



City of Santa Barbara
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW
MINUTES
JULY 16, 2018

3:00 P.M.
David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street
SantaBarbaraCA.gov

BOARD MEMBERS:

Amy Fitzgerald Tripp, *Chair*
Kevin Moore, *Vice Chair*
Bob Cunningham
Richard Six
David R. Watkins
Wm. Howard Wittausch

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON: Jason Dominguez

PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON: John Campanella

STAFF:

Irma Unzueta, Design Review Supervisor
Matthew Cameron, Planning Technician
Kathleen Goo, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

The Full Board meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Chair Tripp.

ATTENDANCE

Members present: Tripp, Moore, Cunningham (until 6:48 p.m.), Six, Watkins (at 3:12 p.m.), and Wittausch
Members absent: None
Staff present: Cameron and Goo

GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Public Comment:

No public comment.

B. Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Approve the minutes of the Architectural Board of Review meeting of **July 2, 2018**, as amended.

Action: Cunningham/Wittausch, 5/0/0. (Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

C. Consent Calendar:

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **July 9, 2018**, as reviewed by Board Member Cunningham.

Action: Cunningham/Six, 5/0/0. (Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

Motion: Ratify the Consent Calendar of **July 16, 2018**, as reviewed by Chair Tripp and Board Member Cunningham.

Action: Cunningham/Moore, 5/0/0. (Watkins absent.) Motion carried.

D. Announcements, requests by applicants for continuances and withdrawals, future agenda items, and appeals:

1. Mr. Cameron announced the following:

- a. Staff welcomed new Board member Richard Six to the Architectural Board of Review.
- b. Agenda Item 2, 920 Summit Road (Montecito Country Club), the location of the proposed security kiosk has changed from what was previously presented.
- c. Board member Cunningham will be stepping down on agenda Item 4, 103 S. Calle Cesar Chavez, and Item 5, 402 S. Hope Avenue.

2. Chair Tripp requested staff to let Board members know of pending appeals at City Council and of any results after Council appeal hearings.

E. Subcommittee Reports:

No subcommittee reports.

FINAL REVIEW

1. 835 E CANON PERDIDO ST

C-G Zone

(3:15)

| | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Assessor's Parcel Number: | 029-312-008 |
| Application Number: | MST2016-00531 |
| Owner: | Philinda Properties |
| Applicant: | Old Dairy Partners, LLC |
| Architect: | Shawn Ridenhour |

(Proposal for a three-story, 41-unit multi-unit residential development using the Average Unit Density Incentive Program (AUD). The proposal will include a voluntary lot merger of three lots totaling 34,780 square feet and the demolition of approximately 16,000 square feet of one- and two-story commercial and industrial buildings. The unit mix will include 25 two-bedroom units and 16 studio units ranging in size from 477 to 984 square feet with an average unit size of 737 square feet. The proposed density will be 51 dwelling units per acre, the maximum allowed on a parcel with a General Plan Land Use designation of Commercial/High Density Residential, 37 - 63 dwelling units per acre within the Priority Housing Overlay. There will be 42 automated parking spaces, 2 accessible parking spaces, one EV charging station, and one loading zone area. 46 covered bicycle spaces are also proposed onsite. Planning Commission review for an AUD project on a parcel exceeding 15,000 square feet, per SBMC 28.20.080, was held on March 16, 2017.)

(Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Project requires conditions for a covenant for maintenance of rental housing for projects in the Priority Housing Overlay, and conditions for an AUD annual resident survey. Project was last reviewed on June 4, 2018.)

Actual time: 3:11 p.m.

