which are being only conceptually reviewed.

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

Jim Mann, of Rural Consulting Associates, introduced the project design team, provided a color and materials board, and presented an overview of the project. He then went through staff's list of recommended discussion items one at a time and provided responses accordingly.

At this time, the meeting was recessed for 5 minutes in order to allow the Board time to review the revised agenda report and recommended conditions of approval.

In response to questions from Chair Ambrosia, project architect Kraig Wilson explained that the stones will be incorporated as belly bands around the lower portion of the buildings and in the main element at the front, which wraps to the sides; that although there will be some sliding windows, most will be casement style because of their size; and that the metal roof on the front building is designed to differentiate it a bit, due to the proposed retail/restaurant uses.

Board Member Goulart then asked several questions about the proposed colors, to which Mr. Wilson replied that the vinyl window frames will be white, the doors will be fiberglass painted brown, and the stucco colors will be a mellow range of earth tones. Rocco Ritchie, of Ritchie Construction, said that the idea is to make the buildings similar but not identical. Mr. Wilson agreed, and clarified that each building will have a single stucco color and a single stone style.

Chair Ambrosia expressed concern about the proposed use of uplighting, and Mr. Mann assured the Board that uplighting would only be used to highlight the landscaping through groups of trees and at the ends of the buildings. Mike Vine, of Sunchasers, echoed the assurance that those lights will be used for accent only.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of August 17, 2005

Board Member Goulart then briefly questioned Mr. Vine regarding the types and sizes of trees planned for the area that backs up to the adjacent residential uses. Mr. Vine said that sycamores will be used for screening, with plums and cherries added for a splash of color.

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

Board Member LaGrow commented that this looks like an excellent project that was very well thought out. Board Member Goulart agreed that all of the questions had been thoroughly addressed. Board Member Ward voiced agreement as well, saying that the project has a lot going for it, and all that is left is determining the details.

Board Member LaGrow moved that the Board approve ARB 05-28 subject to the findings set forth in the agenda report and conditions of approval as follows:

- 1. Development of the Landmark Neighborhood Center shall be in substantial compliance with the site plan, landscape plan, elevations, and color/material samples on file in association with ARB 05-28, except as modified in the following conditions of approval. Prior to or concurrent with the submittal of a building permit application, the applicant shall submit four (4) final revised site plans, landscape plans, and elevations for Buildings "C", "D", and "F" incorporating the following final conditions of approval.*
- 2. Final approval is granted for Buildings "C", "D", and "F"; conceptual approval is granted for Building "G". The applicant shall return to the Board for final review and approval of remaining buildings prior to issuance of building permits for those phases.*
- 3. 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 05-28.*
- 4. If allowed by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, all electrical boxes and piping shall be painted to match the background color of the adjacent building.*
- 5. The trash enclosure at the front of the site shall be constructed of stucco in a color consistent with the buildings, finished with the same exterior stone façade material used on the buildings and a limestone cap, and shall incorporate solid wood "coach" style doors and a trellis element. Additional landscape screening, including shrubs, shall be incorporated around all other trash enclosures.*
- 6. The final design of Building "G" shall incorporate the same exterior stone façade material as used on Buildings "C", "D", and "F".*
- 7. Additional plants, shrubs, and trees shall be incorporated along the Esplanade frontage, particularly in front of the wall element of Building "G", and between the pedestrian paths and the north and south property lines where feasible.*
- 8. The site plan shall be modified to reduce the width of the drive aisle behind Building "G" to 27' in order to accommodate a 48-foot wide half section for future Esplanade right-of-way improvements and maintain a minimum setback of 10 feet*

from the wall element of Building "G" to the back of the separated sidewalk. The flat wall of Building "G" shall maintain a minimum landscaped setback of 24 feet as shown.

9. *Enhanced demarcation of the pedestrian crosswalks shall be provided through the use of stamped concrete. A fourth crosswalk shall be added from the pedestrian entrance on the west side (from Ambrose Hill Drive) to the entrance of the center pedestrian corridor.*
10. *A sign application shall be submitted for all signs, to include administrative architectural review. The proposed monument sign shall be a maximum of 6 feet in height.*
11. *A final landscape plan shall be submitted to City Planning staff for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits.*
12. *Building lighting shall consist of coach light fixtures as shown on the materials board provided on either side of the entryway and at each doorway. Parking lot lighting is approved as submitted.*
13. *Bicycle parking spaces shall be provided as required by CMC 19.70.080 (Bicycle parking and support facilities) and shall be located as indicated on the site plan.*

Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed 4-0-1 (Ertle absent).

2.5 Parking Lot Lighting Guidelines Brochure - Staff has prepared draft brochures relating to parking lot lighting guidelines for both commercial/industrial and residential uses. The Board is being asked to provide staff with comments and direction prior to making the brochures available to the public.

Planning Intern Race presented the staff report, explaining that this brochure is the result of the Board's direction to staff at its April 6, 2005 lighting workshop to research various lighting styles and how other cities regulate lighting.

Board Member Ward expressed concern that the parking lot photos are not representative of Chico in that they do not include adequate numbers of trees, which will significantly impact lighting in heavily landscaped areas. He said he would also like to see the use of bollards encouraged, since they are helpful with respect to security.

Chair Ambrosia complimented Mr. Race on the brochure, saying that he did an incredible job. He commented that placing lights low enough to account for tree canopies seems to be adequately addressed under the heading of "Height", but recommended that the words "while efficient" be eliminated from the first sentence in the text box on the right side of the same page. Board Member Goulart agreed, but said that a photograph showing a more "grown in" parking area might better illustrate the point.

Chair Ambrosia said he would like to see the City take a look at its policy on municipal lighting. He pointed out, for example, that the lights installed by the City for the project at 7th and Palm are 35 feet high with huge arms that are out of scale. He also recommended that gas station canopy lighting be specifically addressed. Planning Director Seidler said that although staff has been struggling with that issue, the canopy on the Safeway gas station on Mangrove is an example of one

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of August 17, 2005

that works well, thanks to significant research done by Senior Planner Sigona and the ability of staff to regulate it through the use permit process.

The Board then discussed with staff the pros and cons of using metal halide versus high pressure sodium lighting, during which Mr. Race explained that in high security areas, metal halide provides better color differentiation for identification purposes. In response to a question from Chair Ambrosia, Principal Planner Bishow said that the handout is an informational guide only and is not intended to require the use of one type or the other. Planning Director Seidler clarified that what the brochure should do is let the public know in advance what the Board is willing to approve so it can be built into original project designs.

Board Member Goulart then asked that staff prepare a similar brochure for signage. Assistant Planner Redeker said that staff is in the process of putting some guidelines together that will be brought to the Board for review and comments, after which some protocols can be established to provide applicants and sign companies with direction as to what the Board would like to see.

- 2.6** **Discussion of Project Tour Itinerary** - Staff will review three potential itineraries from which the Board may choose for its upcoming tour of completed projects, which has been tentatively scheduled for September 28, 2005.

Planning Intern Race presented the staff report, after which the Board agreed by consensus to accept staff's recommended itinerary, "South Chico Tour".

- 3.0** **BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**
None.

- 4.0** **ADJOURNMENT**
There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 6:34 p.m. to the regular meeting of September 7, 2005.

Approved: September 21, 2005

Copies of this Agenda
Available from
Telephone:

City Planning Office
411 Main Street
(530) 879-6800

Agenda Prepared: 08/29/05
Agenda Posted: 08/29/05
Prior to: 5:00 PM

**CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 7, 2005
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, September 7, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. is adjourned to Wednesday, September 21, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1 of the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street, Chico, California.

Distribution:

Board Members (5)
City Manager
CDD
ACDD
Building Official
DPW
City Clerk (8)
CM/Front Desk
Art Projects Coordinator
Street Address Coordinator
Urban Forester

Planning Director
Principal Planner
SP Sigona
SP Stuart
SPCE
Public Counter
Enterprise-Record
News & Review
Utilities (4)
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, 1357 East 8th Street, Chico, CA 95928
Robertson & Dominick, 888 Manzanita Court, Suite A, Chico, CA 95926-2369
Jacki Headley, P.O. Box 4592, Chico, CA 95927

CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of September 21, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Jerry Kotysan, Senior Plan Check Engineer
David Garcia, Planning Intern
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia 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 February 16, 2005

2.2 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of July 20, 2005

2.3 Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 3, 2005

2.4 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of August 17, 2005

*Board Member LaGrow moved that the Board approve Items 2.1 through 2.4 as submitted.
Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.*

5.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

Board Member LaGrow announced that he would be disqualifying himself from participating in the Board's review of Item 3.1 on the Regular Agenda and asked that the Board hear any additional information from staff regarding the tour of built projects at this time. The Board agreed by consensus to move Item 5.0 Correspondence/Information ahead of the Regular Agenda, and Chair Ambrosia invited staff to address Board Member LaGrow's request.

Principal Planner Bishow provided details of the Board's upcoming trolley tour of built projects scheduled for September 28, clarifying that the initial meeting place will be in front of the Council Chambers building, near the "Dancing Trout" fountain. She said that the Planning Commissioners have been invited to attend, several staff members will attend, and that the public is welcome to participate to the extent that there is room available on the trolley, adding that there will be route maps available to members of the public who would like to follow the trolley in their own cars. In response to a question from the Board, Ms. Bishow indicated that she would also extend an invitation to Council.

Ms. Bishow then said that the route has been adjusted slightly from what was originally planned. She explained that some projects will only get a “drive by” to look at colors, while others will be examined in more detail. She went on to say that the trolley will drop passengers off at bus stops near two of the sites to allow everyone to get a feel for what it is like to be a pedestrian attempting to navigate safely from the public right-of-way to the project entrance.

In response to a question from Board Member Goulart, Ms. Bishow briefly explained how the Code determines which projects will, and which will not, be reviewed by the Board.

Board Member Ertle commented that she is learning very quickly about the importance of pedestrian access, since she has recently started walking extensively during her weekly routine.

