# CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

February 17, 2010

Committee Members Present: Bill Cathcart

Tim McCormack Adrienne Gladson 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 with a review of the Agenda.

Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager, stated there were no changes or additions to the Agenda. She stated regarding Policy and Procedural Information; in the past the roll call had been taken as indicating who was present and who was absent. She asked Chair Cathcart if he wanted the roll call procedure to remain as it was, or if he wanted a person-by-person roll call?

Chair Cathcart stated the roll call procedure could remain as it had been.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes and noted corrections and changes.

There was no further discussion.

Chair Cathcart made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

### **ROLL CALL:**

All Committee Members were present.

#### **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**: February 3, 2010

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee Meeting of February 3, 2010, with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Adrienne Gladson

ABSENT: None

#### **AGENDA ITEMS:**

Continued Items: None

New Agenda Items:

### (2) DRC No. 4370-08 – THE BLOCK AT ORANGE

- A proposal to expand The Block, consisting of 105,000 sq. ft. of retail in two phases.
- 20 The City Drive
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, <a href="mailto:rgarcia@cityoforange.org">rgarcia@cityoforange.org</a>
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review

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

Applicant, Ken McKently, address on file, stated as Mr. Garcia had described they would be adding another small wing to the side of the project that would project out to the east. The proposal was for a maximum of 105,000 square feet comprised of four buildings. It would extend through the central cross section across from the theater toward the east. The Promenade that acted as a spine of the new project would continue with paving toward City Drive. On each side there were two proposed buildings and it was perceived that they would be for two major tenants, single-use buildings. The two additional buildings would be multiple tenant buildings. It was intended for retail and there was a proposed restaurant use; there was not a tenant for that site yet. The discussion about phasing was a bit unclear. It was intended that the first phase would include the 35,000 square foot major tenant space and not the other three buildings. The project would be returning once they got through the SRC process. He was speculating that the existing parking would remain in the front area and the front lawn would include the new 35,000 square foot building. They were presenting the entire concept in order to present what the intent of the space would be. Regarding elevations, the proposal attempted to keep the colors, scale, and materials in the same family as what existed on site. There were tower elements that would draw people in and there were paseos to augment the main spine.

#### **Public Comment**

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item for discussion by the Committee.

Committee Member Woollett stated currently there was an important visual element which was the tall aluminum-looking towers. There were two of them at the existing entrance and he had not seen an indication whether those would be removed or if they would be placed in another area.

Mr. McKently stated there was only one that was shown on the plans that would remain; he pointed it out on the drawings.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had noted that there were two on the plans and pointed to them on the drawings.

Mr. McKently stated the idea was that the area would be scraped and they would go away. The intention was that one of the towers would be relocated at an entry axis. In reviewing the drawings he realized there were two and he stated that one would be relocated as well. The promenade with the pylons was gone from that area.

Committee Member Woollett stated it appeared to him that the proposed project presented a very different situation compared to what occurred in other areas of The Block. The proposed project had the central access coming out to the road and that had not occurred anywhere else. It became a line of sight for people in their cars, and he was hearing that there was a possibility that some of the buildings would not go in. He was concerned about what would happen before it was completely built out. There seemed to be a real emphasis on making the entrance attractive and to allow people to see down the mall, but probably not many people would be at the east end as there was too much traffic at that end. He believed the traffic would come from the north and south and he was interested in Mr. McKently's thinking on that. There were also design elements that were a significant departure from what was there, particularly with the molding around the top.

Mr. McKently stated as far as the overall layout, the developer wanted the entire 105,000 square feet to be built. It probably would be built in phases and he could not describe how the pylons would be retained or how the new axis would work for the first phase until it was defined. In working from the proposal that the buildings would all go in; it would be realistic to have the spine continue out. It would be aligned with the main entrance off of City Drive. It would offset the parking to either side and they had attempted to create smaller paseo axis points to bring people in. He supposed most of the traffic would not come directly from that area; and most of the parking would be to either side. They had attempted to create another node, in an area he pointed to on the plans, and he felt the new tenants would be very strong. Visually he thought they would include some type of fountain feature and the elements on the building would be some raised corner elements and some tower like elements would be added. As far as the stylistic look of the architecture, he felt that little by little The Block was going through a transition; and they had seen the Ron Jon's go to a Neiman Marcus Last Call and the Saks near Starbucks. It was not necessarily upscale, but there was a different look. The freeway signs were still there and there was a lot of that still going on.

Committee Member Woollett stated The Block had been fairly unique and now it was looking similar to other buildings.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was losing its edge.

Committee Member Wheeler stated The Block was a cacophony of forms and shapes; and the current proposal looked stodgy and was dull in comparison to what existed. There would be a neighborhood that was so different. He disagreed with Mr. Garcia's comments that it matched the design theme and felt it had not matched and he would love to see how more of The Block elements could be brought into the proposed project.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was the landscape architect on the initial Block project. They had gone through many designs. He felt what Committee Member Wheeler spoke to was the thematic nature of the site. It was called The Block because there were street trees set in a particular manner, specific paving and it was supposed to be "your Block." That was the concept, everyone's street. There were different shapes. When he first reviewed the proposal there was the Alcatraz Restaurant and then there were, what he felt, "office-type buildings", rather than a thematic retail space. Although it had matched some of the pieces of The Block, he felt the match was more to the back end or not the primary areas or faces of the buildings at The Block. There was not an architectural "smash". It seemed a very much even approach on all four sides of the proposed buildings. Another thing he had seen was the similarity to, and he would reference Victoria Gardens in Rancho Cucamonga, where they had continued the mall all the way out to a main road and what had happened was that there was not an anchor or traffic circle; it was not "active" and all the businesses at that end were dying. The "sizzle" could not be continued. The whole layout to get to that area of the new proposed building sites had posed huge problems for The Block when it first opened up. Committee Member McCormack presented a drawing on which he pointed out the original entry area; he stated it had morphed and changed. The City had required that they inventoried all existing plant materials and anything that they could save from what was formerly The City, be saved and reused. Most of the trees in the front and out by Carl's Jr. were all 182" and 90" box trees and they were all saved and put back in. To get back to his original story, was that they had wanted to block direct access to that area, and bring traffic back through. When The Block opened it caused a huge mess. The whole front entry was totally congested and people would wait for others to come out and it was a bottleneck of problems. They came back with a valet system that took a good year to get the word out. When he reviewed the proposed project it had mitigated that parking issue; but there was no chance to animate the area. He noted an area that could be more people space.

Committee Member Gladson stated in her visits to The Block what had become the gathering spot was the theater area and she was not certain if that was the initial vision. She believed the intent was that there was supposed to be a number of gathering areas; just by people doing what they did it had become the gathering place. It was encouraging that there might be some opportunities to anchor the east side of the site. The east side was more of a walk through area. She went to the other side and parked. There were clearly opportunities to activate the site, but how to do that with Urban Design Elements and architecture and sizzle was a real challenge. Most of the Committee Members had lived in Orange for a long time and they remembered when the site was The City and when they had heard of the great thing called The Block, and now The Block was struggling a bit. She asked how they could keep The Block's economic vitality?

Mr. McKently stated the proposal was a balance between the economics and the type of retail that would go there. When The Block first opened he was excited about the billboards and he felt it was very youthful. He was not certain what the demographics currently were.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was the same demographic.

Committee Member McCormick stated Van's Skate Park defined the demographics of The Block. The design theme had been for more of a hang out for younger kids and initially there was a lot of crime at The Block. The site went through growing pains. There had been a lot of movement on the south side with Ron Jon's moving out and the DRC had been concerned about the use. The use defined the shape. A restaurant would have a certain shape and would be more

articulated vs. the design for a shoe store. He applauded moving the space out; he thought there should be an anchor, more of a people space.

Mr. McKently stated it was difficult to speak to something that was not there. There would be a food space and as he was not the developer that was what was in the plan. He pointed to a building and stated the space had been for the Neiman Marcus store which was now in the old Ron Jon's space. From the standpoint of the layout and the plan for a specific retailer one of the new buildings needed a certain footprint and size; and the other space could be a more out-of-the-box dynamic element. It was all speculation currently. He was hearing things from the Committee Members that he had not heard before. He had heard that there was some demographic shift and that The Block was turning into more of what had been originally thought of as a kid's entertainment center.

Committee Member McCormack stated one of the things that had been written in the original development agreement was that the billboards were to have community leaders on them; that was the whole concept and how it had been sold and approved. The billboards were not meant for advertisement, but for community leaders, of someone who had done something unique in Orange County and those had been posted for approximately six months and that concept had gone away. The concept was to bring people into view, and that concept had been lost.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was also a shift to go outdoors for shopping. The Block was the first one out of the box in the Southern California region to be open.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the original City was also open and they enclosed it.

Committee Member Gladson stated that was what she had liked about the City was that all of the supportive services were underground. All the truck loading and trash disposal was underground and it was a history lesson.

Chair Cathcart stated he would want the Committee Members to offer some suggestions as they had gone through the psychological and sociological issues and they needed to offer some suggestions.

Committee Member Woollett stated they had gone around and reacted to the proposed project. It seemed to him that the whole problem was where the whole center was going. The Block had begun with a unified concept. They had looked and approved other buildings and changes to those. It appeared that the unified concept was going away and it was difficult to judge the current proposal because he was not certain what it would become a part of. He stated that there was a need for an update on the basic concept as the current proposal had not appeared to fit in the site.

Committee Member Wheeler stated as Committee Member Woollett had stated the DRC had approved other projects for The Block and in some cases they had concerns whether the façade was compatible. In most cases the facades that were approved were not seen anywhere but within The Block and it was not a huge issue and they were small façades. The site had such an assortment of forms and one odd ball thing was not a problem at all, but the current proposal would be a whole new neighborhood and it was a totally different element from the other areas of The Block. He felt the proposed project was repudiating The Block and stating the other

components did not work and that troubled him very much. The entire site needed to be addressed and a direction of where the site was going needed to be stated, rather than bringing in a new concept that stated the old concepts were no longer any good.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the 2004 entitlement that was being requested to be dropped had gone through the DRC?

Mr. Garcia stated yes it had.

Committee Member Gladson stated maybe it was a matter of being reminded what the concept was in 2004 and to bring them up to date on what the current direction was in 2010.

Senior Project Manager, Economic Development, Lisa Kim, stated she was working with the property owner. To recap, in 2004 those entitlements had been secured by the original developer and what that provided for was 120,000 square feet of office expansion, 2 hotels, a parking structure, and approximately 500 residential units. At the time the Mills Company had secured those expansion entitlements and they had every intention of undertaking the first component which had been the parking structure and residential development. That had failed, and over the course of several years the Mills Company had financial troubles and Simon had acquired the Mills properties that had been under the Mills ownership. In 2008 Simon regrouped the existing property and looked at the entitlements and opportunities for expansion. opportunity to transition The Block into the first outlet mall in Orange County and that was the types of retail uses that were being added to The Block. There was the addition of Neiman Marcus Last Call, which fit in with Off Fifth, and the closed Hilo Hattie location was being transitioned into an H&M store that would open in the fall. There were some existing vacancies within The Block which were left vacant intentionally as the developer wanted to group and release those properties to several retail outlet tenants. There would be some American classics, children's store, and the transition of the retail uses into an outlet concept. The expansion plan that was being presented was part of that expansion plan. One of the buildings, which was identified in the proposal as building N, had a tenant already secured for the space and would solidify the other co-tenants that they would have an opportunity to bring to the property. To address some of the earlier questions, the Redevelopment Agency was in negotiations with Simon on their expansion plan, and to refurbish and restore some of the existing elements would be critical in re-launching The Block property. There were several tenants anticipated for the rest of the expansion plan; however, as they were in negotiations, those tenants could not be currently disclosed. The anchor tenant was committed and it was critical that they met that tenant's time line. They were seeking comments from the DRC to enable the project to return in March and move the project forward. Ms. Kim stated as far as The Block was concerned it was in transition and would be seeing a new life as the first outlet mall in Orange County and that was the vision. The vision would be to bring the property up to that standard and they wanted the DRC's input. The Block had unique features in its existing architecture which they would want to incorporate in the expansion plan. The goal was to achieve implementation of the first phase of the expansion plan to meet the tenant's time line and once that occurred the remainder of the mall space would continue to transition. There were several tenants coming on line and uses that would roll out over the next 18 months. The City's Redevelopment Agency was making every effort to ensure that the tenants were committed to the property. She hoped her input gave the DRC a flavor of where the property was headed and she was aware that they were only previewing elements of the site. The purpose of why the 2004 development agreement was

being terminated was to allow the expansion plan to move forward. Simon was a shopping mall developer and their focus was retail and to attract quality retail and to transition the demographics to family and upscale shopping.

Committee Member Gladson stated what she was hearing was that the Redevelopment Agency would be a partner in the project.

Ms. Kim stated they were a partner in the project and the Agency had an existing arrangement currently and they would be transitioning that into the roll-out of the expansion effort. They would be addressing the style, lighting components, and a whole list of public benefits that would be incorporated into the project. The expansion, which was the current focus, was just one component of the overall plan.

Committee Member Gladson stated to some extent the DRC had a very limited purview and they could assist with what would be aesthetically beneficial to assist with getting the project to be more unified. They could still state that it was a shame that they were losing some of the past goals of the site. Frankly, she was in support of wanting the project to be a successful economic engine; it was a bit sad that it could not quite ever get to the point that the site was intended for.

Committee Member McCormack stated he felt that what they were all wanting to say was not to leave The Block behind. There was an element, which he pointed to on the plans, with some enhanced paving and sidewalks and the proposal stopped that element. A common thread was the infiltration planters, and in hearing that the site was becoming an outlet mall was great and it would fit.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that the proposed entry area be spread out a bit more and the fountain could move down as more of an entry focus.

Committee Member McCormack stated that was a good point as the fountain had picked a primary spot and he understood the layout. He felt there were some problems with people entering and they would turn right, which was the initial problem on the site as turning right would place people at the loading docks. It was an opportunity to address the issue of entry to the site. There was the loading dock issue and some design issues that needed to get flushed out. There had been a total landscape concept on the site and he had asked for the total tree requirement for parking lots; what had come through was that in the parking lots there needed to be one tree per every eight stalls, 36 feet on center. The concept was not to have a forest but to have Palm trees that went in out and to define the spine. That was typical throughout the project and the perimeter trees were counted. They used existing trees, the Ficus, Palms, and Corals. He would want the same type of concept and he noted on the plans where Palm trees could be pulled in and to re-use some of the trees.

Applicant, Rick Mayer, address on file, stated with the new water requirements of having to capture water into the infiltration systems, sometimes the parking lot grade worked against the trees. They were working with the civil engineers and wanting to place trees along the spines to articulate the site.

Committee Member McCormack stated when he spoke of saving trees he would want those reused. They could do what was done at Downtown Disney, where trees from Culver City had been taken and used to define the areas there. The proposed project had the potential to do the same type of re-use and to give the project a sense of history. He could not figure out what trees were what on the plans and it might just be a simple problem.

Mr. Mayer stated the trees in the Firestone lot that were grouped were California Sycamores and the trees that were four abreast, and along the aisles were where the symbols were confused. Those were supposed to be Tipuana tipu trees for shade as they had wanted to create more shade. In reverting to the rest of the parking lot they would be using the Palm trees. They could do that, however, on the requirements he needed to check that, as many cities would not include Palm trees in their tree count. He would need to check the requirements.

Committee Member McCormack stated they would accept Palm trees in the count.

Mr. Garcia stated there would be a requirement for 20' brown trunk height.

Chair Cathcart stated the Palms were not considered a large canopy tree, but they were included as part of the tree requirement.

Committee Member McCormack stated the intent of the site had been to create a skyline and instant recognition that the project existed and to make a bold statement with the up-lit trees. The proposal was written for shade coverage. He would want to suggest saving trees and to reuse the trees. The Magnolias, Corals, and Ficus were on site and had been originally planted and he would want to explore that issue. The Palms were easy to save and transplant.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would want to see roof plans for the proposed buildings.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would want to see the lighting proposal and how they would work with the trees.

Committee Member Gladson asked if they had any thoughts regarding the architectural look of the proposed buildings. She had not found them bothersome or inappropriate in town, but the buildings had not totally fit as it appeared as a standard in line shopping center.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would want to see some of the humor that went into the original Block; to mix colors and add some different shapes and to appreciate what existed on the site.

Mr. McKently stated his initial take on The Block was that the buildings were very basic and what added to that was the hardscape, landscape, lighting, and billboards. The palette of awnings and other things was very simple and not elaborate.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there were cornices that curved and sloped and some were installed upside down. He would hope that there was an element of fun and to not make the statement of turning their backs on what The Block was.

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for February 17, 2010 Page 10 of 16

Committee Member Gladson stated the buildings were not bad and she liked the windows; it was more about tying the project together.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that they not worry too much about decorating the blank walls; he looked at the Market Place in Irvine and there was nothing wrong with blank walls and it went along with the forms in The Block.

Chair Cathcart suggested re-looking at the paving at The Block; what he saw in the proposal was Fashion Island. It was not necessarily bad but it was not The Block. Committee Member McCormack was correct with the area between buildings A & B that picked up the theme of The Block and look at that to see if there was a way to bring back some of the fun to the new areas.

Committee Member Woollett stated when they dealt with The Block they applied a whole different set of criteria. The visual concept of The Block as it had been might not work anymore. He would ask that the DRC be presented with the concept of what The Block was becoming and maybe The Block as it existed currently was going away. As far as he was concerned that was fine; and it was a matter of how it would be going away and there were some pretty prominent elements and treatments on the site that would probably go away. He was a bit surprised that they would be presented with only the four new buildings and not a concept.

Chair Cathcart stated they had pretty much beat it over and he asked Mr. Garcia if he had enough notes and suggestions to offer the applicant?

Mr. Garcia stated yes.

The item had been presented for preliminary review and no motion was necessary.

#### (3) DRC No. 4468-10 - THE CITRUS BUILDING

- A proposal for a sign program for a multi-tenant, historic commercial building located outside of the Old Towne Historic District.
- 940 W. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, <a href="mailto:dryan@cityoforange.org">dryan@cityoforange.org</a>

• DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, James Foster, address on file, stated one of the things that they had agreed upon that the Ricci Realty signage had stood out. What they had done was to create another can to have it appear similar to the other tenant signs and it gave the sign a look of a crate. The panels would be interchangeable and there would not be damage to the wall when a sign was changed. If a tenant moved out there would not be any new holes to the building. All the transformers would be remote and inside the building.

Applicant, Al Ricci, address on file, stated they wanted to find a way to deal with changes in tenants and with the neon that could just be changed out and it worked out very well. It gave an identity to the building; the building was such a big blank non-descript building and it would add something to the site. He looked at the Rod's sign as a cool sign and the building had a blade sign previously. He wanted to create an identity to the building as he felt it was the gateway to Old Towne and it would be important to pick up those elements.

#### Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item for discussion by the Committee.

Committee Member Woollett stated he felt the changes to the signage were good ones. The prints that had been provided had not shown actual colors and one of his concerns was the colors.

Mr. Foster asked, the colors of the neon?

Committee Member Woollett stated the orange had not seemed quite bright enough, as he pointed to those areas on the printed examples. He also suggested that the Ricci Realty sign should drop down on the sign. The color on the Ricci Realty sign had not worked with the other colors and there needed to be some changes to have the signs appear as if they were from the same color family. Ricci Realty was red.

Mr. Ricci asked if he felt all the sign colors should be red?

Committee Member Woollett stated no, he thought the colors should be related to the individual tenant logos. The brown became the back drop for the tenant sign colors.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had an issue with readability of the signs. She was not an expert on colors or hues and there were signs that worked great but they were not easily read. She would want the signs to be a bit clearer.

Mr. Foster stated if a tenant wanted red neon, the red neon was a clear tube and once ignited the neon lighting was red. During the day the clear tube would not be easily read. What they had done was during the day was to paint the letters background to be read during the day. It was a concept that was done during the past with hand painting of the neon signs.

Committee Member McCormack stated his understanding: there would be neon with the background painted and not lit during the day. The outline would show up as white lit at night and during the day it would be opaque and pick up the red background.

The Committee reviewed the plans and the applicant explained how the neon and painted areas would work.

Committee Member McCormack asked how the Ricci Realty sign would work if he no longer was at that building?

Mr. Ricci stated the sign could be split into two areas and changed.

Committee Member Gladson stated she liked the concept of the crate label and there could be value in having the sign read more like a label.

Mr. Ricci stated he picked up the Citrus Building because the cross street was Citrus and everyone called it the Hagen building and he liked the idea of calling it the Citrus building with the Orange concept included.

Committee Member Gladson stated she liked the blade and thought it was outstanding. She liked blade signs especially in a pedestrian area.

Mr. Ricci stated the building was so close to the street that whatever was on the building would not be seen and the blade sign worked.

Chair Cathcart stated he liked neon and if he was not mistaken Committee Member Woollett was on the original collaborative when the sign program provided for a lot of neon and character. It was a very nice sign.

Mr. Foster stated, not only because he designed it, but he felt it was the nicest sign in Old Towne Orange.

Committee Member Gladson stated they were seeing more of the neon element and the use of it with the metal cabinets. The struggle she saw, for example the Grinder sign was difficult to read, and she was speaking to the benefit of future tenants to ensure their sign was readable.

Committee Member McCormack stated he liked the blade sign and questioned why an area of the sign was gray and with the photo being taken on a rainy day it made his concern more visible; he suggested bringing the color down to that area as the gray was washed out and the clock could be a contrast color.

Mr. Ricci stated they would be painting the stair well to match the building and not be a contrast color. Once the sign was up they would be painting.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested toning down the high contrast banding as it appeared so irregular. He asked how deep the blade sign would be?

Mr. Foster stated it would be approximately 12".

Committee Member Wheeler suggested a cap of no more than 18". He asked for the thickness on the wall sign?

Mr. Foster stated that was agreeable. The wall sign would be approximately 4".

Committee Member Wheeler asked for an explanation of LED illumination internal lighting.

Mr. Foster stated due to the facts of the thin strokes of the neon for the orange leaves, it was difficult to get a defined look of a leaf with just neon.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if that would be internally lit plastic?

Mr. Foster stated yes.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was a little sculptural piece on the top of the orange and asked if it could just be boxed out?

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could do it with a metal piece and back light it and could the clock have a remote setting control to avoid someone needing to go out to the actual sign to reset the clock.

Mr. Foster stated there would be two clocks and one would be a slave so the clocks would be set to the same time.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the font of the clock could be the same as the Citrus font.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt that the clock face font should be simple.

Mr. Foster stated he had looked at different fonts and they were more difficult to read.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were clocks of the 60's that looked different, some clocks just had dots. It could be simplified and to play the Citrus up.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt the clock should stand out as a clock; he saw it as a school clock or his watch.

Chair Cathcart asked if the color issues had been resolved?

Committee Member Woollett stated it was a problem because without color charts he could not see specifically what they wanted; however, he would want the project to move forward.

Mr. Ryan stated the question was on the red of Ricci Realty and the brown rustic color that would have enough contrast.

Mr. Foster stated he was confident that the signs would have both day time and night time readability without any of the concerns that were brought up.

Committee Member Woollett was concerned that the Ricci Realty was so much larger that it needed to be compatible with the other signs. The smaller signs could be whatever they wanted to be against the brown background. The Ricci Realty sign needed to have a similar shading; it appeared in the samples provided that it was a tint and no black in it. All the other color samples provided had black in them. The Ricci Realty sign appeared to be from a different color family and that was what bothered him; it appeared that all the other signs were from the 30's and the Ricci Realty sign was from the 90's.

Committee Member Wheeler stated what he was hearing was that the colors should be from a more pure color family and not degraded.

Committee Member Woollett stated there would need to be some white or black added and all the other colors were shaded colors and the Ricci Realty was not shaded.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they would not want to mess with that as it was the logo color.

Mr. Ricci stated the background would tie the signs together.

Mr. Foster stated the color samples provided were from different printers and calibrated differently.

Committee Member Woollett stated the signs needed to be related to old time colors and to give respect to that, it was not whether he liked them or not.

Mr. Ryan stated the colors would tie in together.

The Committee Members and the applicants discussed the colors.

Mr. Foster stated he understood what they wanted and it would look good.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4468-10, The Citrus Building, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- 1. The Ricci Realty portion of the sign be enclosed with a frame at the bottom of the sign.
- 2. Leaves of the orange to be metal.
- 3. Thickness of the blade sign shall be no more than 18".
- 4. Thickness of the wall sign shall be no more than 6".
- 5. The red color of the wall sign to be the same as the Ricci Realty sign.
- 6. The building portion of the blade sign to match the color of the rest of the blade sign.
- 7. The wall lighting to be relocated as to not wash out the neon lighted signage.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

## **ADJOURNMENT:**

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled meeting on Wednesday, March 3, 2010. The meeting adjourned @6:49 p.m.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.