



# CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH LIBRARY LECTURE HALL DESIGN COMMITTEE ZOOM MEETING AGENDA

[https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_1tnHjXMcTCq5m42LRE6Eow](https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_1tnHjXMcTCq5m42LRE6Eow)

Wednesday, February 3, 2021 - 1:00 PM

## ***Library Lecture Hall Design Committee Members:***

**Mayor Diane B. Dixon**  
**Karen Clark**  
**Janet Ray**  
**Jill Johnson-Tucker**  
**Matthew Witte**

## **Staff Members:**

**Peter Tauscher, Senior Civil Engineer**

---

The Library Lecture Hall Design Committee meeting is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act. Among other things, the Brown Act requires that the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee agenda be posted at least seventy-two (72) hours in advance of each regular meeting and that the public be allowed to comment on agenda items before the Committee and items not on the agenda but are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee. The Chair may limit public comments to a reasonable amount of time, generally three (3) minutes per person.

The City of Newport Beach's goal is to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in all respects. If, as an attendee or a participant at this meeting, you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, we will attempt to accommodate you in every reasonable manner. Please contact Peter Tauscher, Senior Civil Engineer, at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting to inform us of your particular needs and to determine if accommodation is feasible at (949) 644-3316 or [ptauscher@newportbeachca.gov](mailto:ptauscher@newportbeachca.gov).

## **NOTICE REGARDING PRESENTATIONS REQUIRING USE OF CITY EQUIPMENT**

Any presentation requiring the use of the City of Newport Beach's equipment must be submitted to the Library Services Department 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.

### **I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

### **II. ROLL CALL**

### **III. NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC**

*Public comments are invited on agenda and non-agenda items generally considered to be within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee. Speakers must limit comments to three (3) minutes. Before speaking, we invite, but do not require, you to state your name for the record. The Library Lecture Hall Design Committee has the discretion to extend or shorten the speakers' time limit on agenda or non-agenda items, provided the time limit adjustment is applied equally to all speakers. As a courtesy, please turn cell phones off or set them in the silent mode.*

### **IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

#### **1. Public Comments**

### **V. CONSENT CALENDAR**

#### **1. Approval of Minutes -**

[LLHDC Draft Minutes 12/07/2020](#)

### **VI. CURRENT BUSINESS**

1. Project review

2. Robert Coffee and the architectural team presentation and discussion of possible interior and exterior layouts to the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee

3. Continued discussion of project schedule, programming and concepts

VII. MATTERS WHICH COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT



# CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH LIBRARY LECTURE HALL DESIGN COMMITTEE MINUTES

Monday, December 7, 2020 1:00 PM via Zoom

## I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

## II. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker, Vice Chair Janet Ray, Karen Clark, Council Member Diane Dixon, Matthew Witte (arrived at 1:56 p.m.)

Absent: None

## III. NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

None.

## IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Jim Mosher noted he tried to call the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee's activity to the attention of the Arts Commission and asked whether the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee received input from the Arts Committee.

Ms. Deborah Allen responded to Chair Johnson-Tucker's question regarding public in the audience.

## V. CONSENT CALENDAR

### 1. *Approval of Minutes*

A motion was made by Vice Chair Ray, and was seconded by Committee Member Clark to approve the *Draft Minutes of the October 26, 2020, Library Lecture Hall Design Committee Meeting, as corrected*.

The motion carried unanimously with the following vote:

AYES: Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker, Vice Chair Janet Ray,  
Committee Member Karen Clark, Council Member Diane Dixon

NOES: None

ABSENT: Committee Member Matthew Witte

ABSTAIN:

## VI. CURRENT BUSINESS

### 1. *Project Review*

Mr. Bob Coffee introduced the team who would present. He stated Jeff Miller would begin the presentation and lead the Design Committee through various audiovisual components of the project. He would be followed by Bill Raben who would present on the Bamboo Courtyard and drop off area and address various comments previously received from the Committee.

Mr. Coffee met with the Signature Rentals Group and received input regarding the courtyard and would be providing exhibits to the Committee regarding the same.

Finally, Mr. Coffee stated he would be discussing the various architectural refinements to the building such as materials, and would provide renderings dealing with entering, the elevation off of Avocado Ave., and several options to solve the undulating wall including how it affects the interior of building and how it looks at night.