3.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 3.1 ARB 05-31 (Central Development) East Side of Huss Drive, APN 039-620-003** - Review of Phase 3 of the Guillon Industrial Properties industrial park. The project includes about 38,940 square feet of warehouse space, about 9,735 square feet of industrial office space, and 73 off-street parking spaces.

Board Member LaGrow recused himself from participating in the Board’s review of Item 3.1 due to his business relationship with the applicant and left the meeting at this time.

Principal Planner Bishow presented the agenda report for the project, explaining that staff had originally planned to ask the Board to review only the site plan in order to allow the applicant to go forward with the building permits; however, the applicant provided all other information in a timely manner, so the entire project can be reviewed at today’s meeting. She pointed out that recommended condition of approval #5 has been included because, although the bicycle parking location has been shown, the actual specifications have not been provided, and that recommended condition of approval #6 deals with the distance between the bicycle parking area and the building entrances. As an additional point of information, she said that staff believes it would be helpful to modify the existing boundary line so that it bisects the planter strip rather than crossing in the midst of the proposed parking area.

In response to a question from Chair Ambrosia, Ms. Bishow responded that covered bicycle parking is not required for so few spaces.

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

Project architect Chad Finch of Russell, Gallaway Associates thanked staff for expediting Board review of the project. He explained that this is a continuation of the existing facility, and that although this phase includes some design elements from the existing buildings, it will be more truck-oriented because of the needs of two prospective tenants. In response to issues raised in the agenda report, Mr. Finch clarified that the pole light on the northern edge of the project is higher because there is more open area to illuminate and that he believes there is existing fencing at the site that is not shown on the drawing.

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of September 21, 2005

In response to questions from Board Member Goulart, Mr. Finch said that the trash enclosures will be designed to match those for the existing facility, that the driveways and walkways will be painted with white striping, and that the landscaped area on the Huss Drive side will likely be bermed. Chair Ambrosia commented that he would want to require berming to help hide the parking.

Chair Ambrosia then asked about the rectangles shown on the elevations that appear to be windows, and Mr. Finch explained that they are $\frac{3}{4}$ " recesses to add appeal without using an overabundance of windows on an industrial building. Ms. Bishow asked whether any of the buildings will have functional second floors, to which Mr. Finch replied that although no second floors are planned, the buildings are designed so that second floors could be added at a later date if desired.

Chair Ambrosia then said he would like the applicant to consider providing an additional landscaped area where employees could congregate for breaks and lunch. He pointed out that since the site is over-parked, some stalls near the truck area could be removed to accommodate a break area.

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, said she was very glad to hear the suggestion about the break area, since the buildings are nearly surrounded by blacktop, and if she had to work there she would want a place to have lunch on the grass. She stated that it would be nice if the developers would think about employees, since there is nothing else available to them within walking distance. She then said she would also like to see more landscaping at the rear of the site.

Board Member Goulart pointed out that the colors indicated on the application are not the same as those shown on the color board. Mr. Finch explained that the application was incorrectly submitted with colors matching the original approval for an earlier phase of the industrial park rather than the modified colors subsequently approved. Ms. Bishow said that she would correct the application and thanked Board Member Goulart for catching the inconsistency.

Ms. Bishow then presented the Board with a memo dated September 21, 2005 that adds a condition of approval requiring the applicant to correct the assessor's parcel number on the site plan, the landscape plan, and the exterior building elevations.

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

The Board then briefly discussed various aspects of the project and agreed by consensus that the motion for approval should include conditions regarding the second bike parking location, the 14-foot height limitation for parking lot lighting, trash enclosure materials being consistent with the buildings, and berming at the front of the site.

Board Member Ertle moved that the Board approve the project based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval set forth in the agenda report, and additional conditions of approval as follows:

- 7. The applicant shall revise the site plan (Sheet A0.1), the landscape plan (Sheet L1), and the exterior building elevations (Sheet A3.1) to include the correct Assessor's Parcel Number, 039-620-003.*

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of September 21, 2005

8. *The exterior lighting poles shall be a maximum height of 14 feet with 2 shoebox fixtures. Any wall-mounted lights shall be shielded downward.*
9. *Trash enclosures shall be constructed of materials and finished in colors consistent with the buildings.*
10. *Landscaping at the front of the site shall be bermed.*

Additionally, the Board recommends that a minimum of three spaces be removed from the rear parking area to provide a landscaped break area for employees.

Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4-0-1 (LaGrow disqualified).

Ms. Bishow then thanked Mr. Finch for having submitted all of the additional materials requested by staff in such a timely fashion.

4.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Karen Laslo, 468 E. Sacramento Avenue, asked how she can make certain that required landscaping actually gets done, saying that the landscaping at the Upper Crust looks ugly. Chair Ambrosia responded that the Upper Crust was approved as a phased project in consideration of the applicant's financial constraints. Principal Planner Bishow said that Ms. Laslo should call Planning or Code Enforcement staff if there is a problem she wants addressed, since it is staff's responsibility, not the Board's, to monitor compliance. Ms. Laslo reiterated that it is very ugly and disappointing when there is no follow through with the required landscaping.

