



## **CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH LIBRARY LECTURE HALL DESIGN COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**100 Civic Center Drive, Crystal Cove Room (Bay 2D)  
Monday, January 21, 2020 8:00 AM**

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

Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker called the meeting to order at 8:00 am.

### **II. ROLL CALL**

Present: Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker, Vice Chair Janet Ray, Diane Dixon (left early), Karen Clark

Absent: Matthew Witte

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

Mr. Jim Mosher commented on a few non agenda items. He commented regarding the land use restrictions the City Council agreed to on November 19, 2019 with the Irvine Company. He summarized the following restrictions: 10,000 square foot gross area, 74,000 square foot area, a commitment to retain 172 parking spaces, and the complimentary use of the hall to patrons of the library, and the use of the lecture hall as a commercial banquet hall or conference center.

He noted the local independent newspaper, the Newport Beach Independent, conducted a poll regarding the public's desired design features, and asked the Committee to review the results.

Mr. Mosher noted the Library Board would be meeting and next Tuesday, the City Council would appoint a committee to negotiate the private/public funding agreement for the financing of the lecture hall.

Finally, he noted that at the last meeting Mr. Coffee expressed that the architectural group understands not just the goals but also the aspirations for the lecture hall. Mr. Mosher would like to clearly communicate that the aspiration to bring A-list celebrities is at odds with the aspiration to have an inclusive lecture hall and one that is compatible with a free library. He asked that there be free viewing in the Friend's Room.

Chair Johnson-Tucker thanked Mr. Mosher and asked whether the minutes were posted online.

Mr. Mosher confirmed he found the minutes online.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted future conflicts in February for Vice Chair Janet Ray and Committee Member Karen Clark. Committee Member Dixon stated she also had a conflict on February 3, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Coffee noted they would be discussing outdoor spaces at the next meeting. He would also like to talk about goals and the functions of the Bamboo Courtyard.

The Committee agreed to change the meeting to Monday, February 3, 2020 at 3 p.m.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted a conflict on February 18, 2020 for Vice Chair Ray and Committee Member Clark.

Mr. Coffee noted that was an important meeting. The Committee decided to keep meetings for the first and third Monday from one to three between now and August. The Committee decided to skip February 18, 2020 meeting.

Mr. Tauscher agreed to send an email with the calendar.

#### **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted that the Committee did not receive the current Minutes in their packets, and thus a vote on the Minutes would be postponed until the next meeting.

#### **V. CURRENT BUSINESS**

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

Mr. Coffee asked John Von Szeliski and Jeff Miller to go through the list and noted they might have some specific questions.

Mr. Coffee wanted to speak regarding specific requirements people have asked for and various patrons of the Hall and their requisites. The Committee spoke of certain musical groups who requested specific technology.

Mr. Miller asked about the type of groups who would be booked.

Chair Johnson-Tucker also spoke regarding some of the specific union requirements.

Committee Member Dixon asked whether union requirements affect functional space requirements.

The Committee discussed that at times, union needs for staging might imply specific requirements.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted there are committees to try to book speakers and groups to use the hall. She spoke about the way the library books speakers.

Committee Member Dixon asked whether capacity would be expanded.

Meg Linton noted the new space doubles the potential for programming because the Friend's Room could also be used.

Committee Member Dixon spoke about the use of the flex space.

Mr. Coffee confirmed that the Committee would like the ability to use the lecture hall and the Friend's Room at the same time on occasion.

Chair Johnson-Tucker spoke about how useful it will be to be able to use both rooms and expand the capacity.

Ms. Linton spoke about the use of streaming and how beneficial it would be.

Mr. Miller again asked about the type of groups who would be booked. He noted actors and speakers and unions for example, would have different requirements which would influence the facility.

The Committee discussed competitor organizations.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked the Committee to remember this is supposed to be, foremost, a support building for the Library, and that space may not permit all the needs of a full-scale auditorium.

Ms. Linton stated presenters are happy using a conference room and don't have outrageous demands.

Mr. Miller asked the Committee to consider the greater expectations of the lecture hall and to consider the one space that will have to be used for various uses. He asked whether the Committee owns the piano and whether a dedicated piano storage space will be needed.

Mr. Coffee stated the Committee would discuss other spaces to compare their function and what the Committee likes or dislikes from those spaces.

He began by showing the San Diego Library Lecture Hall. He showed the floor, the center and side aisles, and the number of seats.

Committee Member Dixon asked whether seats would be lost with the center aisle.

Mr. Coffee stated some seats are lost but also discussed the visibility to stage. He also discussed the number of steps to stage and further issues with visibility and stage height. He discussed the distance between the front row and the stage providing examples. He spoke about the possibility of taking the first row back and showed examples. Mr. Coffee demonstrated visibility issues and slope, and provided examples such as that at the San Diego Library.

Mr. Coffee showed another example below eye-level. He showed various examples with different numbers of rows such as five or six rows or eleven or ten rows.

Mr. Coffee then proceeded to discuss number of seats. He showed how more seats can be fitted in the back and discussed how three hundred seats are about the maximum number of seats to remain compliant with Code.

Mr. Miller discussed the site point which is the point where everybody can see. He discussed the results and consequences of moving the site point from one location to another.

Mr. Von Szeliski discussed how this point is important to consider for dance performances.

Mr. Miller noted some of the examples' site points are lower. He discussed the implications of the site point for visibility.

Committee Member Dixon asked why the site line isn't to the speaker.

The architectural team discussed the site point is the feet for dance or even playing an instrument.

Chair Johnson-Tucker did note there are events when lecturers are viewed by several hundred attendees. She asked whether the stage could drop.

Mr. Coffee spoke about the complications implicated with a stage dropping. For example, he noted backstage access is difficult.

Mr. Von Szeliski discussed depth and the implications to comfort and the sightline. He asked the Committee to consider the critical balance point.

Committee Member Dixon asked whether this would be a lecture hall or a dance hall.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked whether there would be enough depth in the stage for dancing.

Mr. Coffee noted the Committee would have another opportunity to discuss this and decisions did not have to be made at the moment.

Mr. Miller reemphasized why it is important to know what kind of use the space will have.

Tim Hetherton noted the proportion of dance events to lecture events are about 100 to one.

Mr. Coffee moved on to discuss seating arrangement and how to make the space feel intimate. He and Mr. Miller showed examples of various rooms such as presentational rooms where the stage is in front of all the seating. They discussed slope and sight.

Mr. Coffee noted that four concepts of seating arrangements that would be discussed.

Mr. Von Szeliski showed and explained schemes A – D of images drawn to scale of various arrangement of seating rows and the stage. He discussed the aisles and the view given the arrangement of seats. He discussed side seats, rows of seats, sidelines and depth of stage. Mr. Von Szeliski also discussed the feeling of the room and the goal of keeping the room intimate. Goal of using the full space and also be able to concentrate on the lecturer or the performer.

Mr. Coffee noted it is possible to go around double doors.

Vice Chair Ray asked how far back the seats are.

Mr. Coffee provided an image of the thrust stage, which is a semi-circle.

Mr. Miller pointed out the Harvard School of Business with 1,500 was designed to have a two-way conversation with all 1,500 people. He asked the Committee to think about the way they sell tickets and whether they will be selling general admission tickets or assigned seating.

Ms. Linton discussed the various programs and attendance for each.

Mr. Hetherton said that currently, they do a three-quarter layout with an aisle up the middle and two side aisles. He did note people will sit closer for certain events and not others.

Mr. Miller continued to discuss seating arrangements and how it affects perception. He also discussed the length of rows and how seats will be filled up depending on people's perceptions and how full certain sections of rows feel.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted the areas of thirty-six felt more connected and the two wings in scheme A do not feel like they are part of everything else.

Mr. Von Szeliski asked the Committee to consider seat width and comfort. He asked the Committee to consider usual twenty-one or twenty-two-inch seats.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted the seats in the city council hall feel comfortable.

Mr. Coffee also asked if cupholders and writing tables on the seats are needed.

Ms. Linton stated a lot of venues now allow people to carry drinks.

Mr. Hetherton mentioned the challenge of keeping carpets clean

Vice Chair Ray asked about writing tablets on the seats.

Mr. Coffee stated including those elements on the seats would reduce the available number of seats.

The Committee considered whether they should or should not allow drinks inside the hall.

Mr. Miller asked the Committee what they meant by "film."

Ms. Linton noted they would like to show movies once in a while. They would like the capacity to use DVD's or project presentations or films.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked whether the film festivals could be accommodated.

Ultimately, the Committee noted they would like flexibly with technology.

Chair Johnson-Tucker spoke about whether it is possible to use the space as council chambers when a lot of people attend.

Mr. Miller noted duplicating the agenda and voting system would be difficult.

Mr. Coffee asked whether the Committee could determine whether they could choose between scheme A – D.

Vice Chair Ray eliminated scheme A because the rows are too long.

Chair Johnson-Tucker agreed with Vice Chair Ray.

Mr. Von Szeliski stated it is an intimate width and depth but it is a separate section from the main group.

The Committee discussed scheme B.

Ms. Linton stated she likes the way the stairs in scheme B flow into the aisle. She asked the Committee to consider the challenge to older patrons w long aisles.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted the Harvard Business School example seems comfortable even if it is a large space. She noted she likes scheme C because it is more circular than schemes A and B.

Mr. Miller asked whether film festivals would fill all the seats or encompass a smaller group.

Ms. Linton spoke of the difficulty with visibility and the side seats of a thrust stage.

The architectural team noted the Committee is inclined for a lower stage and likes some elements of thrust but does not prefer a thrust stage.

Mr. Coffee asked the Committee to consider lighting and interior finishes and whether they want the space to feel warm or not. He provided the Committee with renderings as examples and discussed the same.

Vice Chair Ray stated she likes the glass.

Chair Johnson-Tucker stated she would like for the space to feel brighter in the daytime.

Ms. Linton stated she likes lighting all the way around.

Mr. Coffee asked the Committee to consider illumination and the view.

Mr. Miller asked the Committee to consider reflections.

Chair Johnson-Tucker opened the floor to public comments.

Mr. Mosher discussed adding power to the seats and the way the idea was received for the City Chambers. He guessed film making seminars might be considered for the lecture hall. He noted it

is important to discuss seating arrangement horizontally. He discussed the struggle to keep natural light.

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

None.

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

No matters were proposed.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Johnson-Tucker adjourned the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

**APPROVED BY:**

---

Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker