

1 **CITY OF ORANGE**
2 **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE**
3 **MINUTES – FINAL**

February 6, 2019

4
5
6 Committee Members Present: Tim McCormack - Chair
7 Robert Imboden
8 Carol Fox
9 Anne McDermott
10 Mary Anne Skorpanich

11
12 Staff in Attendance: Bill Crouch, Community Development Director
13 Marissa Moshier, Historic Preservation Planner
14 Monique Schwartz, Associate Planner
15 Kelly Ribuffo, Associate Planner – Historic Preservation
16 Simonne Fannin, Recording Secretary

17
18 **Administrative Session – 5:05**

19
20 Chair McCormack opened the Administrative Session at 5:05 p.m.

21
22 Chair McCormack inquired if there was any Policy or Procedural information. Ms. Moshier indicated there
23 was no Policy or Procedural information.

24
25 Ms. Moshier clarified the procedures for denial, final determination and continuance in response to questions
26 from the Committee Members.

27
28 Committee Member Skorpanich informed the Committee Members that the California Preservation
29 Foundation will provide a preservation law webinar series on March 19, 2019.

30
31 Chair McCormack discussed his findings on the new LED streetlights that were installed. Ms. Mosher stated
32 the street light replacement was done through a grant program with Southern California Edison. Public Works
33 is looking into the parameters of the grant if there is any flexibility to change out the bulbs.

34
35 Committee Member Imboden informed the Committee that there the California Preservation Foundation will
36 hold their annual spring conference in Palm Springs on May 8th through the 12th. He and Ms. Mosher will
37 be part of a panel discussion on the Eichler homes. He also informed the Committee that he will be asking for
38 their assistance with an Eichler home tour that will occur in the city on the 18th and 19th of May through
39 Preserve Orange County.

40
41 Committee Members reviewed the Design Review Committee minutes for December 19, 2019

42
43 Committee Member McDermott made a motion to close the Administrative Session of the Design Review
44 Committee meeting.

45
46 **SECOND:** Skorpanich.
47 **AYES:** Imboden, McCormack, Fox, McDermott and Skorpanich.
48 **NOES:** None
49 **ABSENT:** None
50 **ABSTAIN:** None

51
52 **MOTION CARRIED.**

53 Administrative Session adjourned at 5:29 p.m.
54

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 were no speakers.

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES DECEMBER 19, 2019

Committee Member Skorpanich made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of December 19, 2018, as emended during the discussion at the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Fox

AYES: Fox, Imboden, McCormack, and McDermott

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED.

1 **AGENDA ITEMS:**

2
3 **Continued Items: None**

4
5 New Agenda Items:

6
7 **(2) ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

8
9 Committee Member Fox made a motion to appoint Anne McDermott as Chair of the Design Review
10 Committee.

11
12 **SECOND:** Imboden
13 **AYES:** Fox, Imboden, McCormack, and McDermott
14 **NOES:** None
15 **ABSENT:** None
16 **ABSTAIN:** None

17
18 Committee Member McDermott made a motion to appoint Mary Anne Skorpanich as Vice Chair of the
19 Design Review Committee.

20
21 **SECOND:** Imboden
22 **AYES:** Fox, Robert, McCormack, and McDermott
23 **NOES:** None
24 **ABSENT:** None
25 **ABSTAIN:** None

26
27
28

1 **AGENDA ITEMS:**

2
3 **Continued Items:**

4
5 (3) DRC No. 4939-18 - ORANGE EXPRESS CAR WASH

- 6
7 • A proposal to redevelop an existing 1.09 acre site with a new automated express carwash, and related
8 site improvements.
9 • 387 N. Tustin Street
10 • Staff Contact: Monique Schwartz, 714-744-7224, mschwartz@cityoforange.org
11 • DRC Action: Preliminary Review.
12

13
14 Monique Schwartz, Associate Planner provided an overview of the carwash renovation consistent with the
15 staff report.

16
17 A committee member asked about the height and length of the existing carwash.

18
19 Chair McCormack invited the applicant to step forward.
20

21 Jefferson Joy, architect for the project approached and stated the existing carwash is currently 167 feet long
22 and is single-story with 16 - 18 foot towers; however the overall length of the proposed carwash is still to be
23 determined depending on what they will do with the existing signage. He explained the bright red color is to
24 create a car racing feel. He added that the existing building is red and will now be a brighter red.
25

26 Chair McCormack opened the item to the public for comments.

27
28 There were no speakers.