Present: John Blair, Applicant; Thom Jess and Shawn Ridenhour, Arris Studio Architects; Andrew Fuller, Owner; and Megan Arciniega, Associate Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 3:32 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Straw vote: How many Board Members can support the mechanical screens as proposed? 4/2 Passed

Straw vote: How many Board Members can support the proposed project being reviewed further at Consent for approval? 5/1 Passed

Motion: Continue one week to Consent with comments:

1. Update all elevation details to be consistent.
2. Study the garage door and add color to the materials board; study whether a finer mesh can be used.
3. Add the door and window colors to the materials board.
4. Label all wood fencing.
5. All exposed metal shall be copper to match other details.
6. The Board finds the custom metal utility screen with a wooden top acceptable.
7. Review parkway planting with City Arborist with regard to allowable planting height.
8. Add canopy trees on Philinda frontage to mitigate building mass.
9. Add street trees on all frontages to achieve minimum spacing allowable by City Arborist. Provide verification the City Arborist has reviewed and approved the planting plan.
10. Increase number of trees along southern (driveway side) edge to mitigate the building mass.
11. The plant list and some designations on the plan do not match.
12. Provide an irrigation plan.
13. Provide MWELo statement on the planting plan documenting the correct selection of plant materials with regard to water use.
14. Specify planting for screening of the irrigation backflow prevention device.
15. All value engineered detail changes are to return for Full Board for Review After Final approval.
16. Restudy all the exposed roof vents.
17. The Board suggests the applicant study a more architectural screening solution for the mechanical equipment, such as a built in shelf above the unit.

Action: Tripp/Wittausch, 6/0/0. Motion carried.

REVIEW AFTER FINAL**2. 920 SUMMIT RD****RS-25 Zone**

(4:00) Assessor's Parcel Number: 015-211-009
 Application Number: MST2005-00831
 Owner: MCC BB Property, LLC
 Agent: Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting (SEPPS)
 Applicant: TY Warner Hotels and Resorts
 Architect: Henry Lenny
 Business Name: Montecito Country Club

(This building is on the City's List of Potential Historic Resources. Review After Final for further improvements to the Montecito Country Club. Current proposal includes the construction of three new golf "hitting-bays" underneath a 415 square foot trellis, a new 4,448 square foot courtyard, and a 215 square foot play court to be built immediately adjacent to the west of the northern most parking lot. A new four column archway and security kiosk for the Summit Road entrance is also proposed to match the architecture of the main clubhouse. A Substantial Conformance Determination is required to be made for this project by the Community Development Director.)

(Review After Final of hitting bays, athletic court, and hardscape at event lawn. Previously proposed entry arch is no longer proposed. Project was last reviewed on January 8, 2018.)

Actual time: 4:22 p.m.

Present: Steve Welton, SEPPS; Sam Maphis, Landscape Architect; Bill Medel, Project Manager, Ty Warner Hotels and Resorts; and Allison DeBusk, Project Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 4:32 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Motion: Continue indefinitely to Consent with comments:

1. The Board finds the architecture acceptable as presented.
2. Add a tree on the south side of the proposed structure.

Action: Six/Cunningham, 3/3/0. (Wittausch, Moore, and Watkins opposed.) Motion failed.

Motion: Continue indefinitely to Consent with comments:

1. Enhance the architecture of the structure by extending the eaves.
2. Add a tree on the south side of the proposed structure.

Action: Wittausch/Cunningham, 5/1/0. (Watkins opposed.) Motion carried.

ABR-PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW**3. 418 N MILPAS ST****C-G Zone**

(4:30) Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-311-033
Application Number: MST2017-00738
Owner: Riviera Vista I, LLC
Applicant: Jayesh Kumar
Architect: Nikhil Kamat

(This is a one-time pre-application consultation. Proposal for a new four-story mixed-use development to be constructed using the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) program. Project consists of a voluntary lot merger (APNs 031-311-033 & 031-311-034), the demolition of all structures on both sites, and the construction of a new 64,994 square foot, 45 foot tall mixed use building to contain 27 apartments and an 84 room hotel. Unit mix for the residential component will include 2 two-bedroom, 14 one-bedroom, and 11 studio units ranging in size from 289 to 913 square feet with an average unit size of 690 square feet. Residential unit density on the combined 41,476 square foot lot will be 25 dwelling units per acre on a parcel with a General Plan Land Use Designation of High Density Residential which allows for 28-36 dwelling units per acre. Proposed hotel amenities include a breakfast area, banquet hall, pool, fitness room, and landscaped patios. Parking for the proposed project will be provided on grade and at a basement level with a total of 111 spaces.)

(Comments Only.)

Actual time: 4:41 p.m.

Present: Jayesh Kumar, Applicant; Nikhil Kamat and Lucretia Reddingburg; Architects; and Allison DeBusk, Project Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Staff comments: Ms. DeBusk clarified that a Historic Structures Report has been requested for the existing adjacent bungalows of the Gutierrez courtyard area, and if the structures report returns with the bungalow court on the List of Historic Structures, the project will then be forwarded for Historic Landmarks Commission review. She also clarified that the parcels to the east along East Gutierrez are zoned residential, and commercial along the Milpas Street corridor. She informed the Board that the rear portion of the project parcel was zoned as commercial which caused the entire property to be commercially zoned, and that the commercial zone has moved more easterly within the last five years.

The following people expressed opposition or concerns:

1. Sebastian Aldana Jr, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the project's potential negative impacts of the proposed project on the eastside public health and safety issues of size, bulk, scale, style, lack of parking, preservation of neighborhood, neighborhood compatibility of craftsmen style homes and senior living cottages, and negative impacts on the quality of life for residents. Such AUD projects should cater to the needs of local residents rather than service the needs temporary out-of-town visitors and tourists.
2. Martha Fragosa, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the project's potential negative impacts of the proposed project on small local lanes and major traffic corridors of Milpas and Gutierrez Streets, on local resident and employee parking density, and on street sweeping schedules and bicycle lane density.
3. Britta Bartels, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the project's potential negative impacts of the proposed project on traffic, parking, high traffic, noise, parking, and carbon footprint

impacts, mold problems from overshadowing and lack of sunlight; privacy issues, and the negative impacts for those who may have to move if the proposed project is approved. Danny Moreno ceded his time to Ms. Bartels.

4. Ernestine Yanacio-DeSoto, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding potential negative impacts to local residents, local trees, pets, to the natural environment, air pollution, handicap accessibility, traffic, noise, parking, and to local businesses.
5. Betty Bottoms, neighbor, spoke of general concerns of the proposed large scale project.
6. Jose Arturo Gallegos, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the massive size, bulk, and scale of the proposed AUD project, and the general loss of neighborhood charm.
7. Tino DeGueyara, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the project's potential negative impacts to children walking to school in the neighborhood, street congestion, traffic, accessibility, and other impacts of this large project.
8. Omar Espinosa, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the project's potential negative impacts of the large project on the local residents, businesses, and the neighborhood community which should not be gentrified. Irma Covarrubias ceded her time to Mr. Espinosa.
9. Holly Gil, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding negative dangerous impacts and gentrification of such large projects on affordability of housing in the neighborhood, to parking in the area, and to the general quality of life in the neighborhood.
10. Julie Stark, neighbor, requested the City protect the authentic quality of life in the Haley and Milpas neighborhoods and its charming bungalows, local businesses, one and two-story buildings, and spoke of concern for the lack of neighborhood compatibility of the proposed large project.
11. David Landecker, neighbor and member of Citizen's Planning Assoc., spoke of concerns regarding general lack of neighborhood compatibility of the large project, and the potential negative impacts to transit services and parks, and on available housing.
12. Betsy Cramer, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the size, bulk, mass, height, and scale, lack of appropriateness and neighborhood compatibility, impacts to modest-sized homes in the Milpas neighborhood, and the need for more affordable workforce housing in the area.
13. Gloria Botello, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding negative dangerous traffic and after-school impacts to children walking to school in the area.
14. C. Newhause, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the project's potential negative impacts of the project's height and density on affordable workforce housing, and the lack of neighborhood compatibility of the large project that is out of scale with adjacent one-story homes in the area, and lacks open spaces, a step-down design for pedestrians, and negatively impacts private view of the Riviera. Emma Brinkman and Andrea and David Lopez ceded their time to Ms. Newhause.
15. Maria and Ruben Rey, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the project's potential negative impacts of noise, traffic, safety for neighborhood children, and privacy impacts of the 400 block of Alisos area and would eclipse the entire Riviera area.
16. Lynne Stark, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the overshadowing design of the massive project, and potential negative impacts of inadequate parking.
17. Angela Robinson, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding project's potential negative impacts of the large project on traffic, children's safety, senior living, and preserving the quality of life for the community. Jose Covarrubias ceded his time to Ms. Robinson.
18. Steve Hausz, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the over-grown proposed project's zero compromise between AUDs and neighborhood compatibility, the lack of three-story houses in the neighborhood, and recommended a reduction to two-story or an AUD or hotel but not both for the neighborhood, and asked if the City or neighborhood benefits in any way from the project which it does not.
19. Kathy Koury, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding lack of neighborhood compatibility of

