CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

December 7, 2011

Committee Members Present: Bill Cathcart

Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Robert Garcia, Associate Planner

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session - 5:00 P.M.

Chair Cathcart opened the Administrative Session at 5:15 p.m.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of November 16, 2011. Corrections and changes were noted.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there would not be a DRC meeting on December 21, 2011. The next meeting was planned for January 4, 2012. The Agenda for that meeting would be out before the holiday break. City Hall would be closed from December 22, 2011 through January 2, 2012, between Christmas and New Years.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session of the Design Review Committee Meeting.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members were present and there was one open seat on the Design Review Committee.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

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.

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 16, 2011

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting of November 16, 2011 with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4502-10 - VASQUEZ RESIDENCE

- A proposal to develop a vacant lot with a two-story single-family residence and accessory second unit.
- Easterly lot (APN 094-402-45) adjacent to 503 South Prospect
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Continued from DRC Meeting of September 1, 2010
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review

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

Mr. Ryan reviewed the FAR and dimensions of the project with the Committee Members.

Applicant, Aaron Johannsen, address on file, stated there was a suggestion made of possibly reducing the FAR by removing the enclosed garage of the accessory residence and that would bring it down .04 with a FAR of approximately .47. He stated he would want to explore based on the information Mr. Ryan had provided on the surrounding residences. He asked the Committee Members what they felt was appropriate for a final FAR on the project? He asked if there was a number that he should be attempting to achieve? With respect to the elevations, there were some varying styles with different window types being found on the Irving Gill house, particularly on the side elevations. There were screened openings vs. shutter openings and there was more than one type. He may have gone too far with that and the design could be simplified. With respect to the roof, everything on the project was gable; they varied in height and that was partially due to the set back of the upper floors and also the plate line changes. The only roof on the proposed project that was different was the roof of the tower element, which actually was inspired from a project that Mr. Ryan had referred him to, The Las Flores Apartments. He presented photos to the Committee Members and reviewed the different elements that he had taken from the photos for his project.

Public Comment

John Elliott, address on file, stated he lived in the adjacent property to the proposed project. He had lived there for 16 years and was a resident of Orange for 21 years. He had no experience in land management, engineering, or construction, but in his mind's eye the lot was very small especially in accommodating the residence that had been brought before the Design Review Committee. He was concerned that the proposed project would impact his privacy. It was a single family residence neighborhood and the lot for the new project was very small and he would not want something that was too big built there.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he remembered the project and they had wrestled with it before. They needed to remind themselves that there was a limit and sometimes a developer came along and they would want to get as close to the limit in order to get the most for their money. The proposed project was in an established neighborhood and there was only the one lot left. There was also a very remarkable building next door that needed to be protected, and it was a resource to the community. There were rules related to in-fill developments. It appeared to him that besides the architectural issues, the building was an improvement to what had been there. They had to deal with the FAR and be down around .25, maybe .30 to be appropriate for the community.

Committee Member Wheeler asked the applicant how he had arrived at the FAR calculation?

Mr. Johannsen stated it was taken per the current building code.

Committee Member Wheeler asked how had he determined how big the building would be?

Committee Member Woollett asked if it was based on the inside of the rooms or on the outside walls?

Mr. Johannsen stated the instructions in the City's documentation called for removal of exterior walls and interior walls from the calculations.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was his understanding that the calculation was made from the exterior of the building and in calculating the FAR in that manner he had arrived at a larger calculation than what was being presented on the proposed project. In measuring to the exterior face of stud, which he believed the applicant was required to do, he arrived at 711 square feet for the accessory unit, which was in excess of the 640 square foot limit.

Mr. Johannsen stated he would check back on the information that the City had provided to him. He was fairly certain that it was underlined to exclude all interior walls, which would not be a typical way to calculate square footage.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had never run into that method of calculating FAR, and he asked Staff if they were aware of where that had come from?

Mr. Ryan stated no.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was his understanding that calculating the FAR was done by using the exterior face of studs.

Committee Member Woollett stated what occurred inside the building was irrelevant; the outside perimeter of the building should be used.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he played around with the calculation on the other buildings and it would be quite a bit larger than what had been presented. In using the exterior face of studs to measure it would require the accessory unit to be reduced, and reduction of the overall FAR.

Mr. Johannsen stated he had calculated the FAR per the City's instructions.

Committee Member Wheeler asked the applicant if he would bring in a copy of those instructions.

Chair Cathcart asked Staff if they would find out where Mr. Johannsen had received his information.