**2. Robert Coffee and the architectural team presentation and discussion of possible interior and exterior layouts to the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee**

Mr. Miller addressed the list of requirements provided by Meg Linton and Tim Hetherton. He explained they would be discussing systems design today and equipment would be discussed during the next design phase at a later time.

He explained the overriding goals are simplicity, quality and flexibility to both do a variety of tasks, and the flexibility to be adaptable and upgradable.

Mr. Miller noted the he recommends a single direct view display and LED wall behind the presenter. He explained that a direct view display is preferred over a projector because the direct view would eliminate issues with natural light in the room. He explained the LED wall allows for almost any amount of natural light which gives the architect team a lot of flexibility. He also explained it provides a better sightline with one screen instead of requiring multiple screens.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked how big the screen would be and asked whether all films could be played

Mr. Miller explained that the system is made of a lot of modules with no frame so it appears to be one screen. In this case, standard calculations say that somewhere between a nine-foot-tall and sixteen-foot-wide screen and ten-foot-tall by eighteen-foot-wide screen would work well. He asked what the source of older film and movies would be. He explained anything that can be played on a video format could be projected on the LED screen, but film from a film projector could not be played on the screen but would require a projector.

He explained the room could be equipped with the required hooks for a screen, if desired.

Council Member Diane Dixon explained the Community Room in the Civic Center with the projector was inadequate, and was upgraded with an LED which works a lot better.

Mr. Miller gave an example of a project at Harvard that has a small rack in an equipment room to use different types of technology. He explained how other equipment can be kept in a small amount of space.

Mr. Miller also touched on the topic of screens to see the presenter. He noted that from the presenter to the back row is fifty feet and so not very distant. He noted image magnification is typically used in very big rooms or in rooms with a layout where there are visibility problems. Mr. Miller explained the library lecture hall does not have either problem and the presenter will be visible. He recommended not to use image magnification.

Mr. Hetherton stated the Library would like to have a camera system in addition to the magnification.

Ms. Linton asked whether something will cover the LED screen in case they do not want the screen to be the background.

Mr. Miller explained the wall would be designed to where the LED screen is integrated but so it has panels that can be slid over the screen.

Ms. Linton asked how fragile the LED screen is.

Mr. Miller explained screens are different but noted the typical screen would not be damaged by finger touches. Ultimately, he stated, normal day to day interaction of people would not damage the screen.

Mr. Miller explained their consideration to have cameras to show presentations to people who are not in the room. He demonstrated some examples such as a recital hall at St. Andrews University. He explained this would necessitate a control booth that would serve multiple purposes such as a space for camera controls and monitoring livestream. Mr. Miller noted this space should be enclosed. Mr. Miller explained the space could also be equipped for podcasting.

Chair Johnson-Tucker explained that It is a shame that the box would be an eyesore but it seems to be imperative to have in a lecture hall.

Mr. Miller agreed the box is necessary and stated, unfortunately, there is no option to place the box behind the backwall so it will be a free-standing element. He noted that on the bright side, the physical element in that location will help acoustically.

Mr. Hetherton confirmed a folding table has been difficult to manage in the Friend's Room.

Mr. Miller stated a space can be created for a camera and a camera operator and a hand-tilt camera can be placed on the wall. He expressed the hand-tilt camera is more compact and simpler but it might be difficult to follow someone around the stage.

Diane Dixon agreed the box is an eyesore and asked it be made as small and minimal as possible.

Ms. Linton noted her concerns with having to accommodate different types of technology during a specific event without a designated area. She opined having a box is simply part of having performance space.

Council Member Diane Dixon commented normally they are dressed nicely and blend in with the surroundings.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked whether there is more room close to the setback.

Mr. Bob Coffee suggested that the ancillary room with the server not be directly adjacent to the control room. He pointed out an alternate space for the control room could be adjacent to the ramp if some of the technology equipment is relocated.

Mr. Miller agreed that is a possibility and noted he would like to explore architectural opportunities with Mr. Coffee.

Ms. Linton asked that the Committee and architect team consider the end user and the need to support this system.

Mr. Miller clarified only maintenance type equipment would be relocated.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked Mr. Coffee to work with Mr. Miller to make the space less visible.

Mr. Coffee asked Mr. Miller to talk about the acoustical aspects.

Mr. Miller asked whether the Committee expects there will be presentations without a microphone.

Ms. Linton opined a microphone would be used for groups of 50 or larger.

Mr. Miller noted the difficulty of not using a microphone is that assisted listening still has to be provided and it is too difficult to not have a microphone. He noted that because this is a multi-purpose room, they need to consider not having a curved backwall and consider the acoustics and how loud they are for average music events. He stated they need to provide enough volume in the room for a person who speaks to be heard but at the same time provide the ability for someone to play instruments without it being too loud.

Council Member Diane Dixon asked whether microphones in the ceiling would be a possibility.

Mr. Miller confirmed there are various options with regards to microphones and acoustics. He stressed the importance of flexibility for the room.

Mr. Mosher commented that anybody entering the lecture hall on the back ramp will see the box as a fairly large visual intrusion and asked that the Committee consider pushing it against the wall and having the tan curved ramp wrap around the box so the box would at all times be behind patrons. He opined that would create a more welcoming space. Mr. Mosher did not understand why the continuous screen would be fragile because it does not have a glass surface. He also commented that the film festival would probably consider the venue for their seminar series.

Committee Member Matthew Witte opined the doors to the box should be placed on the other side.

Mr. Raben, Landscape Architect, discussed his plans for the courtyard as reflected by the updates discussed during the city meeting on November 10, 2020. The following were the topics covered: it was noted that if they start on the upper north end, an important comment was to extend the courtyard paving treatment into the north court so it was consistent with the rest of the space. Another key element dealt with keeping the space more uniform in terms of the paving surface in order to allow flexibility for uses. Also considered was an option for the focal element as a water wall feature and maintenance issues were considered and discussed. In addition, they also discussed fixed raised seat wall areas around certain trees and those were changed from planters to provide more flexibility. Finally, he discussed the plaza entry area, its seating, the drop-off area and its zero-curb condition.

Council Member Diane Dixon asked regarding the trees along the east side and the decorative plaza concrete pavers.

Mr. Raben explained the plaza can be made more sophisticated with attractive pavers.

He continued to discuss tree layouts and Signature Rentals layout options. The first option demonstrated seating layouts for a sit-down dinner with larger tables. This option also provides an opportunity to provide a sense of separation between the various spaces. Mr. Raben also showed a portrayal of the first option from the backside showing the north court to set up the event itself. Mr. Raben clarified these examples take COVID restrictions into account and allow for 100 people and without COVID restrictions, the space would accommodate twice as many guests.

The second layout provides space for cocktails and also provides a sense of separation between spaces. The second layout contains umbrellas and portable furniture for lounge-type seating and a bar.

Mr. Raben described the third and final option which provides the opportunity for a covered space with an entry-extension. He explained how the tent structures would work with the trees

and clarified this would work for both the larger table layouts and cocktails and could accommodate 250 people.

Committee Member Matthew Witte commented the space is L-shaped and a fixed tree at the top of the north-south axis would not allow for a stage or music setup there, which is the space with best visibility.

Chair Johnson-Tucker agreed with Committee Member Witte.

Mr. Raben showed an open schematic with trees within the grates and an example of the trees with the pavers and discussed lighting. He discussed replacing the original water wall with fire elements which require little maintenance. He further discussed movable benches with sculptural features and the tree grates which reflect the direction of the paving. Mr. Raben provided examples of potential fixed features to help direct people when they arrive and frame the plaza. He provided various examples of lighting options to provide dramatic effects in the evening.

Mr. Raben continued to discuss walls to refine the space and the potential of including a trellis element and a photo opportunity. He commented that deciduous trees would be a nice feature in this area. Finally, Mr. Raben discussed the use of grass along Avocado Avenue.

Committee Member Witte opined this discussion was premature if the Committee hasn't settled on the materials of the building because that will dictate the landscaping.

Mr. Coffee explained his blueprints have been coordinated with Mr. Raben.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted that the benches around the palm trees might also want to face the library. She also noted the placement of trees affect the ability to use tents. She commented she is unsure about the fireplace.

Council Member Diane Dixon agreed the Committee should look at the design.

Committee Member Clark thanked Mr. Raben for listening to the Committee's comments and incorporating them into this proposal. She also noted she loves liquid ambers.

Vice Chair Ray asked for clarification regarding the passenger drop off and asked whether a vehicle would drive over the pavers and whether the pavers would get dirty.