29
30 Committee Member questions and comments:

- 31 • The Committee asked if there are two or three pay station bays. Ms. Schwartz responded that the
32 applicant revised the design and there are now only two bays.
33 • The Committee asked if there will be a striping program on the pavement to direct vehicles. Mr. Joy
34 responded yes.
35 • The Committee asked if the paving material will be asphalt. Mr. Joy responded that the footprint of
36 the building and parking will remain the same for the existing carwash; new concrete will be added
37 on to the extension.
38 • The Committee requested the paving to be clarified on the plans.
39 • The Committee is concerned about the existing concrete and the addition of new concrete because it
40 can subconsciously signal a change in direction.
41 • The Committee inquired about the height of the new area lights and if they will have shielding.
42 • The Committee asked for clarification on the up lighting and which building plane it is intended to
43 illuminate. They also asked if the clock will be lit.
44 • The Committee asked about the cross hatched area on the plans. Ms. Schwartz responded that the
45 cross hatching demotes an existing underground easement that cannot be built over with a structure.
46 • The Committee asked why this project does not fall within the Tustin Street Design Standards. Ms.
47 Schwartz responded that this particular location is not within an area that is not subject to those
48 standards.
49 • The Committee asked if the applicant examined the site lines on the ast into the residential neighbors.
50 • A Committee asked if the Podocarpus was intended as a hedge.
51 • The Committee asked if the second-story parapet will be tall enough to shield rooftop equipment.

- 1 • The Committee asked if the driveway approach into the property will be reduced. Mr. Joy responded
2 that the existing driveway approach will be reduced in order to accommodate parking and
3 landscaping.
- 4 • The Committee asked if the applicant will be submitting a signage plan so they can make sure signs
5 are lit and plants are not blocking the signs or lights. Ms. Schwartz stated that the applicant will bring
6 the signage package back to the DRC for review.
- 7 • The Committee noted that the concept of vibrant colors and the speed/racing analogy is good;
8 however it does not fit in this development contract. The concept is pushed too far and there is too
9 much going on.
- 10 • The Committee commented that the roof sheds could be calmer and flatter.
- 11 • The Committee would like to see a more simplified trash enclosure and suggested using stacked bond
12 with joints that are lined up.
- 13 • There are competing design vocabularies with the ancillary structures.
- 14 • The pay station is a simple, elegant structure and calmer than the main structure. A greater
15 consistency could bring the two together.
- 16 • The Committee commented that the structure is an intriguing art form; however the size and style are
17 not appropriate on Tustin Street and the design does not integrate well in this location. It is a long
18 building, close to the street frontage and needs to be handled carefully. There is too much bulk very
19 close to the street and sidewalk. The human scale also needs to be addressed.
- 20 • The Committee would like to see more contextual information on the surrounding properties.
- 21 • The Committee is concerned that the red exterior color will fade.
- 22 • The Committee is has concerns about the height and massing of the highest portion of the building.
- 23 • The Committee feels the landscape area is too shallow against the residential neighbors, and also
24 noted that it would be nice to get landscape architects to go beyond desert landscape and drought
25 tolerant landscaping because there are number of plants that are suitable to Southern California
26 without giving them a desert landscape.
- 27 • The Committee would like to have the applicant explore the notion of coordinating the location with
28 its surroundings.
- 29 • The Committee noted that there is a disconnect between the landscape plan and the renderings.
- 30 • The Committee noted that the roof forms, as proposed, will probably not end up as pure as what is
31 shown on the drawings.
- 32 • The Committee would like to see clear drawings for the canopies and pay station.
- 33 • The Committee noted that the linearity of the landscape design is distracting and competes with the
34 architecture's strong nature; the landscape should be made stronger and bolder.
- 35 • The Committee is sensitive to light fixtures; particularly with the visibility of the point source.
- 36 • The Committee would like to see the existing site plans when the applicant returns.

37
38 Committee Member Imboden commented that as a matter of practice, more contextual information should be
39 provided by applicants.

40
41 Chair McCormack advised the applicant that the Committee has made comments and recommendations and
42 the applicant should return with more information on the vacuum stalls, pay stations, exterior lighting,
43 landscaping and conceptual signage, in addition to addressing the Committee's comments on the massing and
44 scale of the building.

45
46 Bill Crouch, Community Development Director asked the applicant to bring elevations of neighboring
47 buildings back to the DRC in order for the DRC to get a better context.