Mr. Johannsen stated it was located in the application document instructions.

Committee Member Wheeler stated as far as the design issues were concerned, he was not as concerned as Mr. Ryan on the style issues. He thought the applicant had done quite a good job on the majority of the project in addressing the issues that had been previously discussed, such as cutting down the roof pitches and simplifying the project. There had been quite a few of the elements picked up from the Gill House. There were a few things overdone; there were all sorts of gable vents, and on the Gill residence there had been only one that was a tile vent. There were window treatments that were very good, but there were different wrought iron styles that could be simplified. The tower element could be simplified and there was a band that appeared arbitrary. The idea of a California version of Spanish Colonial Revival was simple solid planes of stucco. In looking at the work of Wallace Neff and George Washington Smith in the 1920's and 1930's they used large planes without the need for windows. A nice wall was a beautiful thing that would not need to be decorated. He suggested reducing the decoration and having fewer forms. Another thing that was important was in using wood post to support a stucco element; the stucco element that was "the heavy" would not have been supported by a wood column. Visually, a wooden column to support stucco that suggested masonry had not worked for him. The applicant could argue that there was a balcony on the Gill house that had such an element; his understanding was that there had been two major renovations on that home and the wood column might not be part of the original home. He strongly suggested that the use of wood columns to support a "masonry" element not be used. He had not found the need for the outlookers underneath the balcony. The reason for the out-lookers would go away if there was not a cantilevered balcony and thus would be an unnecessary affectation. There was one window at the top of the hallway leading to the second floor that had not matched the elevation. In going back to the FAR calculation, he was confused as to how the FAR was arrived at. It appeared that there were divided open space areas of 5,447 square feet and he could not find where that had come from. The .56 number that was on the drawings had appeared to have been arrived at by dividing the 5,447 square feet of open space by the 9,800 square feet of the lot area. That would not provide the FAR ratio, but the open space ratio. Committee Member Wheeler stated it was to the applicant's disadvantage, as in using the applicant's calculations with his measurements, he had come up with a FAR of 50.5, which was close to the recommended FAR of 51. He was confused as to where the numbers came from. The applicant's drawings showed .56 and the Staff Report showed .51.

Mr. Ryan stated it could be the difference for the balconies.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not included the balconies and they would need to review the numbers and determine what the real sizes were. He asked if there was a requirement for useable open space?

Mr. Ryan stated the requirement was that the useable open space be accessible to the main structure and the accessory unit.

Committee Member Wheeler stated when the project returned there would need to be the notation for the useable open space and what areas were being considered for that component.

Chair Cathcart asked Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, if she had located the directions for calculating FAR?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated in the application there were very specific directions for the requirements. There was a section for FAR on accessory units that the gross floor area limit was 640 square feet and that was using the exterior wall dimensions. In the past, applicants had asked why they could not just calculate the bedroom square footage and add the numbers in that manner, but in order to be consistent the perimeter was used to calculate the FAR. It was also the same for a residential primary unit. The Application Packet had noted that the interior walls were not to be used to calculate square footage.

Committee Member Woollett stated it could be a different interpretation of those directions and that was what the applicant had been referring to.

Mr. Johannsen stated he had interpreted it in that manner.

Committee Member McCormack stated he mirrored the comments made by Committee Member Wheeler and he had a few comments on the site plan. He also agreed with the comment regarding a wood column holding up a heavier material. He asked if there was a code requirement for the driveway width, as he had measured 12'?

Mr. Ryan stated 12' was the minimum. Typically, the only time that varied would be when there was a fire code or sprinkler requirement.

Committee Member McCormack asked why a City tree was being removed; it was at the front of the property? The Committee Members and Staff reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that might be an error and pointed to a tree that he thought would need to be removed due to the placement of the driveway.

Committee Member McCormack stated the plans actually called for three trees to be removed.

Mr. Johannsen stated the tree in the middle could remain in place.

Committee Member McCormack stated he also wondered where the useable open space would be and the only place he could locate that would be in the far back corner, and he was not certain how useable that would be. With a small lot, the bulk and mass of the project would be high.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the patio might also be used for useable open space. The possibility of removing one garage and having a two-car covered and one-car open, which was the minimum requirement, would help with reducing the mass. It was difficult to place a number on the FAR.

Mr. Ryan stated on other projects it had come down to how much of the mass was on the second floor. There could be a single story structure with a greater lot coverage; the second floor was where the massing would come from and it would be a trade-off whether to reduce the massing by just taking a percentage from the second floor or reducing both floors and to have the open space closer to the units and to be more defined. Those were some of the issues.

Chair Cathcart stated his concern was the FAR, and he would want that to be closer to 30; and that the architecture should be simplified.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the lots in the neighborhood were smaller?

Mr. Ryan stated the lots in the neighborhood were quite a bit smaller.

Committee Member Woollett stated it would seem that of all things that the project site would be the wrong place to push a second unit onto. Since the unit was in the back that would be a better place for it, as there was the bulk and mass issue that should not be visible from the street. He believed that the FAR needed to be much lower.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the thing that would work in favor of the FAR on the project would be the different roof and wall planes and the structure would not appear as big as it was and the proposed project was very well articulated. The accessory second unit had a nice look down the driveway to it. It would need to be smaller, but not a huge drastic change. He was thinking closer to .35, but it was difficult to decide without the correct calculations.

Mr. Johannsen stated on the original design the garages had been at the front of the property and the suggestion had been made to move the garages inside; what that had meant was that whatever happened to the building it would be reduced in width and increase the massing. The massing would be moved into a smaller area.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the current design was a better solution and it would have more of a courtyard feel to it. He suggested exploring eliminating one of the 2-car garages.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the driveway could be considered as part of the useable open space, and it would not necessarily need to be turf block.

Mr. Ryan stated many times turf block was used for parking a car in an area outside of the established parking or driveway areas.

Chair Cathcart stated they had provided suggestions and confirmed with the applicant that he had sufficient information.

The item was presented for preliminary review and no action was needed on the item.

(3) DRC No. 4591-11 – PLAZA 149 CAFÉ

- A proposal for a new wall sign for Plaza 149 Café (formerly Henry's Grill).
- 149 N. Glassell Street, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Continued from DRC Meeting of November 16, 2011
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself from the item due to the location of the proposed project.

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

Applicant, Sammy Medali, address on file, stated he was okay to accept it. At night it was very dark and too difficult to see.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated the size of the sign was fine. The issue was the use of plastic and vinyl. Plexi glass was plastic. He had a discussion with the applicant, who was willing to replace the plastic and vinyl with aluminum and paint on the sign surface. The other issue would be the letter lighting. The Standards stated that there shall be no illuminated lighting and that included individual mounted letters and cabinet signs. The Standards also stated that external illumination shall be with incandescent lights. The lighting as proposed would not be permitted. The Standards also stated wall-projecting signs shall be illuminated from visually concealed sources or approved ornamental exposed incandescent fixtures. That was what the Standards stated and the Standards should be adhered to and it was also a part of the required findings. Since the applicant had agreed with the OTPA, to not utilize any plastic, vinyl, or plexi glass, that would leave only the lighting as an issue.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had a few questions. He had understood that all of the lettering on the sign was push-through, with an aluminum face with plastic pushed through for the lettering.

Committee Member McCormack stated the gray face was aluminum with plexi glass behind that and what shown through was the outline outside of the blue.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had not believed that to be the case. The blue plastic would be pushed through the letter and number cut-outs with the light coming through the blue plastic.

Mr. Ryan stated the blue was a vinyl overlay over the plexi glass that was clear and pushed through.

Committee Member McCormack stated he thought there was a gap which would provide for a hallo affect with the light shining through.

The Committee Members reviewed the design with the applicant and Staff to clarify how the components and materials were incorporated into the sign.

Mr. Ryan stated the sign was, in a sense, back-lit as the light bounced off the solid blue vinyl. There was LED inside the cabinet.

Committee Member McCormack stated he wanted to discuss neon and what Mr. Frankel had mentioned about the light source. He understood why LED was used, but he also understood why incandescent was the choice for lighting in Old Towne. He would mirror what Mr. Frankel had read from the Standards as the way to go for the site, whether it be aluminum incandescent or neon.

Committee Member Woollett stated he believed incandescent lighting was a totally different issue because the incandescent lighting would not be associated with the sign or either would the fluorescent lighting. The lighting that was being discussed was not related to the sign as the lighting was on the building.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was not speaking to that lighting, but the light source for the sign, which was LED. Mr. Frankel had stated that the sign should be metal with incandescent lighting.

Committee Member Woollett clarified that he understood no signs in Old Towne were able to have internal lighting.

Mr. Ryan stated that was correct and it had been managed in two ways. The letters would be channel letters with a light behind the sign with the light source not visible, with the main cabinet having no internal lighting or it was lit through exposed neon. The other issue was that the new energy standards had to be taken into consideration and also new technology from the manufacturers was having to be considered. At Bagel Me the gooseneck light fixtures needed a special bulb that would need to be retrofitted to meet the energy standards and could no longer be incandescent. They were attempting to meld everything together, but also there were ordinances in place that needed consideration. As an option he suggested the use of neon, as it would work well to provide lighting and there would be the contrast with the aluminum. There would be a few ways to apply neon to the proposed sign. There were two issues with the sign, one was the sign was a bit contemporary with some of the details.

Committee Member McCormack stated Mr. Ryan was referring to the word "Plaza" being stretched out and the word "Café" that were too contemporary.

Mr. Ryan stated there were a few things, including the shape of the sign and the lettering appeared as a very modern sign. He had not objected to the cursive writing, that was a readability thing.

Chair Cathcart stated years ago the idea for blade signs was to have some fun with them and to have them be different.

Mr. Ryan stated signs were historically referenced.

Chair Cathcart stated each sign was different.

Committee Member McCormack stated the sign was different and he had not had an issue with the numbers 149, but the stretched-out font on the lettering could be changed. He thought neon would be the way to go.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was not the DRC's job to design the sign.

Chair Cathcart stated they were just providing suggestions.

Committee Member Woollett stated The Bruery had back lighting.

Committee Member Woollett stated the sign could be done just as proposed with a light shining on it and that would meet the ordinance.

Mr. Ryan stated neon would also get them there.

Committee Member Woollett stated neon would have a whole different character. His concern was that they were asking anyone who put a sign in Old Towne to have it appear as if it was from 1932.

Mr. Ryan stated there could not be internal illumination on the sign; there could be lamps such as small goosenecks that could shine onto it.

Committee Member Woollett asked if there was a light that was directed toward the sign would it need to be incandescent?

Mr. Ryan stated there would be a problem with the Building Division and the energy codes and there would be requirements for modification to the light source.

Chair Cathcart stated they could change the font and apply other materials.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was not certain they needed to change the font at all.

Chair Cathcart stated they were providing some suggestions and if the applicant came back with changes that would meet the requirements and neon would be nice. Another thing that bothered him were the words "good food, good times"; they were far apart and if they were both at the top it would be more visible. It was a small thing.

Committee Member Woollett asked the applicant if he had designed the sign?

Mr. Medali stated someone had designed it for him.

Committee Member McCormack asked how was the font chosen?

Mr. Medali stated the font was from the new signature font from the International House of Pancakes and he used it because he had an IHOP too.

Committee Member Woollett asked what type of food would the restaurant serve?

Mr. Medali stated American and Mediterranean. He had the sign designed and had spoken with a lot of people to get their opinion. He spoke with engineering and the City and everyone liked it. The Henry's sign had been old and when he asked people about the new design, and it was also on Facebook, everyone liked it. He designed if for the people and wanted to keep everyone happy.

Committee Member Woollett stated they wanted to provide clear direction and be as sensitive as they could with the image that the applicant wanted to provide for his restaurant without violating the historic code.

Chair Cathcart stated neon met the requirement.

Mr. Medali stated the sign guy was the same person who had designed the sign for Haven and the Blue Frog, same design and same materials.

Committee Member McCormack stated Haven was neon and he would recommend neon. The sign needed to be easily read from far away and he suggested the spacing on the letters could be changed a bit to make the sign readable.

Committee Member Woollett stated they wanted the business to be successful.

The item was presented for preliminary review and no action was needed on the item.

New Agenda Items:

(4) DRC No. 4567-11 – PLAZA BIBLE CHURCH

- A proposal for a new façade, signage, and parking lot improvements for a non-contributing commercial building.
- 240 W. Chapman Avenue, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Preliminary DRC Review on November 16, 2011
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself from the item's presentation, as he was the architect on a portion of the project.

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

Applicants, Wes Hays and Mark Lebsack, addresses on file, were present for questions.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett asked what the material for the screen mesh was like?

Mr. Lebsack stated there were different materials, sheet metal with holes in it or fabric with holes.

Mr. Ryan stated his understanding was that the material for the project would be metal with small holes, although it appeared solid.

Committee Member Woollett stated it appeared solid with the tubular fence in front of it.

Committee Member McCormack asked if it was a circular hole or a punched-out square?

Mr. Lebsack stated the holes would be punched-out circles about the diameter of a ball point pen. Mr. Hays went to his truck to get a sample of the screen.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the fence and screen would be painted black?

Mr. Hays stated yes, it would be black.

Committee Member Woollett stated it would be a solid black enclosure with the texture of the tubular steel in front of it and with the sheet metal being attached to the fence.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was fine with the screen mesh proposal. He suggested in the planting areas to plant a tree for shade and to create a visual affect. He pointed out where trees could be planted on the drawings. Trees would be a nice addition and he suggested using a tree that would cast shade to break up the parking lot. The planting areas were large enough to accept trees.

Mr. Hays stated on one of the areas Committee Member McCormack was pointing out it was a thoroughfare where pedestrians would walk through.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a wall there and there could be a smaller tree planted behind the wall and it would not obstruct the walkway.

Mr. Lebsack presented a sample of the screen mesh. The Committee Members reviewed the sample. Mr. Lebsack stated the other alternative would be to use the cloth mesh that would be zip tied to the fence.

Chair Cathcart stated he had not liked the cloth mesh as it would sag after time and not look as nice as the metal mesh.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the pipes on the wall were being removed?

Mr. Lebsack stated they were being moved to the building. He presented a photo of building and where the pipes had been moved to. He stated the Edison Company would be removing the power pole when they moved the service to the building. There would be a sheet metal cover painted to match the building and that would obscure the pipes.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4567-11, Plaza Bible Church, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report, with the additional condition to add three trees to be provided in the planting areas as sketched out on the plans and he would suggest a certain plant, tree of Platanus acerifolia. Chair Cathcart stated Columbia. Mr. Ryan asked for the common name. Committee Member McCormack stated London plane tree. Mr. Ryan asked "all the same tree?" Committee Member McCormack stated "all the same tree."

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

RECUSED: Craig Wheeler

MOTION CARRIED.

(5) DRC No. 4590-11 - SPORTS AUTHORITY FACADE REMODEL

- A proposal for exterior façade remodel of an existing building at The Outlets at Orange.
- 20 City Boulevard West
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Jesse Macias, address on file, stated he was excited to be a part of the project and to be at The Block of Orange. One of the things that they had noticed and Mr. Garcia had pointed out was that the rendering was not as accurate as the working drawings. The existing awnings at the former Puma store were actually lower and the glazing was lower, and that would remain. The canopies would be re-faced and the heights would remain the same as they currently existed.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the datum lines were the same on both store fronts?

Mr. Macias stated no. The bottom of the existing canopies at the former Borders store was 14' and the bottom at the former Puma store was 11'.

Mr. Garcia stated the plans that were provided to the Committee Members indicated that the height was the same at 14' across both store fronts.

Mr. Macias stated that was the only clarification he wanted to bring to the attention of the Committee Members.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a discrepancy between the elevation and the floor plan on the west side. On the floor plan the entrance appeared to be narrowed and that was not shown on the floor plans. There was a blank space of wall on the right of the entrance to remain, and there were two pilasters that were noted as to remain, however, the rendering had not shown the 2nd pilaster or the blank wall.

Mr. Macias stated Committee Member Wheeler was correct and he pointed to a drawing that showed what the store front would look like. There would be a blank space and actually three pilasters. There was an existing canopy and the store front and canopy were being removed. They would be matching the checkered pattern that existed on the other side.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested the applicant check the dimensions as there was no allowance for a jam on a window that he pointed to on the plans. The Sports Authority sign appeared to be a bit different.

Applicant, Joey Clark, address on file, presented a drawing of what the proposed sign would look like.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they were just pasting the red material onto the sign and asked if the reveal would be flat?

Ms. Clark stated it would go all the way to the cornice and the sign would fit into the space.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the red came in or out from the wall plane?

Mr. Macias stated it would be flush. The existing parapet cornice would remain and the red would be flush and go to the bottom of the lip, which he pointed to on the plans.

The Committee Members reviewed the sign and the placement of the sign.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared to be a difficult joint to work out, in an area they were discussing on the drawings. He asked if they could break up the joint and bring the return out a bit further?

Mr. Macias stated they would be cutting in at the existing pilaster.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would just die in as the canopy had not gone all the way to the face.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could also have some sort of a reveal at the red panel and that would help to break the joint a bit and the metal would not light up the stucco.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they would need to pull off all of the canopies.

Ms. Casey stated yes.

Mr. Macias stated the canopies were only aesthetic.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4590-11, Sports Authority Façade Remodel, subject to the conditions and findings in the Staff Report, with the additional condition that the red façade of the signage be constructed with a reveal on each side where it meets the east finish of the building, just something to break the joint.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on January 4, 2012.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.