CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

June 3, 2009

Committee Members Present: Adrienne Gladson

Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: Bill Cathcart

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Dan Ryan, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation

Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner Sonal Thakur, Assistant Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

The Committee met for an Administrative Session beginning at 5:06 p.m.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the Administrative Session with any information from Staff.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there were no changes to the Agenda and no policy or procedural information to discuss; that would take them to No. 3 on the Agenda which was a presentation of the General Plan by Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek.

Ms. Pehoushek stated the General Plan Update had been in the works since January of 2004. Staff had spent the first phases of the plan in 2004 with internal information gathering. In 2005 they moved into the public outreach phase where a number of community workshops were held and an advisory committee was formed. In 2006 and 2007 the work focused on developing the draft text for the General Plan and the Environmental Report. They broke into study sessions at that point with the City Council and Planning Commission. Ultimately that led to a process where they were able to get the plans out to the public for preliminary review, which occurred in March of 2009. They were at the stage now to incorporate comments and she was present to review those elements that had the most bearing on issues the Design Review Committee (DRC) would encounter. Those were the Land Use element, Cultural Resource element, Natural Resource element, and the Urban Design element. The Urban Design element was a new element.

Ms. Pehoushek stated starting with the Land Use element, the policy focus was land use diversity, mix of development types similar to what was used today, preserving the commercial sites, maintaining the industrial corridors, and looking at some of the under-utilized commercial properties in the community with the possibility of reinventing those areas in different ways. Eight different focus areas were identified throughout the City where land use changes were concentrated and included in the Land Use element, page 31. The areas that were not included had no proposed changes. She would be focusing primarily on a few areas: No. 4 which was

Uptown, No. 2 which was the Katella Corridor, and No. 5 which was Old Towne. There was No. 3, which was South Main/Town and Country, which were areas that mixed-use land uses would be introduced. Around the Block on west Katella and the Town and Country area they proposed a new area referred to as urban mixed use. Those were areas of the City where they had somewhat under utilized properties and commercial properties that might not have experienced reinvestment in a long time; she pointed to those areas on a drawing presented to the DRC and explained where those areas were located. They were reviewing major hubs of employment and transit routes that were serviced by Metrolink. They looked at the General Plan as an opportunity to look toward the future with a reinvention of some areas. There was also the expectation from the State that the City provide the opportunity for housing units to be created in Orange. The urban mixed-use category was to look into creating a higher concentration of residential, commercial, and opportunities for people to work closer to their residences.

Committee Member Woollett asked what was driving the City's direction?

Ms. Pehoushek stated there were regional housing needs from the State that necessitated the creation of more housing. Another factor was the green house gas emissions and legislation in regional planning for air quality and placing people closer to employment opportunities with the intent to reduce vehicle miles traveled. Various dynamics converging on the City. With new growth they would be moving towards a more sustainable living environment with communities built out and neighborhoods being very stable. They looked at where had it made sense to concentrate new growth and there were not too many choices. To maintain the stability of their industrial areas and to create jobs and revenue for the community they looked toward reinventing some of the declining commercial areas. They also looked at segments of Tustin and North Tustin around the mall and the Lincoln Corridor to look at mixed-use opportunities. City Council was not interested in going that way in those locations.

Chair McCormack joined the meeting and asked if other areas were looked at for mixed-use?

Ms. Pehoushek stated they looked at the El Modena area with the pedestrian traffic there and the level of concentration of population there and they looked at the Yorba/Chapman area with the hospital relationship. The problem there was the uncertainty of the hospital in the future and the other factor being that Santiago Creek Trail had cut behind that site and was a connector to Grijalva Park which seemed to be a logical place for a transition from a single family neighborhood over to amenities that would appeal to residential uses. It was something that was not of interest to pursue either. Those options fell off of the table during the course of the briefings and study sessions. There were a few more categories of mixed use, one being 24 units per acre proposed for South Main, between La Veta and Almond. That tied into the density allowed for multi family use. There again they were looking for an opportunity to provide housing and to support employment at the hospital or to provide senior living or amenities for seniors needing care. It was also the suggesting of Economic Development to have South Main take on a more of a medical corridor character. On Katella between California and Glassell they were looking at neighborhood mixed use of 15 units per acre and there was concern based on the interface with single family neighborhoods. What had been proposed was a neighborhood mixed use. In Old Towne currently on the spoke streets they had an existing Old Towne mixed use designation. What had happened with that designation was that it had been split into two designations. With the current density of 24 units per acre which was opposed by the Old Towne

community, they worked through that and ended up with the higher density concentrated around the Depot area with larger buildings which could be designated for adapted reuse or more opportunities for in-fill development. As they moved away from the Depot area they would revert back to the 15 units per acre with the Old Towne mixed-use area.

Ms. Pehoushek stated those points were the ones that the DRC would want to be most aware of and those land use changes. There had been some FAR changes. For the industrial areas and on Eckhoff there had been an adjustment to the FAR for the light industrial area there. There was currently a three-story height limit and they made that a standing component of the light industrial.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the idea of increasing the density allocation was to encourage redevelopment of some of those areas?

Ms. Pehoushek stated in a sense it would encourage redevelopment. They wanted to provide property owners with great flexibility of what they could do with their commercial property. Through market studies with all the studies that had been completed early on they were in an environment that had an over saturation of commercial and office space. In looking to the future, property owners would want to do what made more sense for what direction they should move in.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was his observation that the new higher density areas, such as west Chapman, had only been moderately successful and he asked if it was due to the economic environment or were there other factors?

Ms. Pehoushek stated it seemed to be primarily in looking at the Renaissance Apartments and the Allure Apartments, the Renaissance appeared to be more successfully leased and the mixed-use component of the Allure had not been very successful. Those Apartments had been marketed as luxury apartments and the pricing was high. She had not known what types of deals were being offered.

Committee Member Woollett stated it appeared they were looking at doing more of those projects and he wondered why. The units by the train station had not done very well either.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he suspected that had a lot to do with the economy. He wondered if they knew what was happening with the project across from Main Place in Santa Ana that was a mixed-use project?

Ms. Pehoushek stated a lot of those projects started out being offered for \$800,000 and now they were being offered for \$400,000. She believed it was due to pricing and the economy.

Committee Member Gladson stated some of the reaction they could have at the Orange level, what was happening in Anaheim was that they had big plans for what was happening around the stadium.

Ms. Pehoushek stated that was the thought that some of the energy from the Platinum Triangle in Anaheim could spin off into Orange projects. The Platinum Triangle was in the process of being

completely re-tooled and who knew what the outcome of that would be. The density there was significantly higher than what they were looking at in Orange.