such multi-story buildings that are out of character of the neighborhood, degrade the charming character of the community. The proposed size and scale would set a greater precedent for similar project for the area, with potential negative impacts to private mountain views, and local schools.

20. Anna Marie Gott, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the massive size, bulk, and scale of the project with features such as a roof deck that are not compatible with the neighborhood, and potential negative impacts to traffic, accessibility, parking, safety, lack of affordability for the local working class and workforce housing, and the lack of neighborhood compatibility. A large combined AUD/hotel project is inappropriate for the proposed residential eastside location. Christel Barros and Yolanda Perez ceded their time to Ms. Gott.
21. Graciela Cabello, neighbor, spoke of concerns that the proposed large project does not generally serve the community, contributes to the tourism economy and related problems, with potential negative of commuting jobs on highway and street traffic, alternative transportation (bicycle) safety, emergency services, water resources, and detracts from the development of long-term policy, services and solutions for the community.
22. Angela Whatoff, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the general lack of community contributions and involvement for such projects within the close residential community, lack of neighborhood compatibility, and the potential negative impacts to traffic in the area.
23. Jeanette Padilla, neighbor, spoke of general concerns regarding the lack of youth programs and appropriate affordable housing for the community and local residents, instead of favoritism given to large projects that promote more tourism.
24. Natalia Govoni, neighbor, spoke of concerns the mass, size, bulk, and scale of the proposed project is out of character with the neighborhood, and makes the community a target of opportunity for potential negative impacts of overcrowding, parking density, traffic congestion, and evictions of the elderly and pensioners for developer profit.
25. Dr. Tang, business neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the proposed project's lack of neighborhood compatibility with potential negative impacts on issues of privacy, noise, parking density, natural public views, overcrowding, and in general upon residents with deep roots in the close neighborhood community.
26. Aaron Goldschmidt, resident, spoke of concerns of the project's potential cumulative negative impacts on public health and safety in crosswalks, traffic, noise, related zoning, parking density, public views on the Riviera, massing and shadowing of the CEQA process, and the loss of ownership that is changing the character of the Milpas corridor.
27. James Albert Jennings, resident, spoke of concerns regarding the proposed projects size and four-story massing, potential negative impacts to water resources, traffic, and safety issues. The local residents of the City should be given the opportunity to vote on such large projects inclusion into neighborhoods.
28. Ann Hefferman, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding inappropriateness of the chosen location for such a large project and the potential cumulative negative effect on social and aesthetic landscape, safety, and displacement of residents of an interdependent community, sustainability and infrastructure, circulation element, and encroaches on solar access, privacy, private views, and traffic impacts to schools.
29. Victor Reyes, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the project's massive size and potential negative impact on the heritage and culture of the community and residents, and blocks private views of the ocean, mountains, and Riviera.
30. Eduardo Gonzales, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the massive size and scale of the proposed project and the potential negative impacts on elderly residents, and overshadowing adjacent neighbor's privacy and solar access, and the lack of neighborhood compatibility. Juan Uribe ceded his time to Mr. Gonzales.
31. Jason Dominguez, City Council Liaison, spoke in appreciation of the board's time and hard

work, and of the local representation by eastside residents, community, and neighborhood. He also spoke of issues under Council's purview such as if the laws are working, whether deserving projects are being reviewed or pass the community benefit test, and if requirements actually help with fixes such as requiring applicant electronic format or e-submittals of plans and drawings for on-line general public access, and whether fees-per-applicant-visit be more appropriate despite the size of the project in order to place more value on the design review process of staff and board members. He also requested creation and formulation of Milpas Neighborhood Design Guidelines to assist in clear and concise review of these types of large projects that greatly impact residents and communities.

