



# 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 LAVOIE (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. Sign 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 as outlined in SBMC§22.22.104.

Jaime Limón, Design Review Supervisor, advised the subcommittee of recent changes to the Sign Committee Submittal Packet, which include an 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 the applicants' confusion as to what information is being sought, inadequate responses and 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 more 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 Sign Regulation ordinance language does not call out these neon signs under prohibited signs and neon signage is not mentioned in other portions of the ordinance. Although neon signs are addressed in the Sign Committee Review Guidelines, which are a tool to aide the Committee's review, the guidelines are not subject to enforceable action. Only those issues specifically addressed in the Sign Regulation Ordinance can be enforced upon.

The subcommittee made the following comments regarding materials in EPV:

- ✧ Individual letters should be flush mounted or painted directly on the wall.
- ✧ The most traditional method for signage in the district would be painted wall signs. Painted wall signs should be given more flexibility as to the signs graphic design.

- ✧ Alternative materials that are appropriately finished and detailed can be used in EPV with the following considerations:
  - ◆ A plastic letter, appropriately finished, described as a flat-faced, traditional serif font, which had a flat, antiqued bronze color finish would be acceptable.
  - ◆ Applicants will be required to provide a sample letter, when finishes and materials, upon request. The sample must be the exact style, font, color, and finish proposed must be submitted at the time of submittal.
  - ◆ The following aluminum letter finishes are not acceptable: natural satin, clear anodized, gold anodized, medium bronze anodized, black anodized aluminum finishes.
  - ◆ A factory baked finish is preferable and more durable, but hand painted finishes will be considered as they give the letter a handcrafted feel.
- ✧ The Sign Committee on a case-by-case basis should consider the restoration of a historical sign. The approval would be allowed with exceptions granted to allow the historic sign with vertical text or neon other than the business name to be restored provided that there is documentation of historical significance.
- ✧ Neon, which is not directly associated with a sign, needs to be regulated as signage or as an architectural element within the ordinance.

The subcommittee outlined the next steps that members would undertake to further study this issue in order to 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.
6. Staff will work with Subcommittee members to update and revise the El Pueblo Viejo District Guidelines and Sign Committee Review Guidelines to include additional photographs of preferred signs for the district.

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