Chair McCormack stated he was speaking to someone just a few weeks ago and it was not only about the Platinum Triangle; it was the connection between San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas. Just for design fees it was 24 million dollars for the first phase. HOK had been selected for that competition and it was a world-wide competition and it just broke last week. He asked would Orange, which would be just across the river, be doing anything to link to those projects?

Ms. Pehoushek stated from Santa Ana River to Batavia, those areas currently had a commercial/recreation designation, which included movie theaters, recording studios and that was how it was set up to attract those uses which had not yet been realized. Because of ARTIC and whatever becomes of the Platinum Triangle and Honda Center, they had consciously decided that was a place that made sense to provide opportunities for housing. There was Orange RV Park which was an under utilized property and there were many other properties that property owners would be interested in looking at. She suspected that they would need to spread the discussion over a few of the Administrative Sessions. What she had presented was the Land Use element that had the most bearing on what the DRC reviewed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the implementation page 29 it spoke about Commission and Committee review of programs and was also considering expanding the authority of the DRC and Community Development Department Staff to enforce Orange historic resources inventory, historic register listings, and DRC procedures involving architectural and archeological resources.

Ms. Pehoushek stated that was a component of the Cultural Resources element. It had been previously the historic preservation element. It had been renamed for a couple of reasons. The current element had a very concentrated focus which was the buildings of Old Towne. As the City had evolved they found it was the time to expand the scope of the preservation element, not only in Old Towne but also outside of Old Towne, such as the Eichler tracts and areas of El Modena or areas outside of Old Towne that had historic value to the community. Broadly to also address those historical resources that were not buildings and to tie in the function of the local history center and the library. In the goals and policies related to cultural resources they looked at exploring and establishing Orange as a certified local government that would have implications on the DRC taking on the capacity of a cultural review board or historic resource review board. Currently there was not a process in place to add resources to the historic inventory. They hoped to add that process to the component. They wanted a procedure for identification of new resources. For areas such as El Modena, the Cypress Barrio, and areas of the rail corridor, to establish neighborhood character areas and establish guidelines for design direction for building form and placing of structures on parcels. There could be references from historic buildings that could be used for new projects.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested expanding the information on page 3 of the historical references and possibly to add to that and the relationship to current in-fill design guidelines. The more resource management tools they had the more it would help.

Ms. Pehoushek stated when they got to the point of developing standards the DRC would be more involved in that process.

Committee Member Woollett asked if there had been any thought with new development to encourage very high level development. He had the impression that Orange had been perceived historically boring in its City and that would preclude any outstanding contemporary structures. If that was true it was very unfortunate. Because the historic buildings would only show up at their best when they were in contrast with the very best contemporary structures. It was a concern he had for many years.

Chair McCormack stated most of the contemporary, higher design buildings had come from groups that ran without the purview of the Planning Commission or the City, such as school districts and college campuses.

Committee Member Woollett stated that the hospitals that came in were ready for construction and stated they were already done and the evaluation of design was difficult.

Chair McCormack stated that was a good point and asked what could they do about it.

Committee Member Gladson stated perhaps when they had the review of the Urban Design element that would bridge the gap for Committee Member Woollett and they would use the new tools to layout the vision they wanted in the community for urban design.

Committee Member Woollett stated he thought the proposed General Plan was great and it would take him several weeks to absorb it. It appeared to be set already, however, and the City Council had weighed in on many things.

Ms. Pehoushek stated she felt the DRC would directly make their marks with the implementation of the General Plan guidelines. It was a challenge they had faced for a very long time and they wanted to go in a direction with redevelopment and there had not been policy tools in place. She would schedule more time to discuss the other segments at another meeting.

Chair McCormack stated he would move the minutes to the end of the meeting.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated when he arrived at the minutes review he could make a motion to move those minutes to the end of the meeting.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett, Craig Wheeler

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:39 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Member Cathcart was absent.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Opportunity for members of the public to address the Design Review Committee on matters not listed on the Agenda.

There was none.

CONSENT ITEMS:

All matters that are announced as Consent Items are considered to be routine by the Design Review Committee and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of said items unless members of the Design Review Committee, staff or the public request specific items to be removed from the Consent Items for separate action.

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to move the approval of the minutes to the end of the Agenda.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett, Craig Wheeler

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

(1) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** (a) May 6, 2009 and (b) May 20, 2009

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular scheduled meetings of May 6, 2009 and May 20, 2009, with the changes and corrections noted.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett, Craig Wheeler

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

- (2) DRC No. 4372-08 VU & DANG NEW RESIDENCE
 - A proposal to construct a new two-story, 9,695 sq. ft. single-family residence.
 - 6505 Woodview Circle (10502 Woodview Circle)
 - Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
 - Continued from the DRC Meeting of April 15, 2009
 - DRC Action: Final Determination

Assistant Planner, Sonal Thakur, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, John Nguyen, address on file, stated they had revised the plans based on the suggestions and DRC comments. The driveway had been revised and they had met all the standard City requirements. They wanted to ask for approval of their project

Public Comment

None.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he recalled that the concerns from the previous meeting had not been many and that the driveway issue had been addressed. There were some fairly high retaining walls and a 42" planter and he presumed they would be concrete block walls that would be faced with stone.

Mr. Nguyen stated that was correct and he pointed out the area that noted the call out for stone on the wall.

Chair McCormack stated his concern had been that the applicant's engineer designed the driveway to allow the cars to go in and out of the garage without bottoming out. If that had been done it had been one of his issues. When the walls would go that high he wondered if they would add a railing to prevent someone from falling off when maintaining the landscape.

Mr. Nguyen stated they would use the retaining wall as a planter, it would be a step planter filled with dirt and shrub material and it would not be seen as a retaining wall.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was not certain if it could be a condition or just a suggestion, it was the issue of chain link fencing. The plans noted there was chain link in an area she pointed to on the plans.

Mr. Nguyen stated those chain link fences were existing. They planned on replacing that fencing with wood fencing.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the applicant would be agreeable to having a condition that the chain link be replaced with another fencing material?

Mr. Nguyen stated that would be agreeable.

Committee Member Gladson stated the pictures in the Staff Report showed a wood fencing that had a metal chain to it and it had a rural feel to it. The house was fine with her and she liked the architecture of the house.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had suggested changes to the roof and the chimney.

Mr. Nguyen stated he had made that change to the roof and presented a drawing to the Committee.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was good. It looked a lot better.

Mr. Nguyen stated the chimney would be projected.

Chair McCormack stated his issues had been to ensure the driveway worked and it appeared it had. There would be water coming into that area and the applicant would need to deal with that.

Mr. Nguyen stated their engineer had reviewed it.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4372-08, Vu & Dang Residence, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if he wanted to add a condition for the removal of the chain link fence?

Committee Member Woollett stated he believed that was not within their purview.

Mr. Nguyen stated the chain link fence had been put up by the previous owner or the owner next door.

