



# City of Santa Barbara California

## MATERIALS IN EL PUEBLO VIEJO DISTRICT SUBCOMMITTEE

### MINUTES

**April 2, 2003**                      **Redevelopment Agency Conference Room: 630 Garden Street**                      **10:00 A.M.**

**SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS:**    STEVE HAUSZ (HLC/SIGNS), Present  
   VADIM HSU (HLC), present.  
   WILLIAM LA VOIE (HLC), present.  
   DAWN ZIEMER (SIGNS), Present

**STAFF:**                      JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor, Present  
   SUZANNE JOHNSTON, Planning Technician I, Present

---

Staff began the discussion by laying out photos of installations of alternative materials and sample individual letters. The Subcommittee briefly discussed the shape and form of the fabricated individual letters, during which traditional font styles were mentioned. Recognition was given that the Sign Committee cannot require a registered or trademarked logo which incorporates a non-traditional font to be altered but can require that the materials and finishes meet the design and material criteria as specified in the El Pueblo Viejo District Guidelines and the Sign Design Guidelines. An example of an acceptable plastic letter with an appropriate finish was given which could be described as a flat-faced, traditional serif font, which had a flat, antiqued bronze color finish. Mounting methods were briefly discussed and it was brought to the subcommittee's attention that peg mounting is not consistent with the California Adobe, Spanish Colonial Revival or Monterey Revival architectural styles. The most traditional method would be painted wall signs. The subcommittee agreed that painted wall signs should be given more flexibility as to the signs graphic design. It was agreed that when appropriately finished and detailed that alternative materials could be used in EPV. Applicants will be required to provide a sample letter. The sample must be the exact style, font, color, and finish which is proposed at the time of submittal.

The subcommittee redirected their focus to a list of finishes and materials excerpted from a Gemini Letters catalog. It was determined that certain finishes would not be considered acceptable such as: natural satin, clear anodized, gold anodized, medium bronze anodized, black anodized aluminum finishes. The subcommittee concluded that the durability of the paint would be greater if the letter color was factory baked but recognized that hand painted finishes can give the letter a handcrafted feel.

Jaime Limón, Design Review Supervisor, advised the subcommittee of recent changes to the Sign Committee Submittal Packet, which include a El Pueblo Viejo District Design Conformance Questionnaire. The intent of the questionnaire was to have applicants state how their sign design meets each of the criteria as specified in the Sign Design Guidelines. The Questionnaire was distributed amongst the subcommittee for review. Staff stated that the form is not as helpful as anticipated due to the applicants' confusion as to what information is being sought to answer with an appropriate response and sometimes, illegible handwriting. Staff feels that providing a photographic example of each criteria or a checklist of appropriate responses next to each question would make this form a useful tool for reviewing sign applications. The subcommittee concurred that the concept of requiring the applicant to address the guidelines would direct the applicant to address design requirements but noted without examples the document will not result in useful information.

Mr. Limón stated that there are numerous neon signs, which are being installed citywide. Currently, the ordinance language does not call out these neon signs under prohibited signs or directly refer to such signage in other portions of the ordinance. Neon signs are addressed in the Sign Design guidelines but the guidelines direction is not subject to enforcement.

Mr. Limón asked the subcommittee if the restoration of a historical neon signs for business names would be acceptable. The subcommittee felt that the restoration of a historical sign should be considered by the Sign Committee; on a case-by-case basis with exceptions to be made to allow the historic vertical text or neon based on historic research and documentation.

The subcommittee outlined the next steps in clarify which materials will be acceptable in EPV as follows:

1. All subcommittee members will individually conduct site visits to locate and photograph samples of Signs, which depict each of the criteria listed in the Sign Design Guidelines. The photo should be accompanied with a note as to which criteria are being. These photos will be given to Staff to be incorporated in revised Sign information handouts.
2. Bill LaVoie agreed to provide examples of approximately twelve acceptable fonts, which are appropriate to EPV.
3. The Subcommittee will provide examples of inappropriate sign installations in EPV with information as to why the sign is not appropriate.
4. Staff will gather the information provided in steps 1-3 and create an example binder. Once approved by the subcommittee the binder will be kept at the counter to show applicants as examples of what is and is not appropriate in EPV.
5. The group will conduct another subcommittee meeting once sufficient information has been gathered to discuss. Staff suggests that the meeting should be scheduled within the next four weeks.

**\*\* MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:15 A.M. \*\***