CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

June 16, 2010

Committee Members Present: Tim McCormack

Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: Bill Cathcart

Adrienne Gladson

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner Sonal Thakur, Assistant Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Committee Member McCormack opened the Administrative Session with a review of the minutes from the regular meeting of June 2, 2010. Changes and corrections were noted.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated just as an "FYI", the Planning Commission (PC) moved the Ridgeline project onto the City Council and they expected to have the project heard at the second City Council meeting in July.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there were signs going up around Orange Park Acres.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was interesting that there was nothing but support when it was brought to the Design Review Committee meeting.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated it took three PC meetings to hear it all.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a local paper that had an article about the nasty letters that Ridgeline was supposedly sending out complaining that the people who showed up to the Planning Commission meeting were "plants".

Committee Member Woollett stated he had a theory that when projects go to a public meeting, neighbors become suspicious and they believe that because it was going to a public meeting that someone was asking for something they should not have. It was a knee jerk reaction.

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

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Members Cathcart and Gladson were absent. Committee Member McCormack would chair the meeting.

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

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 2, 2010

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee meeting on June 2, 2010, with changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4474-10 – TRAILWOOD DEVELOPMENT SIGN PROGRAM

- A proposal to establish a sign program for a multi-tenant commercial building.
- 4045 W. Garden Grove Boulevard
- Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
- Item Continued from DRC Meeting of May 5, 2010
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Kevin Churnock, address on file, stated Ms. Thakur had hit it on the head. The front facades had always been the same, and even during the planning process the setbacks and everything were there and the intent at the tower level had been to have the signage above. The electrical had already been placed into the plane at those locations.

Public Comment

None.

Committee Member McCormack opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared that all of the comments of the sign program, typos, and so forth, were picked up. There was a minor problem on page 5, under maintenance of sign, about the 4th line down; it should read: be "painted" instead of "pane". Other than that, during the meeting they had attempted to find a way to have all the signs be on the same level, but reviewing what the applicant had brought back and understanding that the sign on Suite A would be very hard to get on the same level, it would be better to have the sign up on the tower so that there was not only one sign that was off, but to have the signs at different heights. Since the tower was not split-face block, as shown on the original drawings, it would not be such a problem for the applicant. Other than those minor things, he was perfectly happy with the project.

Committee Member Woollett stated on page 7, referring to the channel lettering and logo, and in that particular reference he understood that the logo would have an outside edge with an aluminum return and the middle would be a plastic face.

Mr. Churnock stated the sign itself would be plastic and the return would be a can-type, an irregular shape of the outline of the sign.

Committee Member Woollett asked how the different colors were applied?

Mr. Churnock stated it was an overlay product. The plastic was approximately ¼" thick with a film that covered the top of it.

Committee Member Woollett stated what led him to ask that was when he thought about channel, he saw channel, but in studying the sign and doing some research, what a channel was when there was a logo meant that the sides, however deep, followed the shape of the irregular logo. He stated the only thing that made it different from signs that were not allowed was that the sign had an irregular perimeter.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that they had often allowed logos that were different from the main sign.

Committee Member McCormack stated they had also allowed signs that came off the main face.

The Committee Members reviewed the proposed project and discussed the different details.

Mr. Churnock stated what he understood was that there would be a box with a channel and he pointed out the channeled areas on the drawings. The letters would sit off of the box.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was plastic placed on top of the box with other colored overlayed.

Mr. Churnock stated it was simple, but could get complicated.

Committee Member Woollett stated the sign made the meaning of channel letter and logo very clear.

Committee Member McCormack stated it should state appliqué channel letters.

Committee Member Woollett stated on the actual picture of the monument sign, it was 7-Eleven, and it was an existing sign. It was a big can sign. He asked if another sign, which he pointed to on the drawings, was an existing sign?

Mr. Churnock stated yes.

Ms. Thakur stated the only reason a can sign was allowed was due to it being a corporate sign.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC 4474-10, Trailwood Development Sign Program, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4444-09 - TUSKATELLA SIGN PROGRAM

- A proposal to establish a sign program that replaces an outdated sign program that exists for the center.
- Northwest corner of Katella and Tustin Street (1303 1549 E. Katella Avenue)
- Staff Contact: Chad Ortlieb, 714-744-7237, cortlieb@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Gene Long, address on file, presented a drawing of what they wanted to place on the building and it was what currently existed on the wall. He stated under the current sign code they would normally be allowed 1 square foot per lineal foot. Their client had a 114' wide store front so they would get 114 square feet. Figuring out the sign area by that method, the CVS store exceeded the allowable space and it had been that way for decades. If it went to 2 square feet per lineal foot, which they needed the variance for, they would be fine. He presented a sign which was proposed for CVS; they had added the words "open", and being a pharmacy it was important for CVS to let their clients know when they were open. What was very important for him was a change that would allow them to take care of their tenant. The applicant was asking to be allowed to accrue the sign area, basically outlined by a method he presented to the Committee.

Jill Anderson, applicant, address on file, stated what Mr. Long was presenting was different than what was in the DRC's materials.

Committee Member Wheeler stated what he understood was that the applicant wanted the calculation to be based on the count per individual sign elements instead of just the area around all the elements.

Mr. Ortlieb stated Staff had looked at that, and they had tried to review all the options. They could not find how they would be able to accommodate the applicant. In the example that was included in the Staff Report it would allow for Sign No. 1, CVS, and for Sign No. 2, for tenants that would be over 100 lineal feet. When it was calculated in that manner they were able to arrive at an acceptable number.

Mr. Long stated he had understood the calculations in the Staff Report, however, they had looked at it and looked at the new signage and felt they could do better. Looking at the City as an entirety, for decades the type of signage proposed had been around. He had asked Staff if they could review the code again, instead of looking at it every time they had a sign change in the shopping center. He presented what they wanted vs. what had been included in the Staff Report. Mr. Long stated it was something they needed in order to support their tenants. What the tenants were asking for now was not very different from what currently existed. Even under what the Staff Report recommended, the client could not replace what currently existed as the count for spacing would be different.

Ms. Anderson stated in fairness to Mr. Ortlieb he had not known that there was another option being submitted.

Mr. Ortlieb stated Staff worked on a more of a reactive basis for code changes. If City Council asked Staff to put their efforts into that, they would work on that. The code change option might not be an option that would be available to them. With regard to how the existing sign received its approval and how had other examples in the City occurred, that might be somewhat of a Pandora's Box. Staff had not gone down that road and was looking at the proposal purely from what the code currently dictated; the Staff Report reflected such.

Public Comment

None.

Committee Member McCormack opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he understood what Mr. Ortlieb was stating was that the City had codes that had essentially been in place for a long time.

Mr. Ortlieb stated the codes had been in place for a number of years.

Committee Member Woollett stated particularly the codes that related to size and area and a crucial point that was not new to the code. With the proposed location there was a case where a sign had not followed the code and there was not an explanation for that, and it would be a non-conforming use as it stood.

Mr. Ortlieb stated what had been permitted and installed would be non-conforming.

Committee Member Woollett asked if he was reviewing the report as an interpretation of the code to allow a little bit more freedom?

Mr. Ortlieb stated the freedom aspect under the code really extended best to tenants that had over 100 lineal feet, as in the first example, the code would allow it in drawing a box around everything, including the dead area in between as part of the sign area.

Committee Member Woollett stated the entire area could be theoretically filled with letters.

Mr. Ortlieb stated yes. The code stated that a box could be drawn around the sign area, taking the furthest points to calculate the sign area.

Committee Member McCormack stated in working with aesthetics and working with the sign code, in his previous other appointment to the Committee was to reduce clutter in signage features; he thought measuring each word or closed box or coffee cup would add a lot of clutter from his perspective.

Mr. Ortlieb stated it was a City-wide concern. Usually it was not a concern in a larger center with a consortium of tenants. What was applied to one center was applied to all centers in the

City equally. The concern was with a rogue tenant or property manager and it could get overlooked.

Committee Member Woollett stated theoretically the CVS sign could run all the way across the face as long as all of the wording was contained and it would comply.

Mr. Ortlieb stated also if there were two signs, they would be calculated separately.

Committee Member Wheeler, referring to the sign height on page 3 of the Staff Report, stated the sign program redefined the height as shown in the sign ordinance as the sign program wanted the height to be the distance from the top of the cornice to the first trim band below the cornice. The sign ordinance was clear to him as it stated the height shall not exceed the dimension of twothirds of the height of the vertical surface (plane) upon which it would be located. There were two problems he saw with that definition; first of all, the height shall extend from the top of the cornice to the bottom of the soffit, but in the case of the proposal and the drawings in the Staff Report it was interpreted that the soffit was the bottom of the horizontal trim band. The second problem was that he had not felt it was right to include the cornice as part of the sign height. The cornice was not a plane; a plane was a flat surface and once a huge projecting cornice was added a credit for that height should not be allowed in the overall height of the sign. Condition No. 6 attempted to solve the problem by stating that even if the height was considered in the whole distance, the sign could not be so big as to bump into the limits; it would need to be held back. That would be one solution for handling it; however, he had not thought that the definition ought to be included as it set a bad precedent. He stated they should be very clear that the sign ordinance stated a plane and his interpretation of the plane would be from the projecting element at the top and bottom, the flat surface.