Committee Member Woollett stated just because they had not liked chain link they could not ask the applicant to remove it.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was a requirement of the Orange Park Specific Plan as she read it, however, if it was not on the applicant's property they could not ask to have it removed.

Chair McCormack stated they could add the condition if it was on the applicant's property.

Ms. Thakur stated the home was located in the County jurisdiction.

Chair McCormack suggested adding a vine to the chain link fence.

Committee Member Woollett stated he would add that. The motion was amended to add a condition to add a vine to the chain link fence.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett, Craig Wheeler

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

(3) DRC No. 4419-09 - VILLA PARK CATERING

- A proposal to expand an existing restaurant/banquet facility, consisting of a 3,512 sq. ft. banquet room and an open air patio area.
- 510 E. Katella Avenue
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- Continued from the DRC Meeting of May 20, 2009
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Chair McCormack asked if it would be possible to go over all the changes as there had been many pointed out from the previous meeting.

Applicant, Jon Califf, address on file, stated he would be able to do that. He had a suspicion on what he had been calling Banana trees and they were actually a giant Bird of Paradise and that had been corrected. After speaking with Mr. Garcia he had been calculating the tree count incorrectly and that had been adjusted. There were also notations for planter areas, shrubs and automatic irrigation. He laid out the existing site plan and he believed that part of the confusion previously had been that what had been shown as existing was not the most recent information. He attempted to get the trees in the right locations. The existing plan changes were what was contained in the site data in the legend. The plan had delineation in what was proposed and he noted some details such as the square footage for motorcycle parking. He also noted where trees would be relocated; those were trees of sufficient size. It was the applicant's intentions to relocate some of the trees and consult with the landscape architect to divide and spread some of them out.

Chair McCormack asked, referring to the plans, if a symbol he was looking at was the symbol for relocation?

Mr. Califf stated that was a symbol for Queen Palm. He wanted to distinguish between the two varieties of Palm trees. There was also what he believed was a Pigmy Date Palm and he used a different symbol to specify that. There were several areas that had a grouping of two and three trees together. They provided the information for the existing kitchen and restroom areas. There were notations on what was changing. There was an area of lost storage and a new wall be opened up for the additional space. The poche was corrected on the new walls, and there might have been some previous concerns on what walls were new and what walls were existing. Those had been corrected. Part of the change from the original design with the proximity of what needed to be a taller parapet, a taller space and the clearance they wanted they had not felt comfortable pulling it too far back. He pointed out the changes on the plans and reviewed those with the Committee Members. He aligned some of the parking in order to eliminate any confusion on where the entry was. There was a tower element added to reinforce the idea that the entrance would be located there.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if a new entry door had been added.

Mr. Califf stated it was not an additional entry door; it was rather a stand alone exit door. There was a change to the east wall elevation where the new wall would attach. Basically the new tower would be 5' shorter than the existing tower and they would be using parapet and the same two piece clay tile roofing and the same type of windows as existed at the site. He apologized for the graphic as some horizontal lines had shown up in the 3D model and they should not have shown up in that.

Mr. Garcia stated he believed the applicant had covered all the necessary changes.

Public Comment

None.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated the plans were much easier to read and a number of issues had been clarified and he was pleased with the proposed project.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there were a few minor things. The arches on the existing building were more of a basket handle design and he wanted to ensure that was duplicated. There was also some trim that should be match and he pointed those areas out.

Chair McCormack stated the plans were much easier to read. He was attempting get his hands on an area, and asked if the island was going to stay with a cut through?

Mr. Califf stated yes, that was the intent and reviewed that section of the plans with Chair McCormack pointing out where the cut through would be.

Chair McCormack stated there was a notation that existing pavement would remain if required by WQMP. He was wondering, and it was always about design and designing a new entry, he thought what was being used for the new entry was old asphalt. He was not certain, but it may trigger something that created a hardship for the applicant, but generally they would not want to propose asphalt for that.

Mr. Califf stated there was a threshold of 5,000 square feet and that was a big deal. Obviously they couldn't do anything about where the building went and actually within the 5, 000 square feet, all of an area he pointed to on the plans, could be included. Another thing was that Katella was similar to standing on the freeway in regard to noise, they had thought about adding a fountain to add white noise and another feature, however, it could not compete with Katella and the other thought was to landscape and not try to get people to hang out in that area. It would be more of an entry walk and less of a patio.

Applicant, Tim Zimprich, stated the area was never going to be asphalt, only the smaller area due to the WQMP requirements.

Chair McCormack stated in surveying that area were they aware that the natural flow went down and appeared to go toward the building?

Mr. Califf pointed out how the flow of the lot worked and that the water would flow to a curb and gutter.

Chair McCormack stated any drainage along that area might require another curb.

Mr. Califf stated he understood that and suspected that might need to be added.

Chair McCormack stated it appeared that the threshold of required plantings and trees had been met.

Chair McCormack stated in making a recommendation to the Planning Commission they would want to ask that the Landscape plans would be reviewed by Staff and not need to be reviewed by the DRC. On the Landscape plan it would probably not deal with an area he pointed to on the plans as it appeared to be a hard scape area. Someone would need to be directed on designing that area and dealing with the grade situation. He liked the idea of having a fountain.

Mr. Califf stated they typically placed all curbs and walks that would exist on the floor plan as it was easier to dimension them out at that scale. Everything that was in the immediate area would be added to the floor plan.

Chair McCormack stated in the previous review they had spoken about lighting.

Mr. Zimprich stated they planned on bringing the lighting up to match the new existing lights.

Mr. Califf stated he believed there were 3 different types of lighting.

Mr. Zimprich stated the lighting would all match.

Chair McCormack stated in his quest to reduce asphalt on earth, if the area, which he pointed out on the plans, was to be stripped why would they not take out that asphalt?

Mr. Garcia stated he would need to speak with WQMP as it could trigger other issues.

Mr. Califf stated it would add to the 5, 000 square feet of modified space as a disturbed area.

Committee Member Wheeler stated large pots could be added to that area.

Mr. Garcia stated initially the applicant had wanted to change all that out and add landscaping.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the main tower there were exposed rafter tails and suggested matching that.

Mr. Califf stated that was the intent.

Committee Member Gladson stated the smaller tower element was nice and she asked if it was an open element?

Mr. Garcia stated it was open.

Committee Member Gladson stated on the area next to the trash enclosure which was fenced off, she asked if those were reduced parking areas or what was that?

Mr. Zimprich stated those were old tiles that had been taken from the other building and it was temporary until the construction was completed.

Chair McCormack stated it was suggested that large pots be placed in the entry area and to use the area for additional pots to get to something that was cohesive in making a statement with some possible up lighting and an opportunity to add more interest. They could actually grow some of those Bird of Paradise into the pots.

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission for DRC No. 4419-09, Villa Park Catering, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following conditions:

- 1. The arches match the existing.
- 2. The new tower element shall have exposed rafter tails.
- 3. The trim around the columns match the existing.
- 4. Pots be added at the entry area to have a cohesive design and be repeated at the striped no-parking area and the pots would have the same plant materials.
- 5. An opening to be punched through the curb.
- 6. The architectural site plan to pick up the paving enhancements at the entry.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett, Craig Wheeler

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(4) DRC No. 4420-09 – CAMBRIDGE MEDICAL PLAZA–MONUMENT SIGN

- A proposal to replace a freestanding wood sign with a new monument sign.
- 1026 E. Chapman Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Dan Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Senior Planner, Dan Ryan, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Pete Cavello, address on file, stated he had no additional comments.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated the only comment he had, was again, the proposal for use of vinyl plastic lettering. The Plaza standards which apply to spoke streets referenced that use. For everyone else who wanted to use other materials that he felt they should stick with the standards as it was a required finding.

Mr. Ryan stated the section that Mr. Frankel spoke of in the Standards read that letters should be wood or metal or of materials that accurately simulated wood or metal and it was a question of how that standard was interpreted.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the applicant had brought samples of the lettering? She understood that the background would be plywood.

Mr. Cavello presented photos and finish samples. He stated he would use a matte finish which appeared to be painted wood rather than using a glossy surface.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the existing sign was painted?

Mr. Cavello stated the existing sign was the same, it had vinyl.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the existing sign had a metal base, rather than plywood.

Mr. Cavello stated the material was Dybond, which was more weather resistant and it had not had a plastic appearance. The new sign, which had different requirements, would be wood.

Committee Member Woollett stated Mr. Frankel's comment was clear and he understood what he was stating. The problem he had with the regulations was that it was not sufficiently specific. The letters could be painted using vinyl paint and it would be in compliance. The difference with vinyl paint and a dull vinyl letter was no difference.

Committee Member Wheeler stated when vinyl paint dried it was plastic.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had not thought that using vinyl lettering would be setting an inappropriate precedence due to the thickness of the lettering. It was really a more convenient and precise way to add the letters. One could argue because it was more precise that it looked different. Particularly with the proposed application because it was next to an existing sign and it was a very unusual situation with the property being divided. He thought it was justified. If he had any concerns at all it would be the fact that different materials would be used on the two signs and he would want to ensure that over time they signs would fade the same way. In reviewing the photos of the existing sign the manner in which the stone was applied was inappropriate, the ends of the stone where it connected to the side appeared as if in applying the stone small pieces were stuck in the end.

Mr. Cavello stated with that type of stone they actually made corners and they could use corners on the new sign. He had looked at that and it had appeared very rough.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the proposal was for MDO it was okay to use on the sides, however, he wanted to know what would be used on the exposed top edge?

Mr. Cavello stated they were not intending to use the metal strip on top, and in looking at it instead of having an unsealed top they would use the metal strip. It would be the same type of strip that was used on the existing sign.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested painting the metal strip to match the sign. He asked if the stone was cultured stone?

Mr. Cavello stated it was a concrete stone that came in little strips. The existing stone had cultured stone.

Chair McCormack stated there was real stone available that could be applied in the same manner and the cost was about the same.

Mr. Cavello stated it was approximately 80 cents per foot.

Chair McCormack stated that Mr. Frankel's comments were well taken and he agreed with Mr. Woollett's comments. He had a problem with signs that were just set into the landscape; five years later there would be a white line from the constant water contact. He suggested mitigating that by removing some of the turf that was next to the sign, removing it approximately 12" away from it. He was not certain if the solar light would stand the test of time and was not very historic. There was no requirement for lighting the sign.

Committee Member Woollett asked how long had the other sign been at that location?

Mr. Cavello stated about one year.

Chair McCormack stated there was water hitting it, the mower hitting it.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was inclined to allow the applicant to deal with the lighting and the consequences of those things. If they wanted to change it every year it was probably one solution.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was probably easier to change it than to run conduit to the light.

Chair McCormack suggested using some compatible material to place in the strip next to the sign, possibly a crushed stone that had the same coloring.

Committee Member Gladson stated they had reviewed other sign installations that were similar that had used concrete.

Chair McCormack stated just something loose. There was a material called Chip Seal, which was decomposed granite and it could be spread out and would stay in place. The irrigation heads could be set back.

Mr. Cavello stated on the new sign was the intent to be 1' away?

Committee Member Gladson stated she was still struggling with the material use, wood or metal. She thought the vinyl lettering appeared more like metal and she wanted to talk her self through it to feel more comfortable with it. She wondered what her colleagues thought and if they were having the same struggles?

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared to him to be a painted surface which would be entirely appropriate. It appeared as very accurate painting and one advantage was that when one of the Doctors changed it would be much easier to change the name on the sign.

Committee Member Gladson stated that gave her a bit more comfort as she had looked at the existing sign.

Mr. Cavello stated he liked the idea of removing the turf from around the sign.

Chair McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4420-09, Cambridge Medical Plaza Monument Sign, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following conditions:

- 1. To add a metal channel at the top of the sign to match the existing sign.
- 2. Remove 16" of turf from around the sign and add a compatible material, such as a Chip Seal-type stone with the same coloration of the stone used in the sign

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett, Craig Wheeler

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

(5) DRC No. 4422-09 – BEACH PIT BBQ–SIGNS AND REAR FACADE

- A proposal for new signage and modifications of the rear façade of a contributing commercial building's conversion from retail use to restaurant use.
- 124-128 N. Glassell Street, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Dan Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself from the presentation due to the location of his office in proximity to the applicant's location.

Senior Planner, Dan Ryan, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Tim DeCinces, address on file, stated he would speak to the smoker for a moment. The design of the smoker was to keep the smoke inside, as opposed to having the smoke such as on a grill that the heat and smoke would go up immediately. The smoker was design to keep the heat and smoke inside and the only time the heat was let out was when the smokers were evacuated before they opened the doors. It would not give off any heat. There would be equipment on the roof for ventilation when the heat was let out. As it related to the design, the reason they loved the space was because it was period, nostalgic and fit the Old Towne area and their business would fit. His designers had worked with Mr. Ryan and Staff to fit within the period. Mr. DeCinces asked in recommendation #2 changing the aluminum panels to flat so there would be no reveal and then in #3, in using metal lettering or other suggested materials it would create a reveal and he had not understood those conflicting recommendations?

Mr. Ryan stated what the applicant intended to do was to have a face change and the thinking was that instead have a sign similar to the old Coca Cola sign with the bubble.

Mr. DeCinces asked to have it come out a little bit?

Mr. Ryan stated to not have it come out and to have it flat in appearance. As far as the individual letters that was a question about whether the applicant wanted to use a thin metal letter, a painted letter or a vinyl material that appeared metal. Staff had left choices.

Mr. DeCinces stated he thought a metal letter would look cool, however, it seemed to be in conflict as it would create a reveal.

Mr. Ryan stated the idea was that the thickness would make a difference in how it appeared.

Chair McCormack asked if there was a sample?

Mr. Ryan stated no.

Mr. DeCinces stated the neighboring signs such as the jeweler, there sign had a reveal as the letters came off the sign.

Mr. Ryan stated he believed the intent was to have the appearance of painted letters or individual or fixed letters.

Committee Member Gladson stated the jewelry sign next door would be exposed reversed channel letters and that was mid century and it was starting to get popular again.

Mr. Ryan stated part of it was what the sign company wanted to put together and what would work for the applicant.

Applicant, Al Ricci, address on file, stated that was the point of the building and they had thought about going back and making it look like Citrus City Grill and taking the whole front off to expose what had been behind it with a place to eat out front. They had thought about it and every point in time was history. The building was 1950's history. What happened all the time in Old Towne was attempted duplication of what had occurred in the 1900's and 1920's. By destroying the front of their building it would be destroying what had happened in 1957, which was 52 years ago. The sign by itself and the front of the building were nostalgic and it was an indication of a different point in time in Old Towne. He had taken Ms. Smith to the site and he asked her if it should be taken back to a building such as Citrus City and she had told him absolutely not; that her father had worked there when it was Pixley's Market and it had a cage that went across without a front door and she had encouraged him to keep in 1950's style and not to go back.

Public Comment

Janet Crenshaw, address on file, representing the OTPA stated when speaking of 52 years ago at her age that wasn't very long ago. Her first thing when reviewing the language she had turned to the picture and garish came to mind it was way too big. She read the standards and the applicant was allowed 23 square feet of signage and there was much more there and it seemed over the top to her.

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA stated again he hated to keep hammering the vinyl plastic signage, however, he wanted to clarify that there was two parts to the standards materials section; one that wood or metal utilized to actively simulated wood or metal. It had not stated plastic or use plastic. The second part stated that high gloss or shiny was prohibited and essentially plastic could not be used. That was very clear and until those standards were revised it was clear and not certain if that standard would be changed. He was unclear regarding the square footage of the signage. The standards stated it was 15 square feet per face on that type of sign. The 23 square foot – he was not certain about. He was confused there. He had been to the restaurant in Tustin and they had done a great job of using a historic garage. He and had eaten at the restaurant which was very good. That was a large building and the sign was appropriate for that size of building. The proposed project was a much smaller scale and the signage appeared overwhelming for the store front as compared to the street scape. The idea of restoring the 1950's period sign at the rear was a good idea as it was not within the period of significance. Whenever a sign could be preserved was a positive thing. Also, he noticed in the packet there had been something about the screening but had not found anything in the Staff Report. Staff's idea of placing the vent or whatever it was had been a good idea if that was possible as it would be visible from the front.

Mr. Ricci stated they were preserving a historic sign. The sign had been made out of Plexi glass in 1957 and that was the material in that part of history. Using plastic had fit the historic period.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the applicant had given any thought about piping some of that BBQ smoke down so people riding by would smell it?

Mr. DeCinces stated the restaurant in Alabama, The Brick Pit, which was a house set off of the street where they had a little black pot that they put wood chips in that swung in the wind.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had the problem that Ms. Crenshaw had as the 1950's were not history for him, it was current, and he had not particularly liked the 50's. On #2, which read: change all the raised aluminum panels to flat panels and he asked Mr. Ryan for some clarification?

Mr. Ryan stated the round logos that the applicant proposed on both sides of the blade sign and the one in the back were round, however, had a curved top to them, similar to the old Coca Cola signs.

Chair McCormack asked like a cut basketball?

Committee Member Woollett asked what was wrong with that?

Mr. Ryan stated there was nothing wrong with that design, in order to look at the project as a face change, the sign would need to be flat on a flat cabinet surface to appear as a painting, as a logo or as part of the field of the cabinet sign. In raising it the form of the sign was being changed and became more of a fascia change.

Committee Member Woollett stated on the vertical lettering Staff was stating if there was no vertical lettering previously there could not be vertical lettering in the proposed sign and he asked why?

Mr. Ryan stated what they had looked at was what areas of the existing sign had signage. Either raised or painted on the flat sign that indicated there was signage. Photos showed the areas of the sign that had signage. The blade sign had no appearance of having had letters or signage.

Committee Member Woollett stated so what?

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated they could not look at the sign in two ways; it was either a face change from what Blessing's had or it was not. If it was a face change the new signage could only be installed where the old sign had been. If the applicant was proposing a whole new sign program they would need to go back to the only allowable square footage.

Committee Member Woollett stated if they wanted to use the greater area that had been used before; the applicant would need to be more prescriptive of what they wanted to do. If the applicant wanted to design something in accordance with historical style and they had not cared what had existed, they would be limited to the current area.

Mr. Ricci stated the problem was that Blessing's never permitted their signs; they just put a vinyl sticker over the plastic that was there. The last allowable sign was the drug store sign and they could not judge what someone had just thrown up there. Blessing's was recent.

Committee Member Woollett stated he could not completely rely on that as many of the things they used as historic references were not approved.

Mr. DeCinces stated he understood not having the neon stick out past the base of the sign; when he looked at it he looked at the entire piece as the sign. Where the writing was from Blessing's was confusing for him when he had initially spoken to Mr. Ryan. If they had letters that had not stuck out past the drop down he thought the whole thing was a sign.

Mr. Ryan stated it was a form. The area underneath would be measured to calculate the area of signage and that was where the 143 square feet had come from. They knew that was the gross number with Royal. It had been painted over. They knew certain areas that had not been painted, however, the area at the top had been blocked out. In some cases they could view a faint image, but overall they looked at it placing 70.73 square feet of sign and eliminate the 80 square feet of the BBQ lettering, it would be half of what had been there. The face change could have been 143 square feet.

Chair McCormack stated he was confused as he looked at it as a form and he looked at two different things. The letters looked way too big for the context of the sign and he was attempting to figure out if the letters would be that big because they were reading into the drawing how big the letters could be. He thought the letters should be smaller.

Mr. Ryan stated the maximum letter height was 15". They took the space to calculate. Blessing's had painted out much of the sign area.

Chair McCormack stated from a design perspective that looked a little too big for the thing it was in, referring to a drawing of the signage. It was sticking out.

Committee Member Woollett stated the lettering was being looked at from an odd angle. It was hard for a graphics person to show how it would actually look and it appeared much bigger. He reviewed the picture with the Committee Members.