Ms. Bishow then introduced Planning Intern David Garcia and invited him to address the Board. Mr. Garcia said that he is learning a lot, and that it is very interesting to hear the Board's input on this project, since he had worked on it with Ms. Bishow.

5.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

This item was presented out of order, prior to the Regular Agenda, at the request of Board Member LaGrow.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 4:53 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of September 28, 2005.

Approved: November 2, 2005

CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD & PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of September 28, 2005
Trolley Tour of Approved Projects

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart

Board Members Absent: Lorrin Ward

Commissioners Present: Mary Brownell, Vice Chair
Dave Kelley
Jon Luvaas

Commissioners Absent: Vic Alvistur, Chair
Kirk Monfort
Steve O'Bryan
Irv Schiffman

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Claudia Stuart, Senior Planner
Claudia Sigona, Senior Planner
Steve Betts, Associate Planner
Bob Summerville, Associate Planner
Greg Redeker, Assistant Planner
Matt Kelley, Planning Intern
Robert Peters, Planning Intern

Community Members Present: John Anderson, Chad Finch, Rose Lagler, Karen Laslo, Paul Lieberum, Ed McLaughlin, Pam Stoesser, Melinda Vasquez

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. at the front of the Municipal Center, near the "Dancing Trout" fountain.

2.0 TOUR OF APPROVED PROJECTS

The Planning Commission joined the Architectural Review Board on a trolley tour of various completed projects. Project-specific information materials were distributed during the tour.

3.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Architectural Review Board meeting was adjourned to the adjourned regular meeting of October 19, 2005, and the Planning Commission meeting was adjourned to the regular meeting of October 6, 2005.

Approved: November 2, 2005

Copies of this Agenda
Available from
Telephone:

City Planning Division
411 Main Street
(530) 879-6800

Agenda Prepared: 09/27/05
Agenda Posted: 09/27/05
Prior to: 5:00 PM

**CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 5, 2005
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, October 5, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. is adjourned to Wednesday, October 19, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1 of the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street, Chico, California.

Distribution:

Board Members (5)
City Manager
CSD
ACSD Sellers
Building Official
DOE
City Clerk (8)
CM/Front Desk
Art Projects Coordinator
Street Address Coordinator
Urban Forester

Planning Director
Principal Planner
SP Sigona
SP Stuart
SPCE
Public Counter
Enterprise-Record
News & Review
Utilities (4)
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, 1357 East 8th Street, Chico, CA 95928
Robertson & Dominick, 888 Manzanita Court, Suite A, Chico, CA 95926-2369
Jacki Headley, P.O. Box 4592, Chico, CA 95927

Copies of this Agenda
Available from
Telephone:

City Planning Division
411 Main Street
(530) 879-6800

Agenda Prepared: 10/12/05
Agenda Posted: 10/12/05
Prior to: 5:00 PM

**CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 19, 2005
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, October 19, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. is adjourned to Wednesday, November 2, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1 of the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street, Chico, California.

Distribution:

Board Members (5)
City Manager
CSD
ACSD Sellers
Building Official
DOE
City Clerk (8)
CM/Front Desk
Art Projects Coordinator
Street Address Coordinator
Urban Forester

Planning Director
Principal Planner
SP Sigona
SP Stuart
SPCE
Public Counter
Enterprise-Record
News & Review
Utilities (4)
ARB Chrono
Post

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, 1357 East 8th Street, Chico, CA 95928
Robertson & Dominick, 888 Manzanita Court, Suite A, Chico, CA 95926-2369
Jacki Headley, P.O. Box 4592, Chico, CA 95927

CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 2, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 2

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Patrick Murphy, Senior Planner
Steve Betts, Associate Planner
Greg Redeker, Assistant Planner
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of September 21, 2005

2.2 Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of September 28, 2005

Board Member Ward moved that the Board approve Items 2.1 and 2.2 as submitted. Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

3.0 REGULAR AGENDA

3.1 ARB 05-34 (Slater and Son) 2180 Humboldt Road, APN 002-050-212 - By agenda report dated 10/24/05, Associate Planner Betts reports that the Board is requested to conduct a review of a proposed residential care home for seniors. The project consists of a single-story, 5,164-square foot, contemporary-style structure that would provide care for up to 16 residents. The project site is located on the north side of Humboldt Road, approximately 350 feet west of El Monte Avenue. *(Report: Associate Planner Betts)*

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Applicant's representative Dave Lupton and property owner David Kuperman provided information about the project and answered questions from the Board and staff. Karen Laslo urged the Board to require that trees and shrubs be installed along SHR 32. There being no further public comments or questions, Chair Ambrosia closed the hearing.

Board Member Goulart moved that the Architectural Review Board adopt the findings contained in the agenda report and approve project ARB 05-34 (Roseleaf Court Care Facility) subject to the recommended conditions of approval and additional conditions of approval as follows:

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of November 2, 2005

5. *Parking lot lighting shall be metal halide.*
6. *A less invasive climbing material shall be used on the eastern fence.*

Board Member LaGrow seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (5-0).

- 3.2** **ARB 05-35 (R & S Car Wash) 480 E. Park Avenue, APN 005-570-007** - By agenda report dated 10/25/05, Assistant Planner Redeker reports that the Board is requested to conduct final review of a proposed automated car wash building at the northwest corner of E. Park Avenue and Carmichael Drive. The site is already partially developed with a drive-through coffee kiosk. The project consists of one car wash building approximately 1,066 square feet in size with associated site improvements, including parking, landscaping, and vacuum cleaning stations. (*Report: Assistant Planner Redeker*)

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Project architect Bryant Silliman and property owner Dan Richardson provided information about the project and answered questions from the Board and staff. There being no public comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the hearing.

Board Member Goulart moved that the Architectural Review Board approve ARB 05-35 (R & S Car Wash) based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the agenda report, with the following modifications and additions:

Condition #6 is modified:

6. *Parking lot lighting shall be metal halide and shall be limited to a maximum height of 12 feet. The applicant shall revise the site plan and elevations to clearly indicate the location of all proposed lighting.*

Condition #7 is modified:

7. *All signs shall be reviewed and approved by the project architect, and shall be subject to final approval by the Planning Director in accordance with CMC Section 19.70.080.*

Condition #8 is added:

8. *Additional landscaping shall be provided at the perimeter of the site along East Park Avenue and Carmichael Drive, and shall be maintained at a height of 3.5 feet to obstruct the public view of onsite vehicles.*

Condition #9 is added:

9. *The trash enclosure shall be of the same material and color scheme as the building and shall have metal gates painted to match.*

Board Member Ertle seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (5-0).

Chair Ambrosia thanked the applicant for having chosen to use such high quality building materials.

- 3.3 **ARB 05-30 Eaton & Esplanade Center (Peitz/Joshi) Northwest corner of Eaton Road and the Esplanade, APNs 006-690-020 and -021** - By agenda report dated 10/25/05, Principal Planner Bishow reports that the Board is requested to conduct a conceptual review of the proposed Eaton & Esplanade Center. The project includes three buildings, with a combined total of about 21,878 square feet, designed to allow a mix of uses including retail, restaurants, and offices. Ninety-three off-street parking spaces are proposed. (*Report: Principal Planner Bishow*)

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Applicant Rakesh Joshi, project architect Greg Peitz, and commercial leasing agent Frank Ross provided information about the project and answered questions from the Board and staff. Karen Laslo expressed concern that the project does not comply with the Northwest Chico Specific Plan. There being no further questions or public comment, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

The meeting was recessed for a five-minute break at 6:05 p.m., and was reconvened at 6:10 p.m. All Board Members were present.

The Architectural Review Board provided the applicant with the following recommendations:

- *Consider using several buildings rather than just one – perhaps a one-story building wrapped around the corner and other buildings hidden behind it.*
- *Locate any two-story buildings to the inside of the site rather than on the street.*
- *Relocate building “C” closer to the Esplanade and incorporate landscaping such that there will be no future opportunity to create a drive-through lane along the Esplanade.*
- *Design the buildings to be architecturally compatible with each other, but not identical, so that each has some individuality.*
- *Break up the parking area to avoid having one large mass of asphalt.*
- *For any parking adjacent to the street, provide a perimeter landscaped berm of sufficient height to provide screening, designed so that it returns gradually to the natural grade and avoids creating a pedestal effect by elevating the parking area.*
- *Provide pedestrian paths to the entrances of the buildings from the public sidewalks along the streets.*
- *Consider bridging the ditch in order to provide pedestrian access to the site from the neighboring residential area.*
- *Consider providing a pedestrian connection to the site from the commercial site to the north.*
- *Provide substantial amounts of landscaping.*
- *Provide landscaped outdoor break area(s) for employees.*
- *Consider using unique or artistic lighting, keeping in mind that it must also avoid spilling light onto adjacent properties or causing glare on the street.*
- *Consider incorporating art into the project or providing an area for public art.*

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting of November 2, 2005

3.4 Overview of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Senior Planner Murphy provided a brief training session on the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including an overview of its purpose and key steps in the process.

4.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

In response to a question from Board Member Goulart, Principal Planner Bishow reviewed the Council's action on the Jarvis Gardens project. The Board then briefly discussed an earlier comment by Board Member Ward regarding his desire to see more architectural individuality in new projects.

5.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

None.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 6:54 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of November 16, 2005.

Approved: August 16, 2006

Copies of this Agenda
Available from
Telephone:

City Planning Division
411 Main Street
(530) 879-6800

Agenda Prepared: 11/09/05
Agenda Posted: 11/09/05
Prior to: 5:00 PM

**CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 16, 2005
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, November 16, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. is adjourned to Wednesday, November 30, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1 of the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street, Chico, California.

Distribution:

Board Members (5)
City Manager
CSD
ACSD Sellers
Building Official
SPCE
DOE
City Clerk (8)
CM/Front Desk
Art Projects Coordinator
Street Address Coordinator
Urban Forester

Post
Planning Director
Principal Planner
SP Sigona
AP Summerville
AP Betts
AP Palmeri
Public Counter
Enterprise-Record
News & Review
Utilities (4)
ARB Chrono
Karen Laslo

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, 1357 East 8th Street, Chico, CA 95928
Robertson & Dominick, 888 Manzanita Court, Suite A, Chico, CA 95926-2369
Jacki Headley, P.O. Box 4592, Chico, CA 95927

CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of November 30, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Ed Palmeri, Associate Planner
Bob Summerville, Associate Planner
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 2.1 ARB 05-22 (Chain) 1446 W. 5th Street, APN 004-105-006** - Final review of a proposed duplex on 0.10 acres located in an R3 Medium High Density Residential zoning district. The project consists of a two-story structure that will front West 5th Street. (*Report: Associate Planner Palmeri*)

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Applicant Steve Chain provided information and answered questions. Karen Laslo expressed concerns about various aspects of the project. After a lengthy discussion of the Board's concerns, the applicant requested that the Board not act at today's meeting and allow him to return with a revised submittal for review. There being no further questions or comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

At the applicant's request, the Board took no action on ARB 05-22 (Chain) but provided direction as follows:

1. *Retain existing trees wherever possible.*
2. *Replace hardy board with lap siding.*
3. *Provide hard surfaces for patios and trash container areas.*
4. *Incorporate overhangs above all entry doors.*
5. *Provide pedestrian access to the public sidewalk.*
6. *Provide garages with doors in lieu of car ports.*
7. *Retain window shutters as submitted; do not incorporate muntins.*
8. *Relocate mechanical equipment away from the patios and provide screening.*
9. *Specify wood or other solid material for fencing.*

- 2.2 **ARB 04-24 (Kassebaum) West side of Springfield Drive, east side of State Highway Route 99, APNs 002-140-020 and 021** - Conceptual review of the design of a major retail shopping center consisting of an 89,900 square foot anchor tenant (Kohl's) and an additional 42,700 square feet of retail shop and building pad space on a vacant 11.63 acre site. (*Report: Associate Planner Summerville*)

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Applicant Dean Kassebaum provided a revised project description that includes language regarding construction of a traffic signal at the southerly intersection of Forest Avenue and Springfield Drive. Mr. Kassebaum, his business associates and members of his design team (Jan Zaat, Kenny Cruz, David Blair, Brian Firth, Jason Bisho, David McKay, James Ruebling, and Jim Stephens), and representatives of the Kohl's design team (Jeff Hardman, David DeVos, and Lily Tafel) then provided additional information and answered questions about the project. Paul Cooper, Karen Laslo, and Jill McKay addressed the Board with various concerns. There being no further questions or comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

The Board provided direction to the applicant as follows:

1. *Provide cornice and pilasters on all sides of the anchor building. Revise the elevations to show the pilasters continuing to the top of the building and meeting the cornice.*
2. *Provide pedestrian connectivity on the northeastern entrance through the use of a wide sidewalk, running parallel to and mimicking the design of the one shown on the current site plan.*
3. *Reduce the size of the lettering on the Kohl's building signs, and design all signage to minimize the amount of light spillage onto SHR 99. Provide specific sign proposals for Board review and approval either concurrently with, or subsequent to, final Board consideration of the project.*
4. *Revise the colors on the anchor building to be deeper, but not darker. The basic color format or scheme is acceptable as submitted.*
5. *Provide substantial landscaping to obscure the view of the west elevations of the 'retail A' and 'shops' buildings from northbound traffic on SHR 99.*
6. *Provide the Board with illustrations of proposed exterior lighting fixtures and light poles.*
7. *Provide substantial landscaping to obscure the view of the west elevations of the 'retail A' and 'shops' buildings from northbound traffic on SHR 99. Design the landscaping along the west side of the site to interface/augment the natural landscaping along SHR 99.*
8. *Provide both visual and sound barriers at the northern edge of the site, between the parking area/drive aisle and the adjacent residential area, through the use of dense evergreen shrubs and trees.*
9. *Provide connectivity to the bike path.*

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Adjourned Regular Meeting of November 30, 2005

3.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

4.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

None.

5.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m. to the adjourned regular meeting of December 14, 2005.

Approved: July 5, 2006

Copies of this Agenda
Available from
Telephone:

City Planning Division
411 Main Street
(530) 879-6800

Agenda Prepared: 11/30/05
Agenda Posted: 11/30/05
Prior to: 5:00 PM

**CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

REGULAR MEETING OF DECEMBER 7, 2005
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, December 7, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. is adjourned to Wednesday, December 14, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1 of the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street, Chico, California.

Distribution:

Board Members (5)
City Manager
CSD
ACSD Sellers
Building Official
SPCE
DOE
City Clerk (8)
CM/Front Desk
Art Projects Coordinator
Street Address Coordinator
Urban Forester

Post
Planning Director
Principal Planner
SP Sigona
AP Summerville
AP Betts
AP Palmeri
Public Counter
Enterprise-Record
News & Review
Utilities (4)
ARB Chrono
Karen Laslo

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, 1357 East 8th Street, Chico, CA 95928
Robertson & Dominick, 888 Manzanita Court, Suite A, Chico, CA 95926-2369
Jacki Headley, P.O. Box 4592, Chico, CA 95927

CITY OF CHICO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of December 14, 2005
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1

Board Members Present: Nicholas Ambrosia, Chair
Philip LaGrow, Vice Chair
Ellen Clifford Ertle
Marci Goulart
Lorrin Ward

Staff Members Present: Teresa Bishow, Principal Planner
Bob Summerville, Associate Planner
Mary Fitch, Administrative Secretary

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Ambrosia called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Board Members and staff were present as noted.

2.0 REGULAR AGENDA

2.1 ARB 05-33 (Chico Community Shelter Partnership) 101 Silver Dollar Way, APN 005-560-031

Proposed expansion of an existing permanent, year-round emergency shelter, which will consist of construction of a 9,100 square foot building for sleeping quarters and other related uses. The site is zoned ML Light Manufacturing and is currently developed with an existing emergency shelter building that will remain. *(Report: Associate Planner Summerville)*

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing. Project architect Larry Coffman and landscape architect Brian Firth spoke on behalf of the applicant and answered questions from the Board. Karen Laslo commented that she appreciates the use of passive solar energy for the expansion. There being no further questions or comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

Board Member Ertle moved that the Architectural Review Board adopt the findings contained in the agenda report and approve ARB 05-33 (Chico Community Shelter Partnership) subject to the recommended conditions of approval. Board Member Goulart seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

2.2 ARB 04-24 (Kassebaum) West side of Springfield Drive, east side of State Highway Route 99,

APNs 002-140-020 and 021 - The Board is requested to approve the architectural design, including site and landscape design, of the proposed Springfield Village Shopping Center. The Project includes an 89,900 square foot anchor tenant (Kohl's) and an additional 42,700 square feet of commercial space in separate buildings. The site is zoned CC Community Commercial and is currently vacant. A minor lot line adjustment will also be required, which will be acted upon administratively at a later date. *(Report: Associate Planner Summerville)*

A revised staff memorandum amending the recommended conditions of approval was distributed to the Board.

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing. Applicant Dean Kassebaum, landscape architect Brian Firth, and engineer James Ruebling presented information about the project and answered questions

from the Board. Karen Laslo said that she would like oleanders to be planted along the north side of the project instead of tall trees that might block the sunlight and that more trees need to be incorporated in other areas of the project to provide shade. There being no further questions or comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

Board Member Goulart moved that the Architectural Review Board approve the Springfield Village Shopping Center (ARB 04-24) based on the findings contained in the agenda report and subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. *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 04-24.*
2. *Prior to or concurrent with the submission of building plans, the applicant shall submit two (2) final revised site plans and landscaping plans incorporating all applicable conditions of approval adopted by the Architectural Review Board.*
3. *Prior to or concurrent with the submission of building plans, the applicant shall submit for Planning review and approval specific bike spaces and bike racks in an inverted "U" design in compliance with the CMC Section 19.70.080. Bike spaces shall be conveniently located and generally close to the main entrances of the buildings. Based on the required quantity of bike parking and the proposed consolidation of spaces in key locations, at least 15% of the required bike parking shall be covered. (Note: Minor design changes necessary to ensure compliance with the code, shall not require Board review and approval.)*
4. *Prior to or concurrent with the submission of building plans, the developer shall submit for Planning review and approval revisions to the site plan and landscape plan that comply with the required dimensions for parking area planting islands in CMC Section 19.70.060. Throughout the parking lot, the developer shall decrease the length of the compact parking spaces adjacent to the planting islands to 14 feet, allowing for a 2 foot overhang. (Note: This will increase the planting islands from an estimated 93 square feet to about 178 square feet making them significantly more suitable for shade trees.) In addition, the main raised sidewalk from Springfield Drive directly to the major anchor tenant shall be a minimum of 8 feet in width, netting at least a 4 foot pedestrian walkway.*
5. *Prior to or concurrent with the submission of building plans, the developer shall submit for Planning review and approval revisions to the site plan and landscape plan converting the parking spaces along the north property line from standard to compact parking spaces and increasing the landscape buffer from 10 to at least 12 feet. (Note: This would remove the 2 foot overhang of the parking space into the required 10 foot landscape buffer between the parking area and adjacent residential use according to CMC Section 19.70.060.E.3.b.)*
6. *Prior to or concurrent with submission of building plans, some form of embellished surface design for the pedestrian paved portions of the main entrance along Springfield Drive shall be submitted for Planning review and approval.*

CHICO ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of December 14, 2005

Page 87 of 89

7. *Parking lot light fixtures shall be a maximum of 14 feet in height as proposed by the developer. Security wall packs along the north elevation of the Kohl's building shall not be mounted over 10 feet in height as proposed by the developer. Security wall packs shall be fully shielded and all exterior light fixtures shall be directed downward.*
8. *Prior to or concurrent with submission of a building plan, including parking area improvements, the developer shall submit for Planning staff review and approval a grading plan and at least 3 sections illustrating the proposed finished grade of the shopping center and confirming that at least a three foot high buffer is provided between the parking area and the sidewalk along Springfield Drive. The three foot high buffer can be a combination of a berm and/or landscaping.*
9. *Prior to or concurrent with submission of a building plan, including parking area improvements, the developer shall submit for Planning staff review and approval revisions to the site plan and landscape plan illustrating an 8 foot high solid fence along the north property line adjacent to residentially zoned land. The landscaping shall include dense evergreens and creeping vines. Prior to issuance of a building permit for the anchor tenant, the property owner shall submit a Use Permit application to the City requesting allowance of the 8 foot high solid fence.*
10. *Prior to or concurrent with submission of building plans, the developer shall submit for Planning review and approval revisions to the site plan and landscape plan illustrating at least a 4 foot wide raised sidewalk (or alternative pedestrian connection) along the west side of the easement (driveway) to the adjacent property to the south. The sidewalk shall be designed to minimize the reduction to the size of the landscaped planters adjacent to the driveway.*
11. *Prior to or concurrent with the submission of building plans, the developer shall submit for Planning review and approval revisions to the site plan and landscape plan that relocated the proposed bike path connection to the southwest corner of the property allowing more direct access to Retail Shops A.*
12. *As suggested by the developer, prior to or concurrent with the submission of building plans, the developer shall submit for Planning review and approval revisions to the site plan and landscape plan to: 1) eliminate the parking along the north property line generally between the northeast corner of the Kohl's building to the northwest corner of the Kohl's building, 2) relocate the parking to the west (rear) side of the building, and 3) increase the landscape planter bed adjacent to the north property line where parking was eliminated.*
13. *Prior to or concurrent with the submission of building plans, the developer shall revise the east elevation for Building Pad #1, consistent with the sketch drawn with the project architect and chair of the Architectural Review Board at the December 14, 2005 Board meeting (see attached), to be consistent with the west elevation. In addition, revise the elevations for the major anchor tenant (Kohl's) to provide a cornice around the entire building.*
14. *As indicated by the developer at the December 14, 2005 Board meeting, the developer shall replace the existing masonry wall along the north property line with a new wall and shall plant creeping vines along the south side of the wall.*

Board Member Ertle seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

In addition to the specific conditions of approval, by consensus the Board also provided advisory direction to Planning staff that the size of the signage be reduced and that the Board be provided an opportunity to review and approve the overall signage for the shopping center.

- 2.3 ARB 05-14 (Patterson Toyota/Chatfield Construction) 200 East Avenue, APNs 006-060-015, 029, and 046** -The Board is requested to provide broad design direction to the applicant, in accordance with staff's recommendations, on methods to resolve non-conforming aspects of the proposal. The site is zoned CS Commercial Services and is currently developed with an automobile dealership. *(Report: Associate Planner Summerville)*

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing. Charlie Gabriel, Chuck Patterson, and Jon Martin spoke on behalf of the applicant and answered questions from the Board. Landscape architect Brian Firth recommended the use of red oaks, which are deciduous, rather than scarlet oaks, which retain their leaves year round. Karen Laslo commented that this is just another example of corporations outside our town telling us how our town should look. There being no further questions or comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

The Board provided direction to the applicant as follows:

- 1. Eliminate or reduce to the extent possible the customer parking at the front of the site.*
- 2. Prepare a complete sign proposal for the Board's review and approval.*
- 3. Revise the landscape plan to indicate conformance with the required 50% shading and minimum dimensions of shade tree peninsulas for the parking area (CMC 19.70.060.E.4.a).*
- 4. Revise the site plan to indicate the inventory stacking arrangement, and increase the density of landscaping in that area.*
- 5. Reduce the drive aisles along the east and west sides of the site to the extent possible.*
- 6. Remove all barbed wire fencing.*
- 7. Consult with City Engineering staff regarding the all-weather surface requirement for the storage yard area.*

- 2.4 ARB 05-37 (In Motion Fitness) 1293 E. 1st Avenue, APN 045-712-001** - Proposed expansion of an existing health and fitness club, including construction of a 2,303 square foot ground-level addition that will accommodate a café and a 2,231 square foot second story that will accommodate administrative offices. The site is zoned CN Neighborhood Commercial and is currently developed with a health/fitness club, retail, and office uses. *(Report: Associate Planner Summerville)*

Chair Ambrosia opened the public hearing. Applicant Carl Sommer, project landscape architect Brian Firth, and project architect Chad Finch provided information and answered questions from the Board. There being no further questions or comments, Chair Ambrosia closed the public hearing.

Board Member Ertle moved that the Architectural Review Board adopt the findings contained in the agenda report and approve ARB 05-37 (In Motion Fitness). Board Member Goulart offered a friendly amendment that the dying trees be replaced as part of the project. Chair Ambrosia clarified that the motion does not encompass approval of any signage. Board Member Ertle accepted the amendment and agreed to the clarification, and Board Member LaGrow seconded the motion as amended, which passed 5-0.

3.0 BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

4.0 CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION

None.

5.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Ambrosia adjourned the meeting at 6:18 p.m. to the regular meeting of January 4, 2006.

Approved: May 18, 2006