



PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

STAFF REPORT

DATE: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022

TO: DESIGN COMMISSION

FROM: JENNIFER PAIGE, AICP, ACTING DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: APPLICATION FOR CONSOLIDATED DESIGN REVIEW
NEW BUILDING IDENTIFICATION SIGNS (LUCAS HORSFALL)
299 NORTH EUCLID AVENUE

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Design Commission:

Environmental Determination

Find that the application for Consolidated Design Review is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15311, Class 11 pertaining to accessory structures which includes the construction of signs for existing commercial facilities, and that there are no features that distinguish this project from others in the exempt class; therefore, there are no unusual circumstances.

Findings for Compliance with the Tree Protection Ordinance

Acknowledge that no protected trees are proposed to be removed in conjunction with this application.

Findings for Consolidated Design Approval

1. Find that, upon implementation of the condition of approval, the proposed project will comply with the design related goals and policies of the Land Use Element of the General Plan, the Design Guidelines in the Central District Specific Plan, and the Sign Design Guidelines; and,
2. Based on these findings, approve the application for Consolidated Design Review as illustrated in Attachment A, subject to the following conditions, which shall be subject to staff review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit:

Conditions:

1. The building identification signs shall be reduced in size to a maximum of 100 square feet per sign, pursuant to Zoning Code Section 17.48.090.C, Table 4-20.
2. Plans submitted for a building permit shall demonstrate that the signs are proportional to the scoring pattern of both building facades.

BACKGROUND:

Project Overview

- General Plan Designation: Medium Mixed Use
- Zoning: CD-2 (Central District Specific Plan; Civic Center/Midtown Subdistrict)
- Design Guidelines: The applicable design guidelines are the design related goals and policies of the Land Use Element of the General Plan, the Design Guidelines in the Central District Specific Plan, and the Sign Design Guidelines.
- Site: The subject building is a five-story commercial building and includes ground floor and subterranean parking. The building is located at the southwest corner of North Euclid Avenue and Corson Street, directly south of Interstate 210, with parking that extends west to North Garfield Avenue. The property is located within the Civic Center/Midtown Subdistrict of the Central District Specific Plan. The surrounding land uses consist primarily of institutional, office, and multi-family residential uses in buildings of varying heights, styles, and ages. The subject building is located on the east side of the property with primary frontage on North Euclid Avenue. The subject building was constructed in 1982 with a design of horizontal bands of scored concrete on the front and rear elevations and tinted glass-curtain wall glazing on the north and south side elevations. The subject building is rectangular in plan, with its long facades facing north and south.
- Project Description: The applicant is proposing to install two new 163 square-foot, back-lit, building identification signs. One sign would be placed on the east elevation of the 77-foot tall building, located at the top of the building, near the northern edge of the facade facing North Euclid Avenue. A second matching sign of the same dimensions would be installed on the west elevation, at the top of the building, near the northern edge of the façade facing North Garfield Avenue. Both building identification signs would be made of aluminum channel letters painted blue with back-lit LED illumination and would read "Lucas Horsfall" with a corresponding logo. Both signs would replace signs previously installed in approximately the same locations.
- Property Owner: Jennifer Zadroga
- Designer: Gevorg Hambardzumyan

ANALYSIS:

Pursuant to PMC Section 17.61.030.K, approval of Consolidated Design Review shall be based on the following findings:

1. *The project's design is consistent with a) The purposes of design review; and b) Any applicable design guidelines adopted by the Council.*

Supporting Design Guidelines:

Central District Specific Plan Area Design Guidelines

BD 3.1: Establish a building's overall appearance on a clear and pleasing set of proportions; a building should exhibit a sense of order.

BD 6.2: Use materials, colors, and details to unify a building's appearance; buildings and structures should be built of compatible materials on all sides.

Sign Design Guidelines

D.2.a.: Sign orientation. For the most part, signs in the CD zoning district should be oriented to the pedestrian. This may include wall signs, projecting signs, and window signs.

D.2.c.: Respect for architectural elements and details. Signs should not cover over architectural elements such as transom windows, vertical piers, or spandrel panels. As major elements of the storefront, signs should fit into the building façade just as if they were one of the architectural elements.

D.3.a.: Location and mounting. (1) Signs should be mounted in locations that respect the design of a building. (2) Wall-mounted signs on fascias above storefront windows should be sized to fit within existing friezes, lintels, spandrels, and other such features and not extend above, below, or beyond them. Typically, wall-mounted signs should be centered on horizontal surfaces.

D.3.b.: Illumination. (1) Internally illuminated cabinet signs are allowed as projecting signs only. Such signs are required to have non-illuminated/opaque face panels so that, only letters and/or logos appear to be back-lighted.

As conditioned, the proposed signage is in compliance with the applicable guidelines. They are attractive, high quality signs that will be placed in locations that are appropriate to the design of the building and will replace signage previously approved in approximately the same locations. To ensure that the new signs respect the design of the building, staff recommends a condition of approval to ensure that the final plans submitted for permitting demonstrate that the signs are proportional to the scoring pattern found on both front and rear elevations.

Pursuant to PMC Section 17.48.090.C, Table 4-20, Part 4, building identification signs are allowed in the Central District provided that the building is greater than 75 feet in height, that the signs are located below the roof or parapet, that a maximum of one building identification sign is

located per wall plane, and a maximum sign area of one square-foot per foot of primary frontage, but not exceeding 100 square-feet. As currently proposed, the building identification signs comply with all standards except sign area. The north and south frontages of the subject building measure approximately 105 feet in length, and the applicant is proposing 163 square feet of sign area for each sign, which exceeds the 100 square-foot sign area maximum. As such, staff recommends a condition of approval requiring that the identification signs be reduced in size to comply with the 100 square-foot size requirement. The signs are proposed to be attached directly to the face of the building wall and a raceway is proposed to be internally-mounted to the concrete wall of the building, with an AC wire pipe running through the wall from one location on the raceway to bring power to the sign.

CONCLUSION:

The proposed new building identification signs are consistent with the applicable Design Guidelines for the CD Zoning District. The scale of the sign elements are appropriate to the scale of the building, the signs are responsive to the building's architecture, and are consistent with the signage previously attached to the building, while accommodating the corporate identity needs of the building's tenant. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the project as conditioned.

Respectfully Submitted,



Jennifer Paige, AICP
Acting Director of Planning and
Community Development

Prepared by:



Robert W. Keatinge
Assistant Planner

Reviewed by:



Kevin Johnson
Principal Planner

Attachment:

A: Plans