Chair McCormack stated it was not right yet. His first initial reaction was that the signage was way too overpowering, and he had not known where that overpowering comment would come in to their sign.

Committee Member Woollett stated the drawing that was missing was a perpendicular view from the face, an elevation from the front. That would show how the sign would fit and they would be able to judge it better.

Mr. DeCinces stated the call out was for letters to be 1' 2". The detail was on page 3, A. The lettering was not too big.

Committee Member Woollett stated he wanted to see a line around it in order to be able to understand how big the surface was that the letters would be applied to. The actual panel dimensions; until he reviewed that he could not understand the proportion.

Chair McCormack stated it was the proportion and the size of the lettering. They had spoke about vinyl letters on another sign and if he had an opinion on the sign he would want metal and to have something nice. He would want to see a section to review how the sign would come off the face. People would be noticing it and the details were important. He asked what had supported the sign?

Mr. DeCinces stated he had not understood Mr. Ryan's comment about the sign bubbling out and he had looked for it in the packet, the sign was flat.

Committee Member Gladson stated perhaps he was being cautious to assure the sign would not bubble out.

Mr. Ryan stated basically instead of having a projected disc, he thought the sign person had stated the sign bubbled, maybe she was wrong.

Committee Member Gladson stated they could review the application in parts. An existing blade sign and existing cabinets would be used which was just a change in copy for her. She was essentially okay with that if they used metal letters and the neon was integrated into the cabinet.

Committee Member Woollett asked why would the letters need to be metal?

Committee Member Gladson stated because of the standards, either wood or metal and she was more in favor of metal.

Committee Member Woollett stated what about the concept they had spoken about. They had an old historic sign and they could follow that design or they could form new regulations. He agreed with that and they were deciding on that.

Committee Member Gladson stated if she had her choice she would want to go back to the original history.

Committee Member Woollett stated so she would not give them a choice.

Committee Member Gladson stated she preferred to go back to the older look and it was more of a personal preference. That could be laid aside and she could let the existing sign continue as the applicant was not expanding the form, in terms of the blade or the cabinet and they would be changing just the letters. She was uncomfortable with the addition of the neon and she could view that as inappropriate. She had not looked at it as a historic sign and as valuable as the

applicant or property owner felt. If a future owner wanted to remove the sign and replace it with more of a historic sign she would be inclined to agree with that, but not now.

Chair McCormack asked Committee Member Gladson if she would consider removing the whole sign?

Committee Member Gladson stated that was correct to go further back. On the proposed application she had not felt it would be appropriate as they wanted to use the existing forms and as long as it fit into the required criteria she was generally o.k. with it. There had not appeared to be any signage or evidence of signage on the vertical element and she agreed with Staff in not allowing that. The next thing she sensed a struggle with would be the percentage of coverage on the front of the building and it was a massing element. There was no criteria for that and they could not restrict that.

Chair McCormack stated it appeared too large, almost collegiate.

Mr. Ryan asked if it was the color?

Chair McCormack stated no, it was the size.

Mr. DeCinces stated it was deceiving. In reviewing the detail, 14" was not a large letter.

Committee Member Woollett stated they needed to be very careful. They needed to be consistent in interpreting the rules, because they would get into trouble down the line. The DRC could not pick and choose from the current rules and the past rules; and what was there before and they needed to be careful which required some very critical thinking. One of the things that had been pointed out, for instance in the 1950's a lot of plastic was used and in the current rules they do not allow plastic and that presented a difficult issue. If the DRC stated the 50's qualified as a historic period and there was a sign that was a 50's sign that had plastic in it, even though the current rules would not allow it they would need to allow it.

Mr. Ryan stated there was a section in the standards that spoke to that. There were statements that read all signs in the plaza shall comply with the standards and in addition to the general requirements of the City's sign ordinance. Where conflicts arose the standards supercede the sign code, historically referenced signs would be documented from original building photos and may exceed current limits. That spoke to the sign based on the historic content of the sign.

Committee Member Woollett stated if it was historically plastic it could be used.

Mr. Ryan stated that was his understanding in how the standards were written. When the design study had been done they found that the sign code would not permit some historical signs. They attempted, rather than rewriting the sign code, was to add a paragraph that would allow that the criteria of the sign code could be exceeded based on the historic make up of the sign. The question became would a building that had stood there for more than 50 years be of historical significance for that period. He thought it was yes, whether they liked 1950 or not.

Committee Member Woollett asked if they were in a position to do that?

Mr. Ryan stated yes, that was part of their review.

Committee Member Woollett stated the ordinance had not described that.

Mr. Ryan stated the Secretary of Interior's Standards described buildings that were 50 years old or more and they could lean on that. They could look to previous buildings in the plaza that had been remodeled such as the Radio Shack building, originally Victorian to Art Deco. There was some precedence to guide them in making determinations. They were looking at the building in the proposed project from 1957 and what had remained significant that still had integrity and significance in that building – mostly the front of the whole building. He thought it was consistent with that period and the only problem was that there were no photos from 1957 and there were no clear pictures of Blessing's and they were attempting to fill that in.

Committee Member Woollett stated they were trying to keep a historic sign that they had no photos of.

Mr. Ryan stated they knew the elements that were there had included signage; the question was, was the level of signage appropriate and would they have been appropriate in 1957. He had wanted to avoid all of the discussion by locating a photograph and not having that they had looked at the next best thing. They attempted to reveal what had been there before. The applicant was proposing a sign the size of half of what had been there.

Mr. Ricci stated they knew there were signs there. Behind the Plexi glass there were fluorescent tubes to illuminate it and that told him everywhere there was plastic there was signage. He pointed out those areas on the drawings. There was a back lit Plexi glass sign in the 50's.

Committee Member Gladson stated the building was non-contributing due to all the alterations to the building.

Mr. Ryan stated it was non-contributing based on the Plaza application for buildings within a historic content for the downtown area. The question was had the building gained significance based on that it had been there for over 50 years, whether that was good or bad.

Committee Member Woollett stated that some of the historic signs were really outrageous and that was part of history. It was not a matter of whether the DRC liked it or not, it was that they needed to be faithful to the regulations that they were administering and they needed to be consistent. More of those types of issues would occur. They could wish that everything be exposed on the building and to go back to 1915, but what they wished was not important.

Committee Member Gladson stated that was why she was generally comfortable with what they proposed for the front elevation in agreement with Staff's recommendations.

Chair McCormack stated it was historic, but not historic to Old Towne. It was a snapshot of time in the 50's and it was historic in the fact of its form. He was reviewing the proportions, the size and the lettering and the appropriateness. How the sign worked, which he would want to gain more information on. It was a 6" thick plate and he was not certain that it had a curve or not.

Mr. Ryan stated he may have gotten some misinformation on that. In order for the sign to qualify as a face change it needed to be very flat. Basically, it would not have much of a reveal.

The Committee discussed the different designs of signs.

Chair McCormack stated his preference would be to have up lighting in the back with a halo in the back, design wise he felt that would be nice and it would add a nice feature to it.

Mr. Ryan stated the next question was that if one part was changed was it appropriate to 1957 and would it exceed the sign area that was there previously. They had proposed the dimensions on what had been there, and if a portion of the sign was changed would that no longer be a face change?

Committee Member Woollett stated if the sign had been a can sign with plastic over it why was it still not a can sign with plastic over it and why were they changing it and lighting up those tubes? If that was the historical sign why would they not use those features?

Chair McCormack stated that was a good point. It would be back lit.

Committee Member Woollett stated it would be a plastic sign with thin film vinyl lettering so the light would come off of it and that would have been done in the 50's.

Chair McCormack stated he kind of agreed, he felt that the quality of signage was not that good in the 50's.

Mr. Ryan stated if they were to consider the sign as a face change that would dictate what would be the type of allowable construction and the materials. Once they started to deviate they would need to refer back to the standard sign code. The issue was that they could make assumptions, they knew there was a sign and it was constructed a certain way with florescent tubes. Would that substantially change anything historically? He thought it would be complimentary to the building. Where they clear about what they would be approving?

Chair McCormack stated there were many things, size of materials, lettering, lighting and if the business was called Blessing's they would not have a problem. He liked using the theory of what had been there before, but what was done in that period was not that good.

Committee Member Woollett stated that was true of what had been done in the 1920's too.

Chair McCormack stated much of that material would have been wood or metal. In the 50's they experimented with plastics.

Mr. DeCinces stated at the location in Tustin it was in a historic building and they had done a ton of research on signage to get the approvals in Tustin. Mr. Pomoroy was hired and he had done research from the early 1900's and all the signs were different, some were blacksmith signs that hung out and many were modern looking signs. They were attempting to match the period which was a 1950's palette.

Committee Member Woollett stated they had to be careful with deviating very far from what had been there.

Mr. Ryan stated historically referenced signs were based on documentation and what there were attempting to determine was what was historically appropriate for that time period.

Chair McCormack asked if there had been a light that had punched out or was it just a flat face? As a personal preference he was looking at backlighting and giving the sign a nice feature. If the sign was pulled off and there was a punched hole for a light that had been there it would be nice.

Committee Member Gladson stated she only felt comfortable if it had been something that had existed and there had been evidence of that.

Mr. Ricci stated the proposed lighting was front lighting and lighting from below.

The Committee Members discussed the lighting proposal with the applicant.

Mr. Ryan stated the fact that there were back lit canopy signs lead him to think that there might be some internal illumination.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was really concerned about the issue. He understood they had a 50 year old situation, and if they accepted in Old Towne Orange post-WWII buildings as historic they would open Pandora's Box. If they waited long enough all the junk that was in Old Towne would be historic and that was not the intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Ryan stated that was a determination that City Council would make.

Mr. Ricci stated that what Committee Member Woollett was stating that designs in Old Towne should always mimic the 1920's and 1900's; to always go back to the point the town was built. Eichlers' were approaching 50 years old and they would be protected and they were junk.

Committee Member Woollett stated they were not junk and they were not in Old Towne.

Mr. Ricci stated the 1950's was a point in history.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was and it was not what he liked. Fortunately being on the DRC was not determining design based on what he liked. He had not thought it was the intent when the Old Towne ordinance was set up that it would include buildings after the second World War

Mr. Ricci asked under Committee Members Woollett's theory the 1950's sign would need to be removed?

Committee Member Woollett stated if it was not the intent, it would not be appropriate to consider post-WWII buildings as historic, even though the law states 50 years. He asked how long had the ordinance been in effect – 15 years?

Mr. Ricci stated if the sign was legal when it had been installed it was currently legal. If glass could be installed in it in the 1950's then glass could be installed in it in 2000.

Mr. Ryan stated in reviewing Renee's next door and when surveying the information for the Plaza, that building had been deemed contributing and at that time the current façade of the proposed project had already been in place. The building might be contributing based upon the removal of non-historic features and the discoveries that had been found on other buildings in the Plaza. They could always go back to the original document to see what was contributing and what was not. The question they were getting into was if the building was true to its period as far as its originality and was it a good example of that, and was their a historic building there that they could go back to?

Committee Member Woollett stated would the building have been a contributing building in the 1950's?

Mr. Ryan stated they had looked at that question to and if a store front had just been stuck onto the original building and in removing it the building could be returned to its original period. The same criteria should be applied, had the building been significant, was it important to the period, was it a good representative of a unique style or materials, an exemplary store front and all those questions would need to be asked in meeting the criteria. Although the 50 year rule had not been determined he believed the proposed project qualified.

Committee Member Woollett stated they needed to review the ordinance and follow it. The DRC would evaluate the project based on the ordinance and as a result of going through that process it might cause some of the City fathers to re-evaluate the process. The applicant had the right to submit their project based on the ordinance.

Mr. Ryan stated someone could apply to have the building added the national registry within the historic district as gaining significance for its historic period.

Mr. DeCinces stated he had spent time and money getting the project to its present point. They had done what they were told and they were not asking for anything outside of the Guidelines.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was one of the newer members of the Committee and the project was not easy and they were asking very difficult questions as they were attempting to find a middle ground. Personally she found the proposed project as just a sign change, as just a copy change and that was where her comfort level was. Was it necessarily a look she had been crazy about-no, so she could just dismiss her personal view and go with what was there.

Chair McCormack stated there were two ways to look at it, they were on the Committee to look at design and that was one way that they could ignore the design. The other way, was to look at it from a perspective of how they could suggest ways to improve the project.

Mr. Ryan stated if the DRC felt there were some elements that would make it more appropriate in a different design to reflect the 1950's period they could make that finding too. As long as they would not exceed the sign area of the project.

Chair McCormack stated 70 square feet that had gone into the design, which he clarified on the drawings.

Committee Member Gladson stated it even made her more comfortable as it would not be excessive.

Chair McCormack stated he liked the blade sign.

Mr. DeCinces stated he liked that too.

Mr. Ryan stated they had asked the applicant to examine the roof sign at the rear and to verify if it had been painted, they could also research, if there was any evidence of a blade sign.

Mr. DeCinces stated what concerned him was the argument of whether it was 1950's nostalgia or was it 1920's, as an applicant he liked the nostalgia of the building. He was 35 years old and he thought it was cool and old fashioned looking. To enter into a debate of what year to look at was very dicey for him.

Committee Member Woollett stated there was an ordinance to follow and if it stated 50 years that was what they would need to go with.

Committee Member Gladson stated the period of when the area became significant was still the 20's and 30, the sign had been installed in the 1950's and she was o.k. with that in allowing it to continue.

Committee Member Woollett asked if they would allow more investigation?

Mr. Ryan stated there were two ways to proceed. One of them was to find out if there was any evidence of a blade sign and the information on the signs in the back.

Mr. Ricci stated he wanted to propose that they got the application approved, and if they investigated the signs and found that there was additional signage they could return to modify the application. He felt they were going to have difficulty finding the information on a previous sign and how it had been constructed. They would take the blade signage off unless there was proof that it had existed.

Mr. DeCinces stated he was okay with the conditions and one of the conditions was that they investigate the front. Why not add a condition that they investigate the back as a condition of approval?

Chair McCormack stated if they actually built the sign with the proposed proportions it looked too big and he wanted the applicant's to review that. If it wouldn't look to garish then it could be that size. What would also help was if the neon was gone; he pointed it out on the drawings.

The lettering appeared too big, but it could just be his eyes. If it was not block lettering it might not appear so heavy.

Mr. DeCinces stated the font was old west and it was what it was; Blessing's had script cursive. He asked if they were okay with the logo, the pig and the wave?

Chair McCormack stated that was his only design comment, and he was okay with the logo.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was ready to make a motion.

Mr. Ryan stated he wanted to talk about the background.

Chair McCormack read from the Staff Report regarding the lettering and was it back-lit with seethrough vinyl letters?

Mr. Ryan stated the ones that were not back-lit would be painted or metal.

Mr. DeCinces stated he was fine with that, he liked metal.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was fine with that. For the non back-lit.

Committee Member Woollett stated they could just add a sentence for the back-lit.

The Committee Members discussed the back-lit lettering with the applicant.

Chair McCormack stated there would be two lit surfaces: the lettering and the background.

Mr. Ricci stated the metal would be front-lit and the vinyl would be back-lit.

Mr. Ryan stated the applicant had a choice whether they wanted the background to be up-lit.

The Committee reviewed the conditions of approval.

Chair McCormack stated what about Condition No. 4 to be flushed paneled doors.

Committee Member Gladson stated she wanted to be clear. Was the thought that the existing roof sign with the metal element be restored and with the new sign on the front and she was not certain how it would sit. She was not certain if the applicant would be restoring the sign.

Mr. Ryan stated that was a point that had been brought up to cover the issue of discovery of a historic sign. Depending on the condition of the sign, there could be another sign on top of it.

Mr. DeCinces stated his preference would be to not touch any of that and to leave the rustic old paint intact with the BBQ lettering over it, it was old and nostalgic and they had not wanted to paint over it.

Mr. Ryan stated that was an option and possibly somewhere in the future that sign would be restored.

Mr. DeCinces stated he had not wanted to touch it.

Mr. Ricci stated if there was a sign they could place a plate over it to cover it with the BBQ in front of it. Somehow to preserve the sign and place a metal face over it for protection with their sign in front. It would allow someone to go back and restore the original sign.

Mr. DeCinces asked if it was okay with them?

Chair McCormack stated the old sign would be hidden.

Committee Member Gladson stated they could consult a professional to get information on how it could be restored.

Mr. DeCinces stated he had not understood, as now they were speaking about restoring?

Mr. Ryan stated that came out of the discussion in the removal of the stucco and the discovery of the sign underneath with Orange Lock and Key and what had been done was that they maintained as much of the original signage that they could. They looked for alternatives for their sign placement to preserve that signage. The deciding factor would be the condition of that sign.

Mr. Ricci stated there they went – was that a historic sign?

Committee Member Woollett stated it was 50 years old.

Committee Member Gladson stated it would appear that it would fall into the same style as the front as there was some evidence of a neon element and it would help with the argument that there was a historic sign in existence.

Chair McCormack stated if that was a historic sign and they wanted to restore it as in Condition No. 5, it seemed that they could find another location for the sign in the back.

Committee Member Woollett stated if they did that it would be necessary to follow the new sign code.

Chair McCormack stated it was a historical sign, and was no different than anything else on the surface.

Mr. DeCinces asked why would they want to restore Royal Drugs if it no longer existed?

Chair McCormack stated that the applicant's sign could go anywhere.

Mr. DeCinces asked if they could go with the same palette that Royal Drugs used with the same design and place their business sign there?

Chair McCormack asked if that was what the Grinder had done?

Committee Member Gladson stated they had left what was there.

Mr. Ricci stated the Grinder had an option to cover the sign with plywood and place a full length sign out front.

Mr. Ryan stated that was an option and they had put standoffs with individual letters.

Chair McCormack stated he liked the exposure of the history of the City with something new and he thought that would work.

Mr. Ricci stated if they could expose a salvageable sign on the back they could put the neon over it.

Mr. DeCinces stated weren't they accomplishing the goal by using the historic palette with the new tenant's logo?

Committee Member Woollett stated that was correct.

Mr. DeCinces stated the old rusted background was what he wanted to use, he had not wanted to use a new sign. It was the graphics vs. the detail, they had to look at the dimensions and the call out and they could not just look at the drawings.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had not wanted them to harm a 1950's sign.

Mr. Ryan stated a lot of the neon was on a canvas sign. Sometimes the actual neon hung over the sign and it would not make any penetrations through the existing sign. Another thing they could do was utilize standoffs.

Mr. Ricci stated the existing grommets could be used, and they could craft a condition for that.

Committee Member Gladson stated Mr. Ricci mentioned a shoe business and asked if there was a likelihood that a sign for that business might be discovered?

Mr. Ricci stated they had studied different signs and that was a sign that had come up in their research.

Chair McCormack read from the conditions: provide additional information on rear lighting.

Mr. Ryan stated there was a question whether the round logo sign would be illuminated.

Chair McCormack stated the parking lot was already illuminated. He read through the condition on the roof equipment. The Committee and applicant reviewed the placement of the equipment on the drawings and discussed that placement.

Mr. Ryan stated there were some screening options provided.

Committee Member Gladson stated screening was a big concern of hers.

Mr. DeCinces pointed out the equipment and stated the equipment was existing equipment that was not visible from the street. The parapet from Glassell was very high and would block the view.

Mr. Ryan stated the condition would cover any mechanical equipment that was visible to be screened.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4422-09, Beach Pit BBQ Signs and rear façade, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following conditions:

- 1. Condition No. 3 be modified to add an additional phrase: or with vinyl or back-lit letters to fit the existing signs.
- 2. Use one of the following: metal letters and or painted letters on a non-lit background; and use vinyl lettering on back-lit areas of the sign with only the letters or the background to be lit.
- 3. Condition No. 7 shall be revised to read that mechanical equipment shall be screened as required.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart RECUSED: Craig Wheeler

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled meeting on June 17, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.