Committee Member Wheeler continued, stating that on the next bullet item of the Staff Report he was not clear of the meaning: Required signs needed to be within 75% of the tenant's lease frontage and the sign must be centered either on the architectural element of tenants lease hold space, but there was not an "or".

Mr. Long stated "or the entry."

Committee Member Wheeler stated it could be the entry. On page 9 there was information regarding the centering of the wall signs and spoke to the definition and an illustration on page 10. It showed what he thought was Staff's interpretation of the height, but again he could not find anything with that interpretation in the Sign Program. He thought it was too vague and could be misunderstood. In the Staff Report on page 12, Condition No. 5, the second line read: In the event a tenant was co-branded, only one tag line sign may be permitted. He imagined that meant permitted per brand so that if there were two tenants there would be one tag line sign allowed per tenant. He asked if that was correct?

Mr. Ortlieb stated if there was, for example, El Pollo Loco and Foster Freeze, and all of a sudden they wanted a tag line that stated "Open 24 Hours", they would want to keep the tag lines limited; there would be only one tag line allowed to cover the two tenants.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the same Condition No. 5 regarding the Municipal Code sign area, as the sign area allowed for greater sign areas than the ordinance, would they want to include language to read "whichever was greater"?

Mr. Ortlieb affirmed that the condition intent was to require a sign's area to be encompassed within the "sign area" definition in the Municipal Code and to allow the total square feet of a majority of the center's signs to be calculated based upon a Variance that would allow greater area, if approved. The greater area would apply when applicable.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the same Condition No. 5, the fourth or fifth line from the bottom where Starbuck's was mentioned, he suggested stating something more generic such as a coffee shop or bank, rather than a name. On Condition No. 7, which spoke to sign height, it was not clear enough that the two-third height included ascenders and descenders. In Condition No. 6 it was clear in ascenders and descenders, but if they were using the City Code with the two-thirds had the City Code stated anything about ascenders and descenders?

Mr. Ortlieb stated the City Code had not and under strict interpretation of the Municipal Code the ascenders and descenders would be included in the two-thirds sign area based on the definition of the sign area.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could go with Condition No. 6 that had a specific provision or would they go with Condition No. 7. If they followed the Sign Program's definition of the height and limit the sign to the vertical plane it would be more of a hardship to the client.

Mr. Ortlieb stated they could go back to that after he finished his comments.

Committee Member Wheeler stated starting on page 2 of the sign program, the very end of the third column, he wondered if it wouldn't be better to have a little more detail on how repairs would be made when signs were removed. They had spoken about the issue previously and had placed conditions on projects where the repair would not be visible from ground level and he felt it should have a bit more detail on how well the signs would be repaired. On page 3, on the left hand column, under illumination, it stated internal LED illumination required within channel letters, and it went onto and exception that neon could be used with, and then it appeared that every single tenant in the shopping center would be exempted.

Ms. Anderson stated that was because there were existing tenants.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if they had existing signs that was fine, but would they not want to comply with LED signs if they replaced their signs? He felt there was not a reason to exempt those tenants if any new sign would need to meet the rules.

Mr. Long stated it was a legal issue, that the tenants had the legal right in their lease agreements and the reason that component was added. He dealt with a lot of chains and no one opted for neon anymore. Many of them would go to LED voluntarily.

Ms. Anderson stated she believed most of the tenants had changed out their signs. Almost all the tenant's spaces had their signs changed out, with the exception of Capri and some of the food tenants. They were all using LED. She stated they could check their lease agreements.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could change the requirement to LED, unless a lease agreement stated something contrary. They could add something regarding future lease agreements.

Ms. Anderson stated that was fine.

Mr. Long stated the sign requirement would be a part of a tenant's lease agreement.

Committee Member McCormack asked if it was the City of Orange's intent to phase out neon, as they had just approved neon signs recently?

Committee Member Wheeler stated that was in Old Towne.

Mr. Long stated decorative neon was encouraged in Old Towne.

Mr. Ortlieb stated Staff was not opposed to any one sign type or another; they reviewed signs based on the design. The statement might have been a remnant from a miscommunication to the applicant basically attempting to state what Committee Member Wheeler had brought up. He had understood that the shopping center would be phasing the neon signs out with replacements of LED signage.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 3, the last item: front-lit fixtures that competed with store front designs. He was not certain if there were any front-lit fixtures shown on the sign program.

Mr. Long stated it was prohibited. If there was neon art that just hung in the window that was what they wanted to discourage.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the signage colors, text styles and logos, there was an exception to reverse pan halo illuminated letters and he asked if there were any of those in the center?

Ms. Anderson stated they had not shown any of those in the proposal, but if a tenant wanted one of those they could. They were expensive, but had not wanted to eliminate the use of that sign type.

Mr. Long stated they were asking tenants to go with front illumination signage, but if they had an element to their sign that was reverse pan they had not wanted to restrict that. They wanted to allow a bit of creativity.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they had a history of asking that signage on one elevation be of one type or another, and he felt it made sense on a fairly homogenous building, such as an office or tower; but with the olio of different forms on the proposed project he felt it would not be a problem.

Ms. Anderson stated they had looked at other centers with variety and they looked very cool.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the same page of the Staff Report regarding the sign calculation and what he had spoken to previously, he felt the City Codes and requirements should be upheld. The whole sign should be based on the entire enclosed area, or if there were two signs one would be one rectangular area and the other another rectangular area as shown in the illustration. He felt an exception would set a bad precedent. On page 5, items B and C spoke to the UL label and stickers and he asked if they could be moved out of sight?

Mr. Ortlieb stated by code they needed to be visible.

Mr. Long stated they could be placed on the top, but UL had not liked that. He could contact Code Enforcement to verify where the stickers would be acceptable to be placed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on item R of the same page, it appeared to conflict with the detail shown on page 3, which had shown flush-mounted.

Mr. Long stated they would fix that. They could add the ½" spacers; it was a carry over from the original sign program. Normally with flush mounting to the wall there was a seal around the perimeter of the letter to avoid streaking, with the spacers there could be spider webs and there would be some streaking. It was more of an issue with rough stucco.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 1.1, regarding sign height, he had not agreed with the sign height definition.

Committee Member Woollett stated it appeared to him to be a matter of degree; in other words, if someone was reviewing the picture where would Committee Member Wheeler recommend the height be figured?

Committee Member Wheeler stated between the top of the trim band to the bottom of the trim band or bottom of the cornice above.

Committee Member Woollett asked what if the trim band was 1/8" thick?

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was room for interpretation and there was another sign program they would review that had a reveal and that was a different situation. With the proposed project that had fairly heavy elements, and he had a problem with the term soffit as he felt it was not a soffit. He had not felt the cornice width should be counted in the allowable sign height.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was concerned with unintended consequences; if in order to obtain a bigger or taller sign and leave that off, it could be an undesirable or unintended consequence in interpreting the rule, particularly if the area was small or very minor.

Committee Member Wheeler and Committee Member Woollett reviewed the drawings.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the intention of the sign ordinance was to allow a space to not have the sign bump into, visually, the constraints of the space. The plane needed to be defined, and if the two-thirds rule would be used, the sign could not be more than two-thirds the

height of the existing flat plane. If it was bigger than the two-thirds space, it visually bumped into the edges.

Mr. Ortlieb stated if Staff or if the DRC wanted to take a crack at it, it appeared that the parameters needed to be defined a little better. They tried to define the area with the two conditions that somewhat conflicted with each other, to give it some buffering. If the definition was to not include the bulk of the cornice and maybe go from the points between two degrees of architectural trim or maybe if they could add a diagram of the area the sign would be allowed in. The letter height of the proposed sign was already defined and possibly that could be shown in the diagram and how it complied with the two-third rule. There were a number of things that could show compliance and a good comprehensive theme.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would be pleased if there was something in the sign program that would make that clear, and on Condition No. 6 it was clear that no matter how big a sign was it could not come within a certain distance of the horizontal members, so it had not appeared to be squeezed in there and the intent would be to allow the applicant to have a large sign without the visual discomfort.

Committee Member Woollett asked what if it was a painted border, would that be the same.

Committee Member Wheeler stated not necessarily.

Committee Member McCormack stated it could be any change of the plane in color or form and he agreed that the cornice should be eliminated from the space.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 1.2, it was the same issue with the sign height. On page 1.3, it was the same issue with the sign height. On page 1.6, the page with the additional pad tenant and directional signage it was unclear about the materials and he felt the details of the materials needed to be added.

Mr. Long stated at this point in the proposal the signage was conceptual and they could add the details.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the monument sign the Staff Report spoke of stucco material for the exterior of the signs and he felt the signs should have the same smooth finish as the building structure.

Ms. Anderson stated they were only allowed to do certain things with the existing signs; they had tried to come up with a design using of rock. They had not figured out what the material would be. There were sprinkler problems and the water was rotting the bottom of the signage area and she had not known if stucco would work.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested the use of cultured stone, the same as was being used on the building.

Ms. Anderson stated there was no cultured stone, they were using CDI. It was quite thick and it would be trickier than it appeared to use on the monument signs. They could not specifically state what the material would be, they were still planning those. They had thought of the use of

aluminum and it was an option. She was not certain within the sign criteria what the limitations would be. They could come up with the materials and return to the DRC for an approval.

Mr. Long stated the aluminum would have double the life span and they could return with an actual material board.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the project would come back with a site plan that could solve the irrigation?

Ms. Anderson stated they would not be allowed to move the signs at all.

Mr. Ortlieb stated due to traffic and safety the signs would be modified within their existing locations.

Ms. Anderson stated they were also being held very close to what existed.

Mr. Ortlieb stated due to the code, due to the size and linear space of the buildings the code allowed the monument signs at the existing specifically spaced locations, there was a regular interval for the signs.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was not suggesting moving the signs; it was more of an irrigation/vegetation issue.

Ms. Anderson stated the signs had grass around them; there might be one at Del Taco that had plants around it.

Committee Member McCormack stated they could place some decomposed granite or crushed stone and to move the grass away from the signs. There were other options and they could use a plant that hugged the ground.

Committee Member Woollett stated the plaster should not be taken all the way down to the ground, it was not a building. If the stucco would not go all the way to the ground they would not have that problem.

Mr. Long stated if they had a situation where the stucco went that far they could seal it to a mow strip.

Committee Member Woollett stated as long as the mow strip was sloped away from the sign, it would drain away.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the applicants were comfortable with Staff's request that the Tuskatella Center and the address lettering be channel letters?

Mr. Long stated it could pose some technological issues. With a channel letter, the bare minimum width could be about an inch, which would be using LED. If he changed the font on Tuskatella that could work, but on the bottom it would be virtually impossible to change those to channel letters. They could be aluminum letters.

Committee Member McCormack asked how was it lit?

Mr. Long stated they were internally illuminated. The big difference was that instead of the whole background being lit only the copy would be lit, they had not finalized it, but had looked at one of the ways was to use a push through with a graphic on the front. There would be a white halo light around it and the letters could be opaque so they would not compete with the tenant copy. The larger letters could be channel. The address would need some lighting, which could be up-lighting.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the applicant would agree to a modification of Condition No. 3 and to stay with can letters for the Tuskatella and to use metal letters for the address?

Mr. Long agreed and he explained what the change would be to Ms. Anderson.

Ms. Anderson asked if they specified in the conditions channel letters could they use push-through letters?

Committee Member Wheeler stated the condition currently called for channel letters that could be modified.

Mr. Ortlieb stated there were a few options. If the applicant wanted to return in the future they could make those adjustments.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the monument sign design he suggested using cornice that matched the cornice on the shopping center buildings.

Ms. Anderson stated they had looked at that and had a few options.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the signs showed a convex form and the buildings had a concave form in some parts and they had some areas that had cymarecta. He suggested using a concave form or a Cyma recta, which was the in and out.

Ms. Anderson stated they had several drawings and they had not finalized that yet. They would be using something consistent. One of the problems they were running into was the material that it would be made from and how much design they could use and it would have a bearing on what that shape would be.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if they used a base he suggested using a trim bead that was similar to what was used on the building.

Mr. Long stated the design was actually their 21st version and what they called the legal version and it was not a finished product. They knew it would be better.

Committee Member Wheeler stated since there were so many concerns, he suggested they continue the item to allow the applicant to clear up some of the issues.

Ms. Anderson stated it would work for them.

Mr. Ortlieb stated there was a stop-gap measure when the DRC reviewed the remodel and there was a condition that tenants could come in with signs that were reflective of the corporate imagery that met the sign code and were confined to the box areas as provided for on the plan. They had been able to continue to accommodate a lot of the tenants with that provision. His fear was that they would have someone come in with the desire for a larger sign and they would be applying for a variance; and if that occurred during the continuance period it could present a potential delay. He was thinking about CVS and he was not certain if he had signed off Five Guys and the area of their sign could be problematic.

The Committee Members discussed the requested changes and suggestions. Committee Member Wheeler stated they would need to make the approvals clear with what conditions they were approving and changing. They would also be asking for a return to the DRC of the monument and directional signs.

Mr. Ortlieb stated that would kick the Sign Program into gear; they would need to figure out if Conditions No. 6 & 7 would be eliminated or a new condition re-created based on a blend of those, or had they wanted to go with Condition No. 7, they would need to have a definition of horizontal members that would be used as a frame.

Ms. Anderson asked if the directional signs were only limited to plastic and metal?

Committee Member Wheeler stated no, he was seeking a clarification of materials and that notation on the drawings. He handed Mr. Ortlieb a paragraph that could clarify the sign area.

Ms. Anderson stated the sign presented was a sample of what existed on site.

Mr. Long stated he could plug in specs for what was used.

Ms. Anderson stated they dealt with all the nationals and they all had their own ideas.

Mr. Ortlieb stated the paragraph that Committee Member Wheeler submitted needed some clarification of the cornice, as it stated top of the cornice. They could strike Condition No. 6 and add the parameters to Condition No. 7.

Committee Member Wheeler stated what he had liked about Condition No. 6 was it allowed a taller letter than the City Ordinance allowed. It also clarified ascenders and descenders.

Mr. Ortlieb stated Condition No. 6 went outside of what they could do with the sign code, but it would allow for accommodation to the applicant with taking the top of the cornice and the bottom of the horizontal member to allow for more area and to allow the ascending and descending letters to fall in there. If that language remained they would need to assume top of the cornice/bottom of the horizontal member in the two-thirds to allow for the projecting elements.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could drop Condition No. 6 and clarify Condition No. 7. That would follow the two-thirds rule.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4444-09, Tuskatella Sign Program, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following modifications:

- 1. The allowable sign areas be as shown in the example on page 8 of the Staff Report where one sign would be defined by the area of neatly enclosing the sign, the area of a possible second sign which might contain two elements would be defined by the area of a rectangle enclosing both those elements.
- 2. Condition No. 5 be modified to state that the area limitations of the Sign Program or the Orange Municipal Code set forth the sign area whichever shall be greater.
- 3. Condition No. 6 shall be removed.
- 4. Condition No. 7 be modified to define the sign height of the vertical surface from which the sign height shall be calculated to read: the height of a wall sign band shall be the vertical distance from the top of a projecting architectural element, such as a cornice or trim strip to the bottom of the next projecting architectural element above and the maximum sign height shall be two-thirds of the wall sign plane.
- 5. Condition No. 13 shall be removed.
- 6. Pad Tenant directional signage and monument sign shall be returned to the DRC for review to include materials and suggestions made.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson

(4) DRC No. 4457-09 – SPRINT WIRELESS FACILITY

- A proposal to replace six of the existing panel antennas on the highest arm with three panel antennas and three microwave dishes. One equipment cabinet would be constructed inside the existing wrought iron fence equipment enclosure and one GPS antenna would be attached to the outside of the new equipment cabinet.
- 3335 E. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Lisa Upton, address on file, stated she was available for questions.

Public Comment

None.

Committee Member McCormack opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the neighbors were aware of the tower?

Ms. Nguyen stated it was an existing tower and the application was for replacement of six existing panels. The project was noticed through the City's website and on the kiosk. There was not a notification mailing sent out.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated customarily the DRC actions were not posted or noticed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he drove by the site almost everyday in both directions for the last 35 years, and he was sorry to say that it was one of the biggest eyesores along that route and it appeared with the proposal that they would be making it worse. The existing antennas were 54" x 10' x 7' and the proposed would be a smaller height, wider, and thinner in depth which would add to the jumble with other rounded components being added. It was ugly and the change would make it worse. He asked if there was anything the applicant could do to change the appearance?

Ms. Upton stated it would be 51"not 54".

Committee Member Wheeler stated the proposal showed for all wiring to be completely concealed, but the existing tower's wiring was very visible.

Ms. Upton stated in the current installation there was not a manner in which to conceal the wiring through the actual arm to get it to go from the arm to the antennae. From within the internal main structure it would be fully enclosed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in reviewing the photographs to the drawings the photographs appeared to have the radial arms the same length as the antenna arms, but in the drawing it was a different picture; the radial arms were shown half as long as the antenna arms. The actual array was larger than shown in the plans and the elevations.

Ms. Upton stated one of the things that the monopole incorporated was the light pole standard arched arms, with the main purpose to appear more aesthetically pleasing. The intent for the modification was to create the least amount of visual impact with the additions.

Committee Member McCormack asked if it could be made to look more futuristic? His thoughts were to have it look more like a movie prop.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if they had proposed a pole on the same sight where no pole had existed that it would not need to be stealth even being close to the residential area.

Ms. Nguyen stated that was correct. It would go through a different process; Staff would require a CUP vs. the proposed project being a DRC "final determination".

Committee Member Woollett stated he viewed the pole almost everyday and the north end of the buildings that existed there were a mess. The equipment on the roof of the buildings was not screened and none of the wires were underground. It was not a pretty place. Committee Member Wheeler was probably more aware of the view from Chapman and the only thing that could make it better would be for the trees to grow up.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the design could be more symmetrical. Could the parabolic antennas be moved from the arms to the poles?

Ms. Upton stated the problem in moving the parabolic antennas was that they must remain in a line of sight; their purpose was to feed that particular sight and providing redundancy to the area. Moving those was more problematic for the area.

Committee Member Woollett stated they could be moved concentric to the disc and horizontally and it would not affect the line of sight.

Ms. Upton stated as long as they maintained the same plane they would be fine, but if they reduced the center line it would create problems. They would need to add additional verticality to hold up the center. The purpose was to reduce the amount of impact that the project created.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the parabolic antennas could move to the center of the arm that they were attached to?

Ms. Upton stated the reason for the particular bracket that was used, was there were particular azimuth that needed to be hit and sometimes the further over they were they hit the pole and could not maintain the azimuth. Quite often it also took in account the existing Sprint antennas that needed to meet their particular azimuth and line of sight.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if all the antennas at the site were Sprint?

Ms. Upton stated the highest area was all Sprint.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested to the applicant that they arrive at a more symmetrical arrangement of the antennas; they could be slightly moved to the center.

Ms. Upton stated it was an alternative she could explore. They could work with their engineers.

Committee Member McCormack stated generally the architects would not weigh in on what the engineers designed. He saw it as the potential for a big globe with prismatic fly-type eye nodules on it would be interesting. He almost could not comment on it; they would almost need to start back at square one to have it be more architecturally organized. He suggested that if the antenna components were organized in some sort of pattern that would be interesting.

Ms. Upton stated the engineers worked with them a lot and they understood the constraints and that there was a desire to blend in with the community and to make them happy.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt the addition would make the site worse, making it more cluttered. The more they could organize the less cluttered it would be.

Ms. Upton stated she was concerned with the ability to do that based on the azimuth that was being achieved with the particular array at the site. If the microwave was moved to the middle it had to be tilted enough to hit the mark. She would definitely commit to having the engineers look at it, it was just unfortunately to maintain what was needed there and with the azimuth needed she was not certain how much flexibility there was. They were a back call center and where the dishes were located if they were moved it would throw off five other sites. Each change of a microwave affected not only the site it was on, but other sites as well.

Committee Member Woollett stated the site was projecting a fair distance away. It was a parabolic shape.

Ms. Upton stated it could be projecting at the next cell site; it could be 40' away or 15 miles away.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the Committee would be comfortable approving the proposal with the condition that every effort would be made.

Committee Member Woollett stated no, because every effort could be convenience.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to continue DRC No. 4457-09, Sprint Wireless Facility, to allow the applicant to study a design that was more internally consistent with symmetrical antenna placement and to study Condition No. 3 for wire concealment.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson

(5) DRC No. 4461-09 – AYRES INN REMODEL LANDSCAPE PLAN

- The remodel was conditionally approved by the DRC on April 7, 2010, with the requirement that the applicant return to the DRC with the final landscape plans.
- 3737 W. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Bruce Ayres, address on file, stated he believed they had taken care of all the DRC suggestions and recommendations; they had changed to the Texas Privet instead of the ivy and added the tree to the pool area. There was an issue with the curb depth that had been resolved and the calling-out of the pool deck material.

Public Comment

None.

Committee Member McCormack opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had reviewed everything that they had done. He asked if the Palm trees were existing?

Mr. Ayres stated yes, they were. There were a few of them.

Committee Member McCormack asked if all the issues with the changing room had been taken care of?

Ms. Nguyen stated there was a pool equipment room that had no door and that had been taken care of with the previous approval.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had no problems with what had been done and the applicant had done everything that had been asked of him by the DRC. On the colored concrete with a broom finish, typically the only time a broom finish was used was on a curb and gutter. The only time he saw a broom finish on a pool deck was if the broom finish was brushed in alternate patterns.

Mr. Ayres stated he thought they would use a smooth finish with a salt application; he had not caught the broom finish. They would make it nice.

Committee Member McCormack stated a broom finish had been used at Downtown Disney with a colored walkway and they alternated the light broom finish. They might want to take a look at that example. The only problem with a broom finish was that if you had five different brooms with five different broom handlers it would all look a mess. When he saw a broom finish it was

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for June 16, 2010 Page 20 of 25

generally used for curb and gutter. He suggested using a Top Cast finish; it worked well for pool decks.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4461-09, Ayres Inn Remodel Landscape Plan, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report. With the suggestion that the applicant review choices for the concrete finish of the pool deck.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson

(6) DRC No. 4477-10 – 4000 METROPOLITAN DRIVE SIGN PROGRAM

- A proposal to create a sign program to change out the monument sign, add directional signage on Metropolitan Drive, and wall signs on the south and east elevations.
- 4000 Metropolitan Drive
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Garrick Batt, stated every single sign was compliant with code and conventional and not the least bit controversial.

Public Comment

Gus Navarro, address on file, stated he was present on behalf of ITT to be present for the project presentation and to ensure that ITT's interests were represented.

Committee Member McCormack opened the hearing to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated the proposal was very conventional and the type of signage one would expect on that type of building. On the eyebrow signs of the east elevation, it stated 2" sealed cell foam with painted black faces and returns; it was a very large sign at 30' long and 18" high, and the attachment was silicone and aggressive double-sided tape. He wasn't certain how that would work on a concrete wall.

Mr. Batt stated the tape would only be used for the first 24-hours until the silicone set. It was a temporary holder until the silicone was set.

Committee Member Woollett asked what would protect the painted black foam from being pecked at by birds?

Mr. Batt stated about 15 years ago they changed the cell components of the foam and it tasted very bad; it had affected bird nesting and such.

Committee Member Woollett asked what was the black coating?

Mr. Batt stated it was just a paint coat, it was very smooth. The surface would have the same texture as a dishwashing sponge would have, not a porous sponge, but a sponge that was used to clean pots and pans and such. It had a very smooth finish, there were microscopic holes.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the black was an acrylic or vinyl?

Mr. Batt stated it was paint. It was not acrylic, as acrylic actually ate foam. It was a latex semi gloss paint. Visually looking at the eyebrow sign it would look almost metallic and the

microscopic holes would be filled in. The durability was 10 to 12 years, with absolutely no degradation. Most tenants were 10-12 years in a location.

Committee Member Woollett asked whatever happened to glass foam?

Mr. Batt stated he started in the business about 20 years ago and he had seen it but it was not used much. He had not seen it in the last 15 years. The foam was a standard in the industry. The core material was black, it also came in white. There was an orange color which was 2% of what was used in the United States. If you wanted a color you would start with a white material.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the letters were cut out of a 2" block of material?

Mr. Batt stated it came in a sheet 10' x 4' wide. It was cut with a router.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was a backer to the address sign?

Mr. Batt stated he had brought in an example of the sign. It was a different color scheme but the same general concept; he presented the example to the Committee Members. There was a backing behind the channel letters, cut out to the shape of the letter. The LED light projected out from behind the channel letters and lit the backing, which created a glow. It is the up and coming look for a monument sign; it was very progressive and classy. Since the monument sign was recessed from the street the sign would make the building standout.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was backlit and when you came from behind the sign the letters would be backwards.

Mr. Batt stated when coming from behind you would be going to your car. The form cut letter behind would make the letters perfectly clear to what they were. If there was a block behind it the letters would not be distinct. It was a nice piece and would add to the monument sign.

Ms. Nguyen asked if the channel letter with a backing had a specific name.

Mr. Batt stated it was a "reverse halo letter". He had not heard it called anything other than that and it was an upcoming way of handling things. It was better than just chucking light against the wall. It had a lot of class and the building had good tenants coming in and it was a positive step for the building.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 3 of the staff report, in the first section where there were notes, there was a reference to a block canister and he could not remember what a block canister was.

Mr. Batt stated they were speaking of a unitized canister; the canister would follow the shape of the word or logo and not an outside frame.

Ms. Nguyen stated the canister would follow the letters of the sign and not be a rectangular form. Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 4 of the Sign Program he wondered if they should not have a little more information on the repair of holes when the signs were removed.

Mr. Batt stated that was generally left up to the property manager and they could add something if that was the wish of the DRC.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would be nice if they had something there that could be added. He asked for clarification on page 7 regarding removal of ground-mounted lights?

Mr. Batt stated the ground-mounted lights would not be necessary as the light would come from the sign. The tenant signage would also be all white letters with no colors.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested page 9 of the Sign Program the base of the directional sign could be thinner so the top portion of the sign would stand out more.

Mr. Batt stated he could take that information back for approvals.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 15 in regard to the eyebrow foam, third paragraph, remove "type of illumination"; page 16 for the sign locations on the east elevation there were to be no more than two eyebrow signs total, with none on the south elevation so the text "per elevation" should be removed; page 18, nothing; page 19 first line make "sign" plural to read "signs"; and page 22 to remove the note referring to multiple signs since there was only one sign on that referenced elevation. He asked for information on page 24 as to whether the channel letter supports or wires could be installed through the reveal?

Mr. Batt stated the 2 ½' to 3' tall parapet did not start at the reveal; the tenant's ceiling is above the reveal, therefore the sign infrastructure would be visible inside the tenant space if installed at the reveal.

Committee Member Wheeler stated for the flat sign on the building front, he suggested moving it over to line up with the fenestrations of the building.

Mr. Batt stated the sign could be moved over 10' or 20' to be consistent.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it could be moved to be centered between the window and the reveal.

Mr. Batt stated with the sign that was at the top of the building having the sign centered made it easier to read.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4477-10, 4000 Metropolitan Drive Sign Program, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following condition:

1. Minor corrections to text.

And with the following suggestions:

- 1. Change base depth of directional signs.
- 2. Relocate sign at the building top to either right or left justify the sign, and with the change of height in fenestration.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Meeting on Wednesday, July 7, 2010.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson

MOTION CARRIED.

The meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.