

BOULEVARD ONE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
July 28, 2022
Video/Audio E-Conference

Attendees:

Committee: Jamie Fogle, Monty Force, Steve Lane, Kevin Yoshida
CK Development: Nick Kitaeff, H McNeish

The meeting convened at 9:30 a.m.

● **Minutes Approval (7/21/22)**

A motion by Jamie Fogle and seconded by Kevin Yoshida was passed to approve the minutes from the July 21, 2022, meeting as presented.

- **CK Development**
Amendment to the Comprehensive Signage Plan (CSP) for Block 7
Continuance from the 7/21/22 meeting

CK provided a chart with the total signage allowed under the CSP and the number that has been used to date. With only two remaining retail tenants and three commercial tenants 44% of allowed signage has been used. Kevin asked for clarification on opportunities vs signs installed. Nick explained that the chart is not tracking total opportunities but demonstrating the actual number of installed signs to the total signs allowed under the CSP. Kevin responded that the DRC is looking at the big picture of build out and in the future when tenancy changes. Nick said that the average lease term is 11.5 years, which is long term commitment from the existing tenants. As configured now the medical tenants have invested a significant amount in tenant finish, therefore want longer lease terms.

A determination was made that most of the changes are cleanup language and that a page-by-page review might not be as productive as a discussion of significant topical changes. The following topics were considered significant to discuss individually:

1) **North G.1 ROW Directory relocated to the N exterior of the Target building.** The addition of a W.5 wall sign might be problematic for the BDRC. There is understanding of the desires of the tenants for marketing space. However, there was a lot of discussion to get Target in general, the blank wall enhancements, the requirement of using white for their logo, etc. There was no anticipation of added signage to already approved architecture.

H wanted to remind the BDRC of the history of two G.1 directory signs in the ROW that were BDRC approved, dependent upon CCD approval. Those signs were ground mounted, double-sided with white lettering with "The Exchange" branding at the top. Nick added that it is more than a marketing desire by the tenants. The lease with Target includes terms to allow signage on the building for other tenants and it is a landlord obligation to provide signage along Quebec primarily for those tenants without

Quebec exposure. Without CCD approval for the G.1 directory located in the ROW there is a delinquency per the leases to solve.

H pointed out that they are asking for 1) removal of the north G.1 ROW sign to be replaced by a W.5 directory sign on the N exterior Target wall near the 1st/Quebec intersection and 2) this is not a new concept to the CSP, just carrying the directory sign to a new location. In the January 2021 CSP the two G.1 signs were BDRC approved in the ROW contingent upon approval from CCD for ROW encroachment. CCD did not give approval, so this newest plan removes the north G.1 ROW directory sign and replaces it with the one on the Target building.

There was further discussion of details of the W.5 sign as compared to the white Target logo, which is 6' in diameter. The directory would have four gray steel panels with white lettering (two tenants are known and two are not known at this time). Kevin said that the visual shown helps and asked if the font would be consistent with no logos. Monty was concerned about past-experience in a couple of instances where signs were in conformance to the CSP, but when installed were not what was expected. He wants to be assured there is sufficient detail about this sign that the end-result meets expectations. Kevin asked if there are lease terms allowing for logos and tenant branding font or can there be consistency in the font with no logos for a cleaner look? Kevin said he leans toward the consistency of font and no logos. Steve commented that in the sample shown and in his mind a directory is different than marketing. He prefers the consistency of a directory and pointed out it is far easier to read the shown example for a directory. Jamie pointed out that the existing two W.5 directory signs located around the site use individual fonts. Kevin added that if the goal is advertising rather than directory, this location would lose its effectiveness as a clean crisp directory.

Monty said there is still a lack of a visual of how it would look on the building. Nick described the dimensions of each panel as 4.5'w x 1'tall with a total of four panels mounted on a metal frame. Nick agreed with the consistency of width and height of the lettering rather than using individual tenant font, making it harder to read. Each name would be backlit. It was suggested that the actual design be brought to the BDRC for its visual impact. Jamie asked if there could be site image to show how it will fit on the wall and blend below the Target logo and above the existing door.

Options for a path forward:

- o Approve the location change in the Amended CSP contingent upon the design being along the lines as discussed; or
- o Add language into the CSP with more detail on the actual design: or
- o Approval of the CSP after having a visual presentation of the design as it would be seen on the wall

Nick said he will be on site next week and can take photos where he can superimpose the W.5 sign into the photo of the wall to show to the committee. Option 3 was agreed upon as the next step.

Time allocation for the meeting was running short with several needing to leave for other obligations. The following were listed as significant changes to be held in reserve for further discussion. Kevin, also

noted that there were changes that he found that did not show up on the “ballooned” red-line version reviewed today

2) South G.1 ROW sign relocation within the property boundary. The relocated sign would be located at the south end of the fire pit near the Lowry Blvd/Quebec intersection. Again, this change was prompted by CCD not allowing encroachment into the ROW. This two-sided sign would have an overall width of 66” with four panels each at 54” w x 13.5” h. with “The Exchange” branding at the top. Rather than the original two G.1 signs proposed in the ROW, there would now be only one G.1 directory sign on Quebec within the property boundary. It was noted that the CSP depiction at the new location was not oriented correctly. Correction will be made showing the sign to be perpendicular to Quebec and read on the north and south faces of the sign.

3) Dimensions in the document for signage allowed within the border of sign space is too small to read or understand. Those dimension restrictions are ignored in the tenant signage submittals or are too confusing for them to understand.

4) New signage opportunity with the connection of the SW building (see page 35 of the CSP). Kevin agreed with the new condition, but said that others might want to weigh in. Others noted that signage would face internal to the site so was not of significant impact.

5) Size of banner signs increased from 2’x4’ to 2’x5’. Did not show up in the “ballooned” version. Don’t know reasoning for the change or if it was just a typo. H said he will look into it and determine why the size changed or just not highlighted as a change. These banners are internal to the site and not the street banners.

6) Torchys unexpected sign impact. Even though the signs are compliant with the CSP, the boldness of the font is not regulated and might need some modification to stabilize future control within the document. The impact is especially glaring when compared to the context of other signs near it.

7) Agreement on use and definition of window graphics opaque film window coverings.

Kevin asked for clarification on the dimensions shown on page 9 of the CSP that were not clear. H said that some of the modifications to the CSP are zoning code language that was inserted and required by CCD.

Further discussion of the referenced significant topics was continued to a meeting on August 4 after 10:00. Editors Note: There was conflict with CK availability on that date and time. The continuance was set for August 10 at 9:30 a.m.

- **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.