48
49 PRELIMINARY REVIEW – NO ACTION REQUIRED.
50

1 (4) DRC No. 4952-18 CATLIN CULVER RESIDENCE

- A proposal to reconstruct a demolished service porch and make other exterior alterations to an existing single-family residence.
- 585 E. Culver Avenue
- Staff Contact: Kelly Ribuffo, 714-744-7223, kribuffo@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

2
3
4

5 Kelly Ribuffo, Associate Planner – Historic Preservation provided an overview of the project consistent with
6 the staff report.

7
8
9

8 Chair McCormack invited the applicant to step forward as if she had anything to add.

10 Tina Catlin, property owner approached and provided a photograph of the proposed windows for the original
11 part of the house for the Committee's review. She explained the house was in very poor condition when she
12 purchased the property. She stated she did not remove the actual structure of the wall of the original porch
13 because she wants to rebuild it to what it was with the parapet wall. She has put a lot of money into the home
14 and she purchased the new windows. She thought they were historically correct and would like to use them
15 and wants to know why it is such a major issue.

16
17 Ms. Catlin stated the prior owner entered in to a Mills Act contract 10 years ago and didn't do any of the
18 work, so she does not know how they qualified for tax relief. She has been told that if she does not correct
19 the windows, she will not receive the tax relief. She is spending approximately \$100,000 on the inside and
20 outside of the home to restore it to its historical design.

21
22 The Committee asked if the intention is to build the porch back to the way it was based on the photographs
23 because the plans that have been provided to the DRC do not include the parapet wall. Ms. Catlin said there
24 will be a parapet wall; she didn't realize it was not on the plan.

25
26 Chair McCormack opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

27
28 Jeff Frankel, representative of the Old Town Preservation Association spoke in opposition to the project and
29 is in agreement with staff's recommendation for denial of the project. He was involved in the previous project
30 involving the same property in 2008 and is not sure if it was built to approved plans. The Sanborn maps are
31 not conclusive evidence that a back porch was not there. The windows should be wood and installed like a
32 Mediterranean style home.

33
34 Mr. Frankel stated the Mills Act Contracts are evergreen and do not expire unless the owner cancels it. A
35 violation of the contract may impose a 12 1/2% penalty of the current value of the home.

36
37 Chair McCormack closed the public comment portion of the meeting and brought it back to the Committee
38 for deliberation.

39
40 Committee questions and comments:

- The Committee was not clear about the windows in the addition versus the remainder of the house. Ms. Ribuffo responded that the applicant's submittal was to only replace the vinyl sliding windows in the main portion of the original footprint of the residence. The applicant does not intend to change the existing windows in the addition that were installed per plans that were approved in 2007. The addition's windows are not double hung like the main residence; they are wood frame windows that are consistent with the design that was approved.
- The Committee agreed that the windows need further investigation and need to be detailed on the plans in order for them to be approved.

48

- 1 • The Committee asked about the discrepancy between the R-1-6 zoning district described in the staff
2 report and the R2 occupancy use. Ms. Ribuffo responded the correct zone is R-1-6 with the square
3 footage of the porch, the property is almost as the maximum Floor Area Ratio requirements for the
4 zone. It will remain a single-family home.
- 5 • The Committee noted that the property owner purchased the property with an existing Mills Act
6 Contract which contained specific obligations. It does not understand why the applicant purchased the
7 windows, and did a partial demolition and reconstruction without speaking to the City first.
- 8 • The Committee is not clear if the windows that have been purchased fit the existing openings of the
9 historic windows. Ms. Ribuffo responded that staff is not sure how the dimensions for the proposed
10 replacement windows were obtained given that investigative work had not been done on all the
11 openings to determine the extent that they were in filled.
- 12 • The Committee stated they do not have any detail on the window installation, including where the
13 window meets the stucco and what kind of trim might be used. Ms. Ribuffo stated the applicant
14 provided some details on sheet A-1.
- 15 • The Committee noted a 1 x 4 trim on the plans; however the historic photo does not appear to have 4'
16 trim boards applied around the exterior.
- 17 • The Committee agreed that it seems as though the applicant is asking to make changes to a historic
18 property that is under a Mills Act Contract which requires it to comply with the Secretary of Interior's
19 Standards, yet the windows in the details that are shown do not comply with the Secretary of
20 Interior's standards. The Committee is not sure how they can make the findings to approve the
21 request.
- 22 • The Committee agreed that the Sanborn maps cannot be used as evidence about the age of the porch.
23 However, the porch currently lacks integrity, because it has been taken apart and rebuilt.
- 24 • The Committee is not sure how they can approve a design when the applicant has confirmed that what
25 will be built does not match the drawings in front of the Committee.
- 26 • The Committee agreed there are too many unanswered questions and they are not able to approve the
27 project and would prefer to continue it instead of denying it so that the applicant can work on these
28 issues.
- 29 • The Committee asked if the work plan was submitted by the owner before or after Code Enforcement
30 took action. Ms. Ribuffo stated it was done after; staff requested that it be submitted as part of the
31 Design Review Committee application knowing that the contract's rehabilitation plan only went to
32 2017.
- 33 • The Committee expressed its dismay when work proceeds without following the process to obtain
34 permits and submitting the proper plans. If that had been done, the applicant would not have had to
35 lay out such an expense. Notification of the Mills Act Contract had to have been provided during
36 escrow and the property owner would have known about the expectations.
- 37 • The Committee asked the applicant if the pictures of the windows that she provided to the Committee
38 this evening are the style she intends to use. Ms. Catlin responded that she went to the contractor's
39 home on Pine Street who has the same style Mediterranean home. She purchased the same windows
40 that he had on his home because she thought they were an exact match. She explained that they
41 removed the piece of wood to gain access to the original opening to the house and purchased the
42 windows based on what they saw.
- 43 • The Committee stated all of the windows need to be shown on the plans.
- 44 • The Committee stated that the photographs provided by Ms. Catlin show more than one window
45 style. The Committee asked what kind of muntin pattern is on the window. The muntin pattern in the
46 historic photograph does not match the muntin pattern that is drawn on the plans. The windows that
47 are drawn on the elevations have crossed lines and there's not an accurate depiction of what the
48 windows will look like. The Committee would like to see the three-part window on the front of the
49 home as show in the survey photograph.
- 50 Ms. Catlin restated she copied the exact windows from the contractor's home on Pine Street.

- 1 • The Committee stated the mullion patterns are completely at variance with what the doors look like.
2 Ms. Catlin stated she found the door in the garage and assumed it was the original door.
- 3 • The Committee stated the proposed side windows have a Craftsman detail in the way the muntins are
4 divided arranged that is not typical of a Spanish Colonial Revival house.
- 5 • The Committee would like to see the proper three-panel muntin pattern on the windows on the front
6 of the home as shown in the historic photograph.
- 7 • The Committee asked staff if they had a real historic photograph or if it was just a digital image. Ms.
8 Moshier stated she was not sure and will look into the file.
- 9 • The Committee agreed they cannot make the three findings needed to approve the project and their
10 main concern is the front windows.
- 11 • The Committee stated the applicant has an approvable approach to rebuild the service porch;
12 however, the drawings do not show what is being requested.
- 13 • Committee Member Fox offered her set of plans with her notes to assist staff.

14
15 Chair McCormack stated the Committee appeared to want to entertain a continuance in order to allow the
16 applicant to work with staff to correct the drawings, show the existing conditions, and to coordinate the plan
17 and elevations together so that the Committee knows exactly what is proposed. They should also study the
18 proposed windows for consistency with the historic photograph. He asked the applicant if she wanted to
19 continue the item.

20
21 Rick Moser, designer and structural engineer for the applicant approached. He stated it is a concrete masonry
22 house that has stucco on the outside. The detail of the window sash is correct.

23
24 Mr. Moser stated the applicant has gone back and forth with staff. The applicant submitted plans, and staff
25 sent them back with comments in blocks and squares, but staff never said what they liked or didn't like on the
26 drawings, what they liked better or say what the applicant should do. It's very hard to have direction when
27 you're not getting any. He is willing to do anything; he just needs to be told what the City wants. He took off
28 all the trim and exposed the aluminum windows that were there. The windows that Ms. Catlin purchased were
29 measured to fit the original opening. He can match the stucco; he just needs the DRC to tell him what they
30 want. The parapet will be restored back to the way the porch was; if the DRC has a picture of what they want,
31 they can give him the picture and he'll re-draw it to look like what it was before.

32
33 Chair McCormack offered to have one of the Committee Members meet the applicant at the house and review
34 the proposal in person.

35
36 Bill Crouch, Community Development Director suggested that staff could accompany the DRC Member.

37
38 Committee Member Imboden stated he previously met with Ms. Catlin to look at windows at one of her other
39 properties. It is generally up to the applicant to hire professionals who have expertise in historic properties to
40 provide solutions to the problems; it is not up to the DRC to solve the problems. Ms. Catlin has been through
41 the Design Review process in Orange before and knows how it works. The Committee Members all agreed
42 they cannot understand the drawings. There seems to be a serious disconnect between the applicant owning a
43 Mills Act historic property and her not being able to meet with the Preservation Planners to bring forward a
44 project to the DRC for approval. Ms. Catlin mentioned all the money that she has spent on the property; the
45 purpose of the Mills Act is to give property owners relief to take care of the property.

46
47 Ms Catlin stated she has met with Ms. Mosher and Ms. Ribuffo several times; they kept asking for more
48 information and she or Mr. Moser could not get to the bottom of what she needed to do. She wants them to
49 tell her exactly what she needs to do so she do not have to keep going back and forth.

50
51 A Committee Member stated that the drawings need to be corrected for drafting errors.
52

1 Ms Catlin responded that she would just like more direction from the Historical Preservation Planners as to
2 what they can or cannot approve. She stated she will go back to the drawing board and try again but she do
3 not want to be put down by everybody on the Committee for all the effort she's put into the house. She should
4 have been told to hire an architectural specialist from the beginning.

5
6 Chair McCormack stated they can have staff and someone on the Committee go to the home to provide input.

7
8 Mr. Crouch stated he will work with the Committee and staff to meet with the applicant.

9
10 Committee Member Skorpanich made a motion to continue DRC No. 4952-18, Catlin Culver Residence in
11 order to provide a site visit with a Member of the DRC and staff.

12
13 **SECOND:** Imboden
14 **AYES:** Fox, Imboden, McCormack, McDermott, and Skorpanich
15 **NOES:** None
16 **ABSENT:** None

17 **MOTION CARRIED.**
18

1 (5) DRC No. 4955-18 – PHILZ COFFEE

- 2 • A proposal to convert an existing 1,665 square foot auto repair shop to a coffee shop with associated
- 3 parking lot and landscaping improvements.
- 4 • 202 N. Glassell Street, Old Towne Historic District
- 5 • Staff Contact: Marissa Moshier, 714-744-7243, mmoshier@cityoforange.org
- 6 • DRC Action: Final Determination

7
8 Marissa Moshier, Historic Preservation Planner provided an overview of the proposed coffee shop consistent
9 with the staff report.

10
11 Chair McCormack invited the applicant to step forward.

12
13 Mel Findley, Philz Vice President of Real Estate, provided an overview and history of the Philz Coffee.

14
15 Chair McCormack opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

16
17 Erica Nelles, architect approached and introduced herself.

18
19 Josefina Garcia, Philz Senior Construction Manager, introduced herself.

20
21 Jeff Frankel, representing the Old Town Preservation Association, spoke in favor of the project.

22
23 Chair McCormack closed the public comment portion of meeting and brought it back to the Committee for
24 deliberation.

25
26 Committee questions and comments:

- 27 • The Committee Members all agreed it was a great project and that the applicant did a very good job in
- 28 addressing the concerns that the Committee has for these types of buildings.
- 29 • The Committee suggested that the area around the new door openings on the west elevation should be
- 30 patched with plaster and set in slightly from the face of the concrete block in order to see where the
- 31 original windows were.
- 32 • The Committee asked if the raised planters in front of the building are permanent or removable. Ms.
- 33 Nelles stated they are all permanent.
- 34 • The Committee was pleased to see that parking was reduced in order to provide more landscaping.
- 35 • The Committee asked if there will be an address on the building. Ms. Moshier responded that Fire and
- 36 Police will weigh in on the code requirements for the minimum size, placement and lighting of the
- 37 address.
- 38 • The Committee asked how the porcelain enamel panels will be prepped for painting. Ms. Nelles
- 39 stated the panels will be prepped with an acrylic primer with no sanding or scouring.
- 40 • The Committee asked about the thickness of the cantilevered canopy. M. Nelles stated it is existing
- 41 canopy.
- 42 • The Committee had a slight concern that the yellow fabric canopies may draw attention away from
- 43 the building because they are so large and bright. Ms. Nelles responded that the yellow color is used
- 44 throughout Philz establishments.
- 45 • The Committee asked staff if all of the landscaping was a City requirement. Ms. Moshier explained
- 46 the standard code requirement for planters between the sidewalk and parking spaces was not feasible
- 47 at the site, so they worked with the applicant to obtain a reasonable landscape planter size that
- 48 improves the conformity of the site and still provides a functional parking lot.
- 49 • A Committee Member was concerned that the amount of landscaping being added eliminates some of
- 50 the historic context. It did not look like a 1950's service station with the landscaping in the
- 51 renderings.

- 1 • The Committee discussed the design and materials of the pedestrian path. They would like to see a
2 wider entry walkway from Glassell Street to avoid pedestrians walking in the driveway.
- 3 • The Committee suggested replacing the Strawberry trees with London Plane trees or Tabaulias to let
4 the building stand out in a simple land scape palette.
- 5 • The Committee liked the shrub plants that were selected.
- 6 • The Committee asked if a lighting plan will be submitted. Ms. Nelles responded that they don't have
7 any proposed site lighting in the parking lot. Two light poles that are currently on the property will be
8 relocated and the building has three bays with glazed garage doors that will allow the interior light to
9 flood the patio.
- 10 • The Committee recommended that the applicant evaluate up lighting for the trees or path lighting for
11 the pedestrians.
- 12 • The Committee has concerns about the wall of Cypress trees along the driveway that goes out onto
13 Glassell; it will not provide visibility for pedestrians. Ms. Moshier stated the Traffic Division
14 reviewed the plans and did not express any concerns because it is an existing driveway.
- 15 • The Committee recommended a traffic-calming device in the pavement to slow down traffic.
- 16 • The Committee recommended some kind of visual or textural change to indicate to the drivers that
17 they are entering into a pedestrian zone, i.e. when tires rumble it slows people down. Ms. Nelles
18 agreed to apply a rougher paving surface to signal those specific zones.
- 19 • The Committee stated a zero curb can also be helpful in the pedestrian zone.
- 20 • The Committee suggested increasing the 4 x 3 pedestrian stepping pads to 5 x 3 and to add two more
21 at the back of the sidewalk. Ms. Nelles agreed to add the larger 5 x 3 pads in order to encourage
22 pedestrians to use the access that is provided by the paver stones.
- 23 • The Committee stated they did not want the vinyl sign material. Ms. Garcia responded that they want
24 an acrylic sign instead of vinyl so that the mug can glow.
- 25 • The Committee discussed the neon lighting on the aluminum pylon sign and the possible lack of
26 contrast.
- 27 • The Committee stated there is a small parapet on the roof and is concerned about visibility of
28 equipment. Ms. Nelles stated there will not be any equipment on the roof; the condensers will be on
29 the ground behind the building.

30
31 Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve DRC No. 4955-18, Minor Site Plan Review 0956-18 and
32 Administrative Adjustment 0265 – 18, Philz Coffee based on the findings and conditions in the staff report
33 with the additional conditions and recommendations as follows:

34 Conditions:

- 35 1. The new doors at the restrooms shall have a plaster finish inset from the plane of the concrete
36 block in the infill area above the head of the doors on the west elevation.
- 37 2. There shall be a paving change in the drive aisle at the exit towards Glassell, and at the
38 crossing of the pedestrian path in front of the building.
- 39 3. The cup on the pylon sign shall not be vinyl as indicated on the material board and shall be
40 acrylic or paint, at the applicant's discretion.

41 Recommendations:

- 42 1. The applicant should consider uplit trees to help promote site lighting.
- 43 2. The applicant should work with staff on the building address prior to its placement on the
44 building.
- 45 3. The pedestrian path in paving stones should be widened to 5 feet. An additional paving stone
46 should be added on either side of the first stone at the back of the sidewalk on Glassell Street.
- 47 4. The Strawberry tree may be substituted with the Pink Trumpet or a London Plane tree.
- 48 5. The applicant should study the neon on the pylon sign to ensure that the letters are legible.

49
50 **SECOND:** Skorpanich
51 **AYES:** Fox, Imboden, McCormack, McDermott, and Skorpanich

1 **NOES:** None
2 **ABSENT:** None

3
4 **MOTION CARRIED.**

5 Committee Member Imboden thanked the applicant for doing such a great job with the details on the project.

6
7 Bill Crouch, Community Development Director endorsed Mr. Imboden's comments and thanked staff and the
8 applicant for all their hard work.
9

10
11
12