32. Michael Montenegro, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the project's inappropriate eastside location and lack of neighborhood compatibility and affordable workforce housing.
33. April Montoya, neighbor, spoke of concerns regarding the proposed size of the project that is not compatible with the eastside Milpas Street neighborhood and community. She asks that the large project be denied and that consideration be given to the residents instead of big developers.
34. Correspondence from Ann Hefferman; Jane Eldridge; Carolyn Hornberger; Tomas Buenrostro; Mark Moses; Gabriela Dodson; Beatriz Dorado; Nancy Schaak; Alison Galindo; Joan McKay; Kathy Koury; Julie Teufel; Naomi Greene; Maxine Jagiello; Theresa Pena; Beth Pyle; Pamela Jameson Boehr; Maryee Miranda; John & Loy Beardsmore; Lyn Proctor; Richard Bornstein; David & Martha Kay; Pauline Cooney; Kellam DeForest; David Landecker; Tino De Guevara; Victoria Valente; Mary Robles; Barbara Burkhart; Betsy Cramer for Citizen's Planning Assoc.; Meredith Brace; Mariah Brennan Clegg; Adriana Rey-Dovgin; Anna Marie Gott; Janet Francesca Patruno; Ms. Morales; Leslie Colasse for Citizens for Livable Neighborhoods; and Steve Hoegerman were acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 6:15 p.m.

Board comments:

1. Board Member Wittausch commented that even though the proposed six-story project with four-stories above grade, towers, and a roof have evolved from two separate parcels combined into one large parcel, he cannot find the proposed massing architecturally acceptable or the eastside Milpas neighborhood location suitable for a hotel project of this size. The original urban plan consisted of smaller parcels and buildings in the surrounding neighborhood, and this unaffordable AUD project should of a more modest in size and seek to serve the community around it. This hotel portion of this project should find another location better suited for it, such as along the coast, since it does not fit and is not compatible with the Milpas Street community or business corridor.
2. Board Member Cunningham concurred with Board member Wittausch that the proposed project is outlandishly big, not compatible with, and out of character with the Milpas Street residential neighborhood and for the Milpas business corridor in size, massing, and scale. He is concerned that the applicant will be unable to successfully incorporate or translate the craftsmen style of the surrounding Milpas neighborhood into their project. He noted that the neighborhood has limited housing. Also, he is concerned that the proposed row of trees on the eastern boundary may not provide sufficient screening, and may not allow sufficient solar access to the adjoining properties to the east. He cannot find that such a large hotel will work in the Milpas residential neighborhood or the Milpas business corridor, and such AUD housing should provide more for the community than just housing for transient or out of town visitors.
3. Board Member Moore also concurs with the other board members that the proposed massive project is out of scale with the surrounding Milpas residential and business neighborhood,

- and needs to be reduced dramatically in size and massing.
4. Board Member Six also concurred with other board members that the project needs radical reduction of 60% or more, and should be of a more modest sized hotel for the surrounding residential neighborhood which might use the hotel for their own overnight guests. Also, the issue of displacement of residents should be more formally studied and the AUD component should be based on lowest possible incomes, etc. for affordability. Clear direction should be given to the applicant that they need to radically rethink the bigger issue and basic program of division of properties and not just a reduction of massing.
 5. Board Member Watkins stated that a traffic study should be done to see if such a large-scale hotel project is neighborhood compatible. He questioned the impacts of the proposed project in terms of size, scale, and massing within the context of surrounding residents and neighborhood. As shown on some of the renderings, in sheer height the project would block views of the Riviera and mountains. The proposed architectural elements such as the towers show no vertical or horizontal relief and should be dramatically reduced in scale to “accentuate and not dominate” the massing or appear as separate smaller structures, to respect the context of the neighborhood by keeping to a human scale of one or two stories in height for neighborhood compatibility.
 6. Chair Tripp also concurs that the project is out of scale with the neighborhood location, the proposed massing is too large and not suited to the surrounding neighborhood. She also concurs that a traffic study should be done, solar access may be impacted for adjacent neighbors due to the height of the project, and that the historic structures needs to be studied and resolved for the Gutierrez homes. The applicant needs to study the one and two story scale of buildings in context with the surrounding area and reduce the scale for neighborhood compatibility.

*** THE BOARD RECESSED FROM 6:43 TO 6:48 P.M. ***

PROJECT DESIGN REVIEW

4. 103 S CALLE CESAR CHAVEZ

OM-1/SD-3 Zone

(5:30)

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Assessor's Parcel Number: | 017-113-020 |
| Application Number: | MST2016-00295 |
| Owner: | American Tradition |
| Agent: | Suzanne Elledge |
| Architect: | DMHA |

(Proposal for a revised parking lot and a new three-story, approximately 11,000 square foot administrative support building for back-of-house activities for a proposed hotel located at 433 E. Cabrillo Boulevard. The hotel is being reviewed under separate development application MST2004-00791 and the hotel design will be reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission. Currently permitted on this 2.42 acre parcel is a parking lot serving the approved Waterfront Hotel at 433 E. Cabrillo Boulevard; this project would replace the parking lot approved under that application. A Substantial Conformance Determination was made for this project by the Planning Commission on June 28, 2018.)

(Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Project was last reviewed on October 23, 2017.)

RECUSAL: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Board Member Cunningham recused himself from hearing this item.

Actual time: 6:48 p.m.

Present: Ed de Vicente and Ryan Mills, Architects, DMHA; Lory Romano, Landscape Architect, Arcadia Studio; and Allison DeBusk, Project Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 7:06 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Straw vote: How many Board Members can support granting Project Design Approval for the project? 1/4 Failed

Motion: Continue two weeks to Full Board with comments:

1. Restudy the materials selection.
2. Refer back to the previous design and drawings for materials and detailing.

Action: Tripp/Watkins, 4/1/1. (Wittausch opposed. Six abstained. Cunningham absent.)
Motion carried.

ABR-PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW

5. 402 S HOPE AVE

RS-7.5/ACS/USS Zone

(5:50)

Assessor's Parcel Number: 051-240-017
Application Number: MST2018-00329
Owner: SB Automotive, LLP
Applicant: Mike Ramsey

(This is a one-time pre-application consultation. Proposal for a remodel and addition to an existing Porsche dealership. Project consists of demolition of approximately 1,261 square feet of existing soffit and modification of existing exterior structure to accommodate a new metal and glass paneled façade. Project also proposes 668 square feet of new commercial floor area.)

(Comments Only.)

RECUSAL: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Board Member Cunningham recused himself from hearing this item.

Actual time: 7:27 p.m.

Present: Mike Ramsey, Applicant; and Dwayne Sanders, Agent for Porsche of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 7:32 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Board comments:

1. Board Member Wittausch commented that he cannot support such a radical departure from the usual style of Santa Barbara architecture and the proposed project is a type of borderline "freeway" architecture. He does not support the proposed "canyon" passage into a very high glazed wall; however, the proposed middle panels have an interesting finish. He cannot support such a non-integrated type of architecture.
2. Board Member Moore concurred that he also cannot support such a radical departure from the existing architecture.

3. Board Member Six also concurred that he also could not support such “architecture-as-signage” that obliterates the existing beautiful continuous massing of building forms throughout the plaza, and is not well coordinated or integrated into the rest of the architecture.
4. Board Member Watkins suggested mimicking the panel massing using materials already found on site, but also concurred that he also could not support the architecture or the new foreign materials being introduced which does not match the existing architecture.
5. Chair Tripp commented that although she is aware that other existing structures in the area have metal paneling, those are structures are separate entities; therefore, she also cannot support such non-integrated paneling that should be integrated into the existing architecture.

*** MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:45 P.M. ***