Mr. Coffee explained it is the same as the City Hall area.

Mr. Raben noted the pavers used for auto access are denser and more resistant to staining.

Mr. Coffee explained the alternative is black asphalt which would not look as nice.

Mr. Mosher emphasized that although the courtyard will occasionally be used for events connected to the lecture hall, it will remain a part of the library where it will be used more often. He asked for it to be a welcoming library amenity as well as an event space, and the water feature is efficient and not costly to be run all the time, which would add to the ambiance to the library instead of the fire that would only be turned on during special events. He also commented that he loves sycamores but liquid ambers drop spiky golf ball-like leaves seed pods and they create root problems.

Ms. Allen, President of the Harbor View Hills Community Association, noted the original library lights positioned to shine upwards created a problem for the Association and had to be capped. She asked that lights are capped and hooded at the top so they do not emit-light into the Association's neighborhood. She is concerned the Association homes would see the lights in the drop off area. She also stressed that any landscaping and trees would have to conform to

the height plan ordinance which limits landscaping to thirty-two feet and not to exceed the height plane.

Mr. Coffee explained the highest portion of the roof on the lecture hall is lower than the elevation on the Friend's Room.

Mr. Coffee then moved on to discuss the architecture. He noted the ramp was changed to take away the curve and demonstrated some of the primary materials. Mr. Coffee noted his approach is to let the undulating wall be an iconic portion of the building and discussed how the building reflects the City Hall more than the library. He described the entryway with the drop off and the glass wall.

Mr. Coffee then moved on to discuss the courtyard and the stone used as well as the pattern on the façade. He opined the back of the space needs to have a specific feature.

For the building, he demonstrated four schemes. The first scheme uses a vertical fin which could be steel or glass. The steel would have a special paint job. The second scheme uses a glass that shifts colors. The third scheme uses perforated panels and the patterns created on the inside. The last scheme also uses a perforated metal system that will provide a see-through pattern. He discussed the shingle elements and how they are used for the pathway leading to the library.

Committee Member Witte noted all the schemes use a certain glassed curtain wall system that has an overlay of some type of metal panel.

Mr. Coffee confirmed the schemes would require a glazing system or a secondary-support element for a rain screen would be needed.

Committee Member Witte commented that curved glass would be extremely expensive and asked the Committee to take into account the material of the wall and the implications of the design on acoustics and other interior elements. He wondered if the building would actually look like the proposals. Committee Member Witte commented he was satisfied with the color palette and the direction the architectural team is taking the project.

Mr. Coffee confirmed each piece of glass would not be curved. He noted the project has moved away from a performance hall to a lecture hall.

Council Member Diane Dixon stated she was pleased with the concept and commended the architectural team. She noted she does not like the green upholstery.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked about the angling of the walls.

Committee Member Witte explained how the vertical elements on the wall work together to affect light, the façade, and visibility. He explained how the sun would affect the light. He clarified he did not care for the fourth scheme.

The other members of the Committee agreed.

Council Member Diane Dixon voiced her concerns regarding visibility when the sun reflects into the building.

Mr. Coffee stated their goal is to return to the Committee in January 2021 and finalize schematic designs to present to the Council and Irvine Company. He noted final decisions need to be made.

Committee Member Clark noted her concern with how transparent the wall is.

The Committee further discussed angles with the architecture team.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted she preferred the scheme with the angles.

Committee Member Witte suggested the Committee make a decision regarding transparency and think about what to do about the fins.

Mr. Coffee noted an alternative exists to create a pattern with fritted the glass.

Committee Member Witte agreed fritted glass is a good suggestion.

The Committee will reunite again in January 2021.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted she liked schemes one and two best.

Committee Member Witte asked that the Committee consider scheme three with variations.

Committee Member Clark agreed she would like to still consider scheme three with the proposed change.

Mr. Coffee stressed he would like a scheme to be selected in January 2021.

The Committee agreed.

Mr. Mosher asked whether the program schedule would be discussed.

Chair Johnson-Tucker confirmed there is no program schedule to take the project to the Council yet.

**3. *Continued discussion of project schedule, programming and concepts***

Not Applicable.

**VII. MATTERS WHICH COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM)**

None.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Johnson-Tucker adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

**APPROVED BY:**

---

Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker