CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

May 19, 2010

Committee Members Present: Bill Cathcart

Adrienne Gladson Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: 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.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, stated there were no changes to the Agenda. He stated he was working on an outline for the new Design Standards and working on collecting really good graphic examples. He had put together a list of illustrations they might need for the future.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if that was for Old Towne?

Mr. Ryan stated it was the Design Standards for Old Towne and it might encompass more than Old Towne. He was beginning the process and it was exciting. His goal was to end up with a document that was workable and took as much gray area away; to be able to approve more things over the counter with defined standards. There could be separate handout sheets for applicants for those items that always came up. It would be a working document that had a lot of good information, illustrations, and photography; it would also combine the Old Towne Design Standards and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. It would make all their jobs easier and it would be a document that illustrated what was required and he wanted to stress in the introduction of the document that, although someone could construct to the minimum standard, the City was looking for high quality projects overall. He would want to have some type of pointing system; he had seen many projects that just met the minimum all over and there could be one terrible item and the collection of items would not work. He felt it should be the major part of the document that set the tone, the standard, and a direction of what they wanted.

Committee Member Woollett stated his younger brother was a planner and one of the frustrations he had was that everyone went for the minimum. Everybody designed to the minimum; how were they able to reject something if it met the minimum?

Mr. Ryan stated there had been some very successful challenges in a workable way. Sometimes applicants thought that they could slide on one part of the project and he had seen projects where the overall project had not had the level of quality that was expected.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would not want to have the same effort as in the past, it had to be different, and how could it be different and how could that be defined?

Mr. Ryan stated he believed by having good examples. They all had seen excellent work and there were people who spent a great deal of time and those were great projects; having the ability to include all of those examples in order for applicants to see the expectation. When the Design Collaborative just started there was a very detailed drawing of one street. The "design bar" was raised and everyone wanted to do the same thing. If the expectation was high and there were examples of what not to do there would be a gauge to measure the projects by. He was spending the time to go in that direction. As the process continued he would keep the DRC informed.

Committee Member Woollett asked what the process for the document was?

Mr. Ryan stated the process he saw was to look at what they wanted to keep, the areas that would be changed and having a residential section gave the document a lot of strength, however, they had never touched on the industrial areas and in some other places there was information included but not in-depth. He wanted to review the structure of the document and look at the graphic design level in order for the entire document to have an illustrative sense. He would want the document type face to be readable and include photos and graphics.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would want to see a green element of design added.

Mr. Ryan stated that English design documents were that way and they were phenomenal.

Committee Member McCormack stated that was the flavor he spoke of; he was not stating that he would want it to be over-seasoned with onions so it would be distasteful. To add a little zest, a little flavor in the document.

Mr. Ryan stated there was a building on West Palmyra and the builder took off a leading barge board that was 2' x 8', and the back barge was smaller than the front one in length. He had taken the front ones off and threw them in the trash. He had asked the applicant why had he not used those for the back barge as there would not be a need to buy new materials? They then had to find full dimensional lumber.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would be re-use.

Mr. Ryan stated it was a more friendly word.

Chair Cathcart stated he hated the word "sustainability"; with landscape, designers would design things to die.

Committee Member Gladson stated the reason why sustainable sounded better was that it got them off the whole issue of global warming which would be fraught with all other views.

Mr. Ryan stated he just wanted to give them an overview.

Committee Member Gladson asked if he had a timeline as to the completion of the document?

Mr. Ryan stated just to be clear he had been working on it since he had started working for the City of Orange. He would hope his knowledge could be transferred and it would allow people to know what the expectations were right up front. He wanted to have fold-out graphics and develop a website that allowed input of a roof style that figured out what the building envelope would be. There was a lot of good stuff out there and he was open to ideas. It should go pretty quickly once they completed the framework of the document.

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

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members 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

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 21, 2010

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Meeting of April 21, 2010, with changes and corrections as noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items: None

New Agenda Items:

(2) DRC No. 4436-09 – ORANGE SENIOR CENTER - SIGN PROGRAM

- A proposal for a new sign program for the City's Senior Center.
- 170 S. Olive Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Chair Cathcart stated he had a conflict on the item as he was on the Board of Directors for the Orange Senior Center; he was recused from the item's presentation.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had a conflict on the item due to the location of the proposed project; he was recused from the item's presentation.

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

Applicant, City of Orange/Community Services Director, Marie Knight, address on file, stated the only clarification or addition that they had was the decision to go with the illuminated front sign. The project was funded through CBG funds and they needed to ensure that they had adequate funding for the illumination. The City used the facility in the evenings and having the lighted sign was very helpful to the patrons in order to find the facility. The City had a new Programs Director and the programs at the center were expanding and the illuminated sign would help.

The applicant's sign consultant, Tom Riggle, address on file, presented a color and materials board for the Committee's review.

Ms. Knight stated the remodel and painting had been completed and the sign was the finishing touch.

Public Comment

None.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett asked for an explanation on how the lighted sign worked?

Mr. Riggle stated the sign would have a halo effect.

Committee Member Woollett stated the sign called for a halo, however, as he read it the lettering was set off from a metal face and behind that there were LEDs and behind that there was a clear Lexon back. The light would shine back to the wall and would halo the metal and not the letters. He asked how would the sign be able to be read at night? It would be difficult to read the sign at night because of the light coming around the metal letters and the contrast.

Mr. Riggle stated per the site assessment with the lighting on the outside of the building and the light shining down they would be able to read the sign.

Committee Member Woollett stated the LED was not necessary and it would only make the sign harder to read.

Mr. Riggle stated the halo effect would give it some ambiance.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the only lighted sign would be on the canopy. The profile of the canopy looked like the piece of metal was cantilevering over the surface behind and in effect if it could be a flush mounted sign. If it was a flat surface it would work. The halo would only light the underside of the cantilever.

Ms. Knight stated it was a flat sign.

Mr. Riggle stated it was flat.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the non-illumination it had not shown the 1 ½" offset from the wall and that detail needed to be shown so it was all the same.

Mr. Ryan stated they should all be 1 ½".

Committee Member McCormack discussed the dimension and the distance of the mountings with the applicant. He stated what he would not want to see was the conduit and the J Box that always got stuck flat on the back side of the thing; and for their situation it would be something that would be seen upon exiting the building.

Committee Member Woollett stated that would not be visible as there was a soffit under there.

Ms. Knight stated the conduit would not be visible.

Committee Member McCormack stated the detail should be shown on the plans for the canopy; he would not want the contractor to get any bright ideas to surface mount conduit.

Vice Chair Gladson stated Committee Member Woollett's point on the readability of the sign struck a point with her as well. She understood there was a cost element involved and asked if they had considered neon and was it way out of their budget? She understood the value in having it be really legible and easy to read; she would not want to impose a financial hardship on the design. She liked halo and the illumination; however, there was generally front illumination to have the sign be readable.

Mr. Riggle stated LED was much more cost-effective and energy efficient.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the actual lettering of Orange Senior Center on the front face was just one plane and there was not a channel effect with the lettering.

Mr. Riggle asked if the Committee would be agreeable to a halo and front-lit sign?

Vice Chair Gladson stated that went back to an illuminated sign.

Committee Member Woollett stated if he was correct all they needed to do was turn the light off; they would not have the halo effect, and the sign would be readable. Whether the applicant decided to go with it as presented, he had not cared, however, he felt it would not work as well. For an example, he could see Committee Member McCormack's face across the room, but if there was a bright light behind his head he could not be seen as clearly. He was not certain how bright the LED would be and their responsibility of how easily the sign could be read was not their concern. The value of using a punch through would be that the light would come out behind the letters and illuminate the letters, but it would cost more.

Mr. Riggle stated they were willing to work with the City.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they could have a Lexon back, to have the entire LED area be Lexon. It would have a halo and illumination.

Mr. Ryan stated that would be against the standard for illuminated signs.

Ms. Knight stated that was the challenge, to stay within the rules.

Vice Chair Gladson stated neon was the exception for illumination.

The Committee Members discussed different ideas and referred to the drawings.

The applicant's sign consultant, Tom Pitts, address on file, suggested they route out the word "Orange Senior Center" from the aluminum material and it would not cost any more money as it would use the same amount of LEDs. They could back that up and there would be a halo; it would look awesome.

Committee Member McCormack asked if it would be a continuous route?

Mr. Pitts stated each letter would be routed and appear as it had in the drawings. The route would be the thickness of the aluminum, whatever the letter size was.

Committee Member McCormack asked if that would be done with the words "Senior Center" as well?

Mr. Pitts stated yes.

Mr. Riggle stated everything would be done to work with the City and ensure the sign was readable.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she supported the direction the project was going in and they had to balance the guidelines.

Mr. Riggle reviewed the color samples with the Committee Members.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4436-09, Orange Senior Center, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following condition:

1. The metal letters shall be routed out.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

RECUSED: Bill Cathcart, Craig Wheeler

(3) DRC No. 4452-09 - HENRY'S GRILL - PATIO COVER REVISION

- A revised proposal for a new patio cover on the outdoor patio area at the rear of the building. Proposal also includes a sight study as to visibility of roof-top equipment
- 149 & 151 N. Glassell Street, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Prior DRC Recommendation to Planning Commission on January 6, 2010
- Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had a conflict on the item due to the location of the proposed project; he was recused from the item's presentation.

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

Applicant, Jack Selman, address on file, stated previously they had known that there was a stained glass panel on the right hand side, but they had not known about the left side and they had agreed to attempt to match it if it was not there. The glass was different than what had existed next door on the Italian restaurant. They took some wood off in the inside and discovered that there was glass there and it was in pretty good shape. It had been painted over and there were purple pieces of glass with clear glass around the edge and they would attempt to remove the paint; they would do the best they could to clean it up. Structurally it was definitely not bad. The other issue they had was at the Planning Commission (PC) presentation one of the Commissioners had brought up the visibility of the mechanical equipment. He felt it was not visible. Mr. Selman stated he went back to obtain some photos. One of the Commissioners had stated that placing a screen would be worse, and another Commissioner stated that not much of the equipment had been visible, however, per the code any visibility of equipment had to be screened and there was nothing in the code that mentioned landscape screening. He presented photos from various angles. He stated that one of the photos was taken the day after the PC presentation where the roof equipment was screened by the trees and there were three months of the year where the trees were bare, however, the tree limbs still provided screening. presented another view of the building and stated the equipment could not be deciphered in his opinion. He had also completed a site line study which was 100% accurate; technically there was just a small piece approximately 4"-6" that was visible. He would be returning to the PC regarding the screen issue and the trellis that he would present. He wanted to present it to the DRC and obtain their opinion on the matter. If he placed a screen up it would be \$5,000.00 and he had not wanted to spend the money. It would also puncture the roof in several locations and it would need to come up higher than the equipment. Instead of seeing a nice little box, a larger piece would be visible, and he had not understood what the point of that would be. He could paint it and that would be fine.

Mr. Selman stated, regarding the trellis, the material on the ground and the railing would remain the same. Originally his tenant had wanted to use patio umbrellas, which he had thought was fine. He now wanted a full wood trellis. He presented a wood trellis which he was proposing

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for May 19, 2010 Page 10 of 18

that would be in a traditional stacked manner with main beams running in both directions. There would be a base on the columns and a detail at the top. It would be stained wood.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he thought it was fine.

Committee Member McCormack stated since the trees would be doing the heavy lifting, if they could just ensure that they showed the trees on the plan as they would be the screen.

Mr. Selman stated from the sidewalk the equipment was not visible unless someone was really looking and there was just a piece visible.

Committee Member McCormack stated he felt if the trees were not there the applicant would need to provide screening; however, since they were mature trees then that screened the equipment.

Mr. Selman asked if that was due to the code?

Committee Member Gladson stated because it would be more visible.

Mr. Selman stated but there would only be about a foot of screen that would be visible.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they could put something up on the edge?

Mr. Selman replied he would have to build it higher and the screen would be visible all the way across.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would not accomplish much.

Mr. Selman stated when the trees were bare of foliage there were still a bunch of branches going through there.

Committee Member McCormack stated he liked the trellis and asked about his plans for lighting? He didn't want the conduit to be visible.

Mr. Selman stated he wanted to have lights mounted to each side and route out the conduit location. He was not sure if independent lighting would work.

Committee Member McCormack stated the lighting could be compatible with any inside lighting.

Mr. Selman stated there was the whole issue with vandalism in downtown, and the entire back of the building needed lighting. They had graffiti being scratched into all of their windows. Even the building in the parking lot was scratched. In addition to any decorative lighting he would be figuring in some lighting for the back of the building.

Committee Member Gladson stated she thought the trellis was fine and Mr. Selman's suggestions were good. Adding a screen would create a worse situation in her view, just to add something to hide 6" and she felt the suggestion of painting it out was a good idea and was worth adding as a condition of approval. When the A/C units were selected he could choose something lower.

Mr. Selman stated any new equipment would be mounted further back. There was one existing unit that was barely visible.

Committee Member Gladson stated she could understand the PC's concerns and they had given their input in that placing a screen there would not be beneficial. She liked the concept of the trellis and she was excited to read in the Staff Report that the transoms had been uncovered and it was so cool that it was coming out.

Mr. Ryan commented that in uncovering original features on the building and bringing them back could place the building as a contributing structure to the Plaza; and the Committee could choose to add that to a motion. Working around the seismic work that existed, the applicant would still be bringing the contributing elements of the building back and it could be deemed as a contributing building.

Committee Member Gladson stated if she was hearing it correctly they could suggest that action.

Mr. Selman asked what that process would be?

Mr. Ryan stated the survey information would be changed to reflect the new discovery since the building had been last classified.

Mr. Selman asked who would do that?

Mr. Ryan replied that the City and he personally would do that. It was an opportunity to add the building as a contributing building to the Historic District; based on the recommendations of what had been found it could be done. Based on the new information they could consider that.

Committee Member Gladson stated they had real life examples to show to other building owners. They had previous applicants who had re-created the same elements that now they had found to be original elements and could encourage other building owners in their projects.

Mr. Ryan stated on the retail clothing shop on West Chapman, the Torn Building, there were two shops on each side, and prismatic transom glass had been discovered and in removing some plaster they discovered two huge historic signs. The signs were damaged due to the plaster application, but they were visible and wonderful. Mr. Ryan stated he had given that contractor information on preservation of those signs.

Committee Member Gladson stated what was interesting about that was she was the little minion who watched the design collaborative work 15 years ago and in their discussions talked about the Plaza and what still might exist, and it was a blessing that they were actually discovering some of those historic elements. They suspected that they were there and now they were discovering some of those things.

Mr. Selman stated he had found the Hoff's Battery sign in the front of one of his properties and they had restored it. It was now in the building.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the trellis stain would be clear?

Mr. Selman stated it would be a stain that gave the wood protection and the wood had not needed to be pressurized; it would not be Redwood, he thought he would use Douglas fir. He wanted the wood stained so it would not look brand new; he wanted it a bit darker.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4452-09, Henry's Grill-Patio Cover Revision, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the additional conditions:

- 1. There shall be no exposed conduit on the trellis lighting.
- 2. Show the three trees on the plans and call out that they shall be existing trees to remain.
- 3. Stain to be clear stain on the Douglas fir.
- 4. To reclassify the building as a contributing historic structure due to the discovery of the historic transom windows and restoration of same.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had understood that the applicant wanted to darken the wood.

Mr. Selman stated he wanted to darken the wood and he was not certain it would be an actual clear stain. The stain would have a tint; it would be an Olympic stain and technically it would not be clear.

Committee Member McCormack amended his motion that the stain would be semi-transparent in order for the wood color to be enhanced.

Mr. Selman stated in adding the building as a historic structure he wanted to ensure that the designation would not be something that would hold up his project.

Mr. Ryan stated it was fairly simple and was just a classification of the property; and if Mr. Selman followed through with the restoration on the transoms and store front, based on the discovery and photo documentation they would move the building into a contributing status and there was nothing further the applicant needed to do.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

RECUSED: Craig Wheeler

(4) DRC No. 4485-10 – US BANK - SIGN PROGRAM

- A proposal to install a new sign program for a change in bank ownership.
- 216 E. Chapman Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Tim Pitts, address on file, stated he was in agreement with Staff and there were a few points he wanted to make. The existing sign was brushed and if they went with a matte finish the paint filled the brushing. The aluminum was brushed and it was visible in the grain, however, once it was painted it defeated the purpose. They would paint it a flat finish and they were on agreement with that. On the letter height, the higher he went the longer the sign became and he had not wanted to go beyond the background panel. The bank's logo was a trademark and he had not wanted to go much larger; if he had to go larger it would extend too much. He was fine with the other recommendations. In pegging off the letters he would peg off the word bank and he was not certain if the red logo should be pegged or just the US and have the red area remain flat, or peg the red and have the US remain flat. He wanted the DRC's input on that.

Mr. Ryan stated that since the logo portion of the sign met the minimum height standard and that controlled the remainder of the sign, he thought it would be logical to have those heights.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member McCormack asked on item no. 3 if they wanted that to be bigger?

Mr. Ryan stated the previous bank sign was longer, the same height but was a longer bank name. He was reviewing the relationship of the overall sign and how it would fit the standards, and he could go either way on it. The portion of the sign with the logo was larger than the minimum standard and there was a relationship between US Bank and the rest of the sign and it met the intent of the standards. Having the individual metal letters was important and it was just a matter of how much depth they wanted to see.

Committee Member McCormack suggested having the red emblem raised. He asked how the registered symbol was applied?

Mr. Pitts stated it was vinyl. It was a small piece of vinyl applied to the sign.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what would be done with the awnings?

Mr. Pitts stated they would be re-skinned, but that was not part of his project.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was a bit concerned about the thickness of the sign. In the historic district a sign would either be painted or the letters would be fairly thick and he was nervous that the letters were fairly thin. It could be fine as paint and the Committee had considered that applied vinyl lettering was the equivalent of paint. He felt having the letters stand-off was not appropriate and if they had stood-off the letters should be fairly thick. He suggested that they just use vinyl lettering and it would be keeping more within the signs of the historic district.

Mr. Pitts stated the truth was that the sign had already been sent to him and there were vinyl letters on it.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was not their problem.

Mr. Pitts stated he agreed with staff and shame on the sign maker for not listening to him.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he could not think of another sign in Old Towne that had thin stand-off letters.

Mr. Pitts stated the original letters were. The letters would peg-off from the background.

Mr. Ryan stated the letters needed to be a sufficient depth from the background and that would be whatever was determined by the DRC.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was not only the depth but the thickness of the letters that concerned him.

Chair Cathcart asked for a suggestion on the thickness?

Committee Member Wheeler stated 3/4" would be equivalent to a 1 x plank.

Committee Member Woollett stated they could have the red panel offset with white letters. They would get the offset effect and the logo would stand out.

Chair Cathcart stated the only stand-off area would be red and he liked that suggestion.

Committee Member Wheeler restated what Committee Member Woollett had suggested; that the red area be raised and it could be something substantial and that could have vinyl lettering that would have the appearance of paint and the background, the word "bank" could be directly on the plane with vinyl letters.

Chair Cathcart stated he liked that idea. The sign was small and attempting to have all raised lettering would be too much and raising the shield would be appropriate.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was having a hard time with the word vinyl.

Committee Member Wheeler reminded her that the DRC rationalization was in using vinyl paint it would be vinyl on the surface, and what was the difference?

Committee Member Gladson stated with another sign they had looked at there was acrylic and the samples the applicant was presenting on the current project were troubling to her as some of them looked plastic and she wanted the letters to appear as metal lettering; she wanted to get comfortable with that and she was just a minority.

Chair Cathcart stated a painted sign was appropriate.

Committee Member Wheeler stated as long as the vinyl appliqué was very thin.

Committee Member Woollett stated the vinyl could be a matte finish.

The Committee Members discussed the different materials.

Mr. Ryan stated what they had discussed was whether the proposed materials used had the appearance of metal or wood and how had the surface reflected light. Another point was the red shield portion of the sign would have depth and the appearance was the key.

Chair Cathcart stated the surface would be a matte finish.

Committee Member Woollett stated it would be a matte finish and was consistent with what they had approved previously. They could add some thickness to the red shield.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested 3/4" thickness. They could use metal for that piece, either solid aluminum or they could fabricate a box.

Mr. Pitts stated no pegs and 3/4" thick that would work fine.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the lighting they would be relocating some of the lights and in the rear they could eliminate one of the lights and center the sign.

Mr. Pitts stated on the back there was an awning that the sign was centered over, and if they centered it over the lights it would be offset. The awning could be shifted and centered over the lights.

Committee Member Wheeler stated his feeling was that they could do it either way as long as it was all centered.

Committee Member McCormack asked how thick the blue panel on the sign would be?

Mr. Pitts stated that had not yet been determined. It would be mounted directly to the wall and be a matte finish; the letters would be a matte finish, flush-mounted vinyl. The red shield would be ³/₄" fabricated with flush matte lettering and the US would be flush-mounted vinyl.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would appear as a thick piece of plywood. He asked how would they deal with taking the old sign off and covering that profile?

Mr. Pitts stated it was already off and the wall was painted.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the dimensions of the awnings were off and they would want to correct that.

Mr. Pitts stated from grade they were 8' x 8'.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the awning elevation had not agreed with each other on the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4485-10, US Bank-Sign Program, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following conditions:

- 1. Removal of Condition No. 2 and Condition No. 3.
- 2. Retain Condition No. 4.
- 3. The five-sided red emblem be an aluminum box or plate at a minimum of ³/₄" and maximum 1" thick.
- 4. All sign material shall be a matte finish.
- 5. Remove one light on the rear of the building.
- 6. Lights and awnings be repositioned to align correctly or be centered.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Meeting on Wednesday, June 2, 2010. The meeting adjourned @6:52 p.m.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None