CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

October 5, 2011

Committee Members Present:	Bill Cathcart Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett
Committee Members Absent:	None
Staff in Attendance:	Alice Angus, Community Development Director Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner Lucy Yeager, Contract Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Cathcart opened the Administrative Session at 5:11 p.m.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there were no changes to the Agenda or any additional information to impart.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of September 21, 2011. Corrections and changes were noted.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session of the Design Review Committee meeting.

SECOND:	Craig Wheeler
AYES:	Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members present and there is one open seat on the Design Review Committee.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Opportunity for members of the public to address the Design Review Committee on matters not listed on the Agenda.

All matters that are announced as Consent Items are considered to be routine by the Design Review Committee and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of said items unless members of the Design Review Committee, staff, or the public request specific items to be removed from the Consent Items for separate action.

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 21, 2011

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting of September 21, 2011 with changes and corrections as noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4563-11 - PCH HOT DOGS

- A proposal to replace one awning on the north elevation.
- 3438 E. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- Continued from DRC Meeting of August 17, 2011
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, John Tomberlin, address on file, was present for questions.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he thought the proposal before them was very responsive to the DRC's concerns. There were challenges.

Mr. Tomberlin stated the awning sloped pretty steep from the sidewalk.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on both the right and left side elevations it appeared as though the last segment was angled slightly different. He pointed out the area he was speaking to on the drawings.

Applicant, Benito Corona, address on file, stated the top of the sidewalk sloped down to the parking; it followed the grade line.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if it could be raised with the slope being a little less and it could remain horizontal?

Mr. Tomberlin stated the valance would be soft on the bottom; it was rigid for 7" and then was soft.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would be unfortunate if it was horizontal and then slightly dipped. It would be better if the horizontal visible edge was straight and it would not appear as if it was a mistake.

Mr. Benito stated there was about a 1" slope.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the connection between the very steep roof and the fabric that came up to it, he asked if it was all one piece of fabric that would be tucked under and attached? He asked if the metal bar would be visible?

Mr. Benito stated the bar would not be visible.

Mr. Tomberlin demonstrated how the material of the valance would fold over with 2" of soft valance. The fabric would wrap around the tubing and there would be a flashing at the order window.

Committee Member McCormack stated the water could come through all of it.

Mr. Tomberlin stated yes, in a hard rain it would. It was underneath the eave and if there was a driving rain with wind there would be water under there. But most people would not stop in that type of weather. The goal was UV protection as the umbrellas were not doing it for them. At 12:00/noon they worked, but not at any other time of day.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4563-11, PCH Hot Dogs, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the additional condition:

1. The valance of the awning shall be horizontal the entire distance around and not to slope down as presented in the drawings.

SECOND: Joe Woollett
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4398-08 – FLAPPY JACK'S RESTAURANT (MODIFICATION)

- A proposal to modify the approved finish color scheme and materials on an existing commercial property for a new restaurant.
- 2848 N. Santiago Boulevard
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- Previous DRC Reviews: October 21, 2009 & February 3, 2010
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Ted Romios, address on file, was present for questions.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett asked the applicant what exactly was a "Route 66" theme?

Mr. Romios stated the inside theme was Route 66. The other location was in Glendora on Route 66 and the theme was Route 66. They wanted to go with the 1950's theme and a Hollywood theme and some Route 66.

Committee Member Woollett stated there were some inconsistencies that had not existed before with the Mission tile roof and the new tile for the building wall that was selected; if they had seen it before they may have spoke about the tile a bit more. He could see why the tile wall would not be appropriate in today's market to have a 1960-1970's style with the tan stucco and the Mission tile; however, he had not thought it was worth making an issue of it.

Committee Member McCormack asked Staff what they had been uncomfortable with?

Mr. Garcia stated with the overall color changes being different than what had been approved by the DRC, Staff was not comfortable making a decision at a Staff level.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was a dramatic change.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated if something was off just a shade or two Staff could make the determination, however, the project before them was very different from what had been initially presented.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the colors were a bit jarring, but for something such as a restaurant they should be allowed to do something that would attract the eye. The one thing that

upset him a bit, he would suggest a change, was that the tile pattern stopped at a couple of the locations. On the corner of the cooling space the tile stopped at an outside corner that would appear to be visible from the freeway. It read as cheap, as a false thing and he suggested the tile be continued to a re-entrant corner and could stop there. It would give a more quality finish.

Chair Cathcart stated he had not known what to do with the planting area. With the rocks, it seemed that there should be half as many.

Committee Member McCormack stated there should be half as much, or twice as many. He asked what had happened to the proposed tree?

Mr. Garcia stated back in February of 2010 there was a suggestion for a tree, but it was not a requirement.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would want the project to appear finished and without anything significant it looked unfinished. They had spoken about a tree to complete the landscape; it looked as if they had run out of money.

Mr. Romios stated they had spent more money on the rocks. The tree was originally $350.00 and the landscaping and rocks had cost them $1,050.00. The reason they had not wanted to place a tree there was due to the restaurant window at that location and a tree would block the view.

Committee Member McCormack stated they had suggested a tree to shade the building and to finish the landscaping. In a large area with just rocks, from a design perspective, it had not appeared well designed. They reviewed photos and Committee Member McCormack stated a tree would complete the landscape. If the area was smaller he would not suggest a tree. The space looked unfinished without a tree.

Chair Cathcart stated he would suggest that the number of rocks be reduced and placing the remaining rocks in a pattern and to select a tree that was not dense. The area needed to be finished.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested a vertical cactus for the area.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had hit on it; they needed a vertical element and suggested a cactus, or Palo Verde tree. He suggested that they review Route 66 photos and to place a Palo Verde tree, some type of small scale tree that would complete the landscape.

Chair Cathcart asked if he wanted that to be a condition?

Committee Member McCormack stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he thought it was not fair to have it be a condition of approval as it had initially only been a suggestion.

Mr. Romios stated what would happen was that they would need to resubmit the proposal and the project would be delayed.

Chair Cathcart stated that was the problem they had; the DRC reviewed projects, conditioned the project, and then an applicant would do what they wanted. Then the applicant would return to the DRC and then it presented a hardship.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4398-08, Flappy Jack's Restaurant (Modification), subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report, and with the following additional condition:

1. A tree to be added in the rock vignette area, a 6-7' tall tree that was a Route 66 type tree.

And with the following suggestion:

1. The wainscoting tile treatment to be carried around on the freeway side of the building to southwest re-entrant corner.

SECOND: Joe Woollett
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

(4) DRC No. 4504-10 – SERRANO WOODS

- The applicant has City Council approval to construct 63 affordable rental apartments in four buildings with a 27,240 square foot footprint and associated site improvements. Final architectural and landscape design is subject to Design Review Committee (DRC) approval.
- 1820 E. Meats Avenue (off Park Lane)
- Staff Contact: Chad Ortlieb, 714-744-7237, cortlieb@cityoforange.org
- Previous DRC Reviews: December 15, 2010 & January 5, 2011
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Chair Cathcart recused himself from the project's presentation as his landscape firm was associated with the project.

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Todd Cottle, stated on the shutters, those may have been omitted by mistake and would be corrected and squares on the plan documents represented the location of the gas meters. On the landscaping in the right-of-way dedication, they had not been certain when the City would require planting at that location and the idea was to plant a type of shrub that would be aesthetically pleasing.

Public Comment

None.

Vice Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Vice Chair Woollett stated he was a bit confused about the setback issue. If they were asking for less landscaping why would the owner not want to put in less landscaping? It would seem that it would be a suggestion on the part of the City and if the owner wanted to plant whatever they wanted as long as it was attractive he would not think the City would care. When the street widening occurred, there would need to be some landscaping added. He asked what the concern from Staff had been?

Mr. Ortlieb stated they had not wanted a scenario to come up where it would be viewed as the City was taking something from the applicant. Realistically there probably would not be any street widening out at that location anytime soon and the landscape would grow to maturity. Just chopping it off at that point; and if there had not been familiarity with the issue he could see where someone might have a concern with it and they were attempting to include some preventative measures.

Vice Chair Woollett stated Staff was looking down the road 10 years or so.

Applicant, Bob Luther, stated what they had done was to have large massing of shrubs and anything that was located in the dedicated right-of-way would be ground cover. The irrigation

system had been isolated and if the street changes occurred they could easily remove the irrigation areas that would be impacted and the only thing that would be lost would be ground cover.

Vice Chair Woollett stated they had already been constrained in that area.

Mr. Luther stated that was correct.

Committee Member McCormack asked if an area on the plans was the future right-of-way line?

Mr. Luther reviewed the drawings with the Committee and explained the layout of the proposed landscape. He explained the future property line and the location of the pilasters.

Committee Member McCormack stated there would be a pilaster with sidewalk right up against it. There were no trees there.

Mr. Luther stated that would not change. It would mirror what was on the other side of the fence.

Committee Member McCormack stated the end result with a sidewalk there would be a pretty harsh area.

Applicant, Barry Adnams, stated there was a parkway that he pointed out on the plans and he was not certain what the City had planned on the right-of-way area.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was attempting to match the two submittals. What he was going after was that they would repeat the plantings if the right-of-way was extended to match the areas.

Mr. Admans stated what he understood was that Committee Member McCormack wanted a plan that showed what the proposed planting would be; and that submittal would be provided at plan check.

Committee Member McCormack reviewed the plans with the applicants for clarification on the landscape. They had discussed at the previous submittal the removal of the Italian Cypress and the Ficus trees and the effect on the area and the reason for removing the Italian Cypress.

Mr. Luther stated there was a spacing requirement and they had come out too far with the water quality requirements that they were faced with. Many of the trees were in poor health and the trees had fallen into areas that were designated for other uses, primarily the BBQ area and the tot lot. They were looking for good specimens that would thrive in those areas and as they plotted the remainder of the project and keeping the water quality issues in mind, they would look at saving any trees that they could. Due to fencing and hardscape issues they would be using alternate plant materials as suggested during the previous submittal.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the applicant's drafting people seemed to have so much trouble with building A, on sheet A1.2 vs. sheet A1.3 the tower element showed a hip and ridge,

but on A1.3 it was missing. On the window details there was an out-looker added and he would have wanted it a bit bigger.

Mr. Adnams stated that could be done.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested on the other elevation sheets where the out-looker was incorporated and that also contained the window details, on those sheets to reference back to sheet A1.2.

Vice Chair Woollett stated it was understood that the shutters would be sized to half the size of the window.

Mr. Adnams stated that would be completed.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4504-10, Serrano Woods, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following suggestions:

1. The out-lookers be widened.
2. The roof form over the western entry of Building A be corrected to be consistent with the roof plan.
3. All other elevation sheets that showed the window detail or the out-looker detail be referenced back to sheet A1.2.

And to note that the set of plans that had been provided were not the final plans to be approved at plan check.

SECOND: Tim McCormack
AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None
RECUSED: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

(5) DRC No. 4565-11 – CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY FILMMAKER'S VILLAGE

- A proposal to partially demolish the West Anaconda Building Complex, construct three (3) student housing buildings totaling 397 beds in 96 units, construct one (1) multi-level naturally ventilated parking garage with 358 parking spaces, and construct a commissary with multiple uses (tenant improvement).
- Project bounded by N. Cypress Street to the east [addresses 220, 228, 264, and 296], W. Maple Avenue to the south, the Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railroad tracks to the west, and W. Palm Avenue to the north
- Contract Planner: Lucy Yeager, 714-744-7239, lyeager@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review

Chair Cathcart recused himself from the item's presentation as he was the landscape architect on other Chapman University projects.

Contract Planner, Lucy Yeager, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

The applicant's consultant, Ken Ryan, KTGY, address on file, stated they were not asking for an action on the project and they expected that to occur in the coming weeks; in the course of their efforts on the project they wanted a preliminary review by the DRC. Having a preliminary review was important to them and would enable incorporating suggestions that might come forth through their discussions. One of the goals that the City and the University agreed to in adopting the Specific Plan was ways to have a more inviting and residential on campus housing for students. They wanted to continue with the successful film school; it was one of the strongest film school curriculums in the United States. They also had an opportunity to uplift a portion of the campus and an important part of the City. The City had completed such good work in the Depot area with the addition of Ruby's and the resurgence and the underpass and they wanted to continue the strong connection between the University and the City and not lose the industrial character of the area. They wanted to celebrate that. Mr. Ryan stated they had followed the ground rules of meeting with the community and they had met twice with the OTPA and with the OBHS and had community meetings with the neighborhood. They had received some good feedback.

Mr. Ryan stated that he had his team present and available to participate in the discussion. He presented photo boards and discussed the various aspects of the proposed project. The essential idea was to celebrate the relationship to the Depot area and the project included a commissary at the corner of Cypress and Maple, three residential buildings with one of them being stepped back slightly to incorporate landscape and where the citrus grove would be located. There was a strong history and they explored ways to incorporate the strong railroad connection. There were impervious areas to deal with the water collection and a parking structure located near the railroad tracks and back from the façade that would be restored along the adaptive uses along Maple. The site was listed in the National Registry and locally designated in the Old Towne overlay district and the approach they had taken was with respect to the historic nature of the site. The structures had been added on to and what was important from a historic significance perspective and they had identified a three tiered classification: the primary area in purple was constructed during the period of significance and had a high degree of integrity and that was the most prominent area where the commissary would be located; the second of significance was the green area that had a moderate to high degree of integrity and the façade out front

was intact and there had been some add-ons that had taken that area to a second degree of integrity and they asked themselves if there was a way to pick up on the cues from the railroad line; and the third area were the areas that had a minimal degree of historic significance.

Mr. Ryan stated in working with the preservation groups and City Staff the diagram he referred to were the areas they would be incorporating into their project. The commissary adaptive reuse, restoration of the façade adjacent to the southern portion and around the corner and incorporate the façade in front of the Baja building into the design. The next three graphics that he was referring to outlined what the corner once was; there was such great history in Orange.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if he knew why the California Wire Company had decided to locate in Orange?

Mr. Ryan stated he thought it was a combination of things like labor, location, and it had a lot to do with the railroad tracks; it seemed to be the right place to do business. Through the course of the neighborhood meetings and their outreach it was much more than a wire company; it was a place where people met their spouses and became connected to Orange and there was a great deal of fond memories associated with the site.

Applicant, Kris Olsen, Chapman University, address on file, stated there were a lot of windows associated with that façade and when they viewed the contemporary picture they were filled in. The parapets that were there were no longer there; they had been chopped and he guessed that they had come down with the Long Beach earthquake and were never replaced.

Mr. Ryan stated in reviewing the drawings it was an opportunity to bring the building back to what it once was. The tower would be rebuilt and the form would still exist. He referred to another drawing of what they proposed. The residence halls would have the barrel roofs and it was reflective of the Anaconda West.

Mr. Olsen stated at some point the brick façade had been extended all the way to the railroad tracks, even though the California Wire Company had not extended that far in its original construction. The façade had been extended with the buildings behind it.

Mr. Ryan stated there would be access to the commissary by the general public. Access would be off of Cypress. The parking structure would be two levels below ground and four above, with one level at grade and it would be screened well. From a design perspective he presented a view from the film school and pointed out the industrial materials that would be used and the colors that would fit the goal of being contextual. He continued his presentation by showing various areas of the proposed project and views from different areas of the site, explaining the drawings and he went through them and he gave an overview of the landscape treatments.

Mr. Olsen stated one of the goals of the landscape design was not to make the site appear as if it was a resort; it was an industrial area and the concept was to provide green spaces without losing the feel of the industrial area.

<u>Public Comment</u>

Steve Bennett, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated the OTPA had recently met with the Chapman folks and they were in full agreement with the proposed project. They had managed to capture some good qualities of the original structures that were historical and the OTPA was pleased with what they were proposing.

Vice Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Vice Chair Woollett stated he was very impressed with the proposed project and it was a very vital connection to the historical area and the community and the project was very carefully thought out. It made a strong statement.

Committee Member McCormack stated the project was very well thought out and it felt good to go through the drawings. They had done a great job. He asked for a shade explanation of the plant palette as it related to the citrus and the shrub palette. When he had gotten to the sun/shade study he realized that with the shape of the building there would be one area that would only see one to two hours of sun 365 days of the year and he had reviewed the plants and found only one or two plantings that could handle that deep shade, many of them could be forced to do that; but from a longevity standpoint they might not be the best choice. They had chosen drought-tolerant and he liked what they had stated about the site not being a resort; he was a bit concerned with the shade reeking havoc on the plant palette as proposed. He was concerned that the Italian Cypress and the Orange grove would not get very much sun. He wanted an explanation of how they could pull off the landscape as proposed?

Applicant, Claudia Kath, address on file, stated the Orange grove area was open to the street and it was quality not quantity of hours of sun that plants received; there was overhead sunlight time and she felt confident that the Orange trees would do okay. The canopies would be fairly substantial; they were specimen-type trees that could be walked under from day one. They would be raised up about 12" as they would be in little planters. There would be mostly gravel in between and just a few plants that might line the gravel areas.

Mr. Olsen asked if there was a shade tolerant plant that could be recommended for the project?

Committee Member McCormack stated he had noted some plantings on the plans and he provided that to the applicant. He asked how they would be handling the water management issues?

Mr. Olsen stated their civil engineer was present for another agenda item and he might be available to answer that question.

Applicant, Warren Williams, address on file, stated they had worked with the City's storm water division to come up with a fairly advanced plan. There was a large area identified that was depressed 8" to 10". For the most part most of the drains were being diverted to that area, and it was all pervious pavement. There were some small areas at the north end of the building and they would have some small underground infiltration units that would mitigate that end of the project. For overflow, that would be behind the parking structure along the railroad tracks and the overflow would go out in that direction. The pervious gravel between the buildings would mitigate much of the water that would fall. They had completed percolation tests as part of the preliminary WQMP requirement. They would conduct further tests.

Vice Chair Woollett asked would the building be supported if water from the pervious pavement reached the soil supporting the building?

Mr. Williams stated they had placed the areas as far away from the buildings and it was something that was being reviewed all the time.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had not seen any dry bed type water drainage system. He asked for an explanation of the ladder situation and asked if that was only on the west side?

Ms. Kath stated that was correct. The Fire Department required that all bedroom windows had fire personnel access and a ladder would need to have access to be raised up to reach the window. The trees were spaced appropriately.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was an issue with the driveway area (an area he pointed to on the plans) and could Staff explain what the issue was?

Ms. Yeager stated the articulation of that was not in keeping with a study that had been done several years ago, and due to the curvature of the area there was a conflict with the pedestrian uses of that area.

Vice Chair Woollett stated he was not following what the problem was.

Ms. Yeager stated that it was not in keeping with the studies that had been conducted in the past. The curvature was the issue and Staff believed that most pedestrians would walk directly across the area and that was due to the width of the sidewalk.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was probably a flow on Cypress Street from a traditional gutter type of arrangement. Could the area be feathered out with the drainage along the street and possibly change the area to have a zero curb and to only have the tactile strips? They could not ask a handicapped person to go in and out. He wanted to know where the apron would be, and it depended on where the ramps would be located and the entry access.

Mr. Williams pointed out where the normal ramp would be with the curb continuing back to the garage. The sidewalk would wrap around the radius, mimicking the public sidewalk with the ADA access across it and the entry to the project would be a standard City driveway entry, there would not be typical corner street handicap access. There would be a driveway apron.

Committee Member McCormack stated there would not be ramps at that access.

Mr. Williams stated it would be a standard driveway, embellished with paving treatments.

Vice Chair Woollett stated the entry would be at street elevation.

Mr. Williams stated yes, it would drain in the gutter area.

Committee Member McCormack stated the area could be handled as just a curb area or have a zero curb incorporated.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if cars would enter there?

Mr. Ryan stated students would circulate from the building to the commissary out front and it was a way to soften the edge.

Mr. Olsen stated in between the buildings the students would not be circulating to the south as there would be fire access to that area and the intent would be that the students would flow through the lobby. As with all the dormitories there would be someone at a front desk, and all the students would be flowing from Cypress going south; and they would be going to one of two places and that would be to the commissary or to their cars.

Mr. Ryan stated the proposal before them was version 38; and one of the thought process was why would students want to live on site. With the film school they wanted to make the place a bit cooler and the thinking about the Orange grove and the commissary and the historic significance that they were working with and they wanted to create spaces that were a bit different. The entry addressed that as well.

Mr. Olsen stated from a future standpoint was that the University anticipated that the southern lot of the film school would expand and across the street there would be a symmetrical curve that would link the two.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the under grounding of the power poles had been considered?

Mr. Olsen stated that the current power lines were high tensioned high voltage lines and it was very expensive to change that. The power lines contained fiber optic cabling and to underground those, due to the continuous non-spliced fiber lines it was not feasible. To underground only the Time Warner lines on a previous project it was estimated at $400,000.00. He was not certain that would be done in the future.

Mr. Ryan stated there was some self awareness in keeping the site a bit more industrial and gritty due to the creative nature of the film school.

Committee Member McCormack stated his comments regarding the power lines were in response to the trees that would be planted under the lines and they might want to look into the relationship of the trees and the power lines. He was in total support of the project.

Committee Member Wheeler passed out a list of his concerns, questions and suggestions. On sheet 1A.201, there was a portion of the bowstring that was going to be retained, but the side elevation had not shown how far it had gone back.

The applicant's architect, Tim Smith, Tagawa Smith Martin, Inc., address on file, stated it would go just to the façade and they were retaining what existed. There was a jack bay and the bow had not gone all the way across.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the enclosure wall on the trash enclosure there was a reference to wood.

Mr. Smith stated it was block with stucco.

Ms. Yeager stated there was one area that it was referred to as wood.

Mr. Smith stated it would be block and that detail would be corrected, and the door would be metal.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on sheet 1A.202 the brick should be wrapping around the structure and he could not see it.

Mr. Smith stated that it was a raised planter.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the commissary the drawings showed an acoustic panel system and he asked with the next submittal could the details of that be given? On the view drawings for the floor plan and the elevation for the parking structure there seemed to be some disagreements. Every ramp shown on the parking structure plans showed up. He wanted to have some more detail on the window trim treatments and some of the brick showed head treatment and he would want details on that. On the brick he suggested a raised head and sill. There was one other area that he wanted to address and that was there was not much Hollywood incorporated into the design; he wondered if they had given any thought into making the interior courtyard spaces more like movie sets, with different themes.

Mr. Olsen stated they had reviewed that and it had been a request from the film school for more spaces to film that were controlled, however, the issue was that the courtyards were not wide enough to film. Once they had reviewed the depth requirements they realized it would not work. They were working with the film school in having one study room be designed as a doctor's office and the commissary itself would be themed. There was thought of having a "West Wing" room as that was popular and having a dorm corridor have a high school look with lockers and such.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if there had been any thought to place the turbine ventilators on the domed roofs?

Mr. Smith stated they could add those, it would be very easy to do that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was conflict with cars coming and going into the parking structure and pedestrians coming and going to the commissary area and crossing in each others path and he suggested some thought to calming the traffic.

Committee Member McCormack suggested a zero curb area.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested having some changes in material, with the smoother areas for pedestrians and the rough would act like speed bumps.

Mr. Smith stated they could build that into the driveway.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if any consideration had been given to a level separation. His concern was people exiting the parking structure in the bright light might miss pedestrians.

Committee Member McCormack suggested making the space more pedestrian dominant.

Ms. Kath stated there was separation with the landscape that was proposed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated, regarding the parking structure, the northwest corner of the cooling tower had not had any visible means of support. On the cornice treatment protruding brick and stucco element, he was struck by the fact that it was not historic, there was no historic reference to it. He would recommend a more simple form.

Mr. Smith stated the bevel shape was not appropriate as he reviewed it.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested they take a look at some of the more historic buildings around town. He stated that they had done a wonderful job of preserving the most important historic structures on the block and in sculpting within them new forms that both complimented and played off against them.

Vice Chair Woollett stated they were constantly walking a fine line between genuine historic references and veering off into the "historicalesc," if there was such a term, and they got lost sometimes. He liked what they had done with the southeast corner and in maintaining the materials and respecting the most historic elements in the best way. The cooling tower, and he had not looked too closely at it, was wood?

Mr. Olsen stated it was galvanized metal; it had a nice rust patina.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if there was any intent to use that space.

Mr. Smith stated as the commissary had a lot of kitchen equipment they would be using that space for those uses. There was a concern from the structural mechanical engineer in placing the heavy equipment there due to the structural load and the concern of losing the trusses and the architecture inside. The heavy equipment would be moved to the garage area.

Mr. Olsen stated there were beautiful monitors that existed and they would replace the glass and preserve that space.

Vice Chair Woollett asked about the sound and vibration associated with dormitories and would people sleep better because of the trains?

Mr. Smith stated they were working with sound engineers on the sound controls and they had received some basic recommendations and they were working with those. The massing of the building would lend itself to less vibration. They had some studies and they would address those issues; they would not be luxury condominiums, but livable spaces.

Vice Chair Woollett asked with the living spaces looking out at the narrow building separation, would it produce more of a downtown major City feel?

Mr. Smith stated like New York. They had calculated the living spaces to what the height was the width would be and they were within those guidelines. They had completed other living spaces that were tighter than what they proposed.

Mr. Olsen stated the space was oriented north to south and there would be sun light in the spaces.

Mr. Ryan stated the dorms themselves would be quite different, there would be living spaces in each of the rooms and a deeper response to what the students wanted. The bedrooms would be small private rooms with 4 bedrooms to a unit with a common living area in each unit.

Vice Chair Woollett stated he hoped they were helpful in providing feedback.

Mr. Ryan thanked the Committee Members and stated it was very helpful.

There was no motion necessary, as the item was presented for preliminary review only.

(6) DRC No. 4570-11 – 4000 METROPOLITAN DRIVE-PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE, ANNEX BUILDING, AND SECURITY BARRIER

- A proposal to:
  1) build a pedestrian bridge from a recently approved but not yet constructed parking structure to an existing 4-story office building;
  2) construct a new 5,000 square foot free-standing building; and
  3) construct a barrier around the existing office building and conduct landscaping reconfiguration in association with the barrier.
- 4000 Metropolitan Drive
- Staff Contact: Chad Ortlieb, 714-744-7237, cortlieb@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Michael Meyer, stated they had signed a lease with the GSA, a government agency to occupy the second and third floors of the building and as part of their requirements was the need for a 50-foot perimeter barrier around the building for security, it was a K barrier. There was a pedestrian bridge that went from the third deck of the parking structure to the second floor of the building and it would be dedicated for their use. It would be one of the main entries to the space. The annex building which was down below the Lewis Street overpass was a 5,000-foot annex building that would have vehicle storage and sally ports in the building (interrogation rooms). There would also be a security fence around the building. In the front they would be relocating some of the parking that was on both sides of the drive aisle. There would be landscape added.

Public Comment

None.

Vice Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion. He asked Mr. Ortlieb to explain what had been meant by "new use" and the changes to the building that might occur?

Mr. Ortlieb stated there were no windows and there were roll-up door elements and when reviewed at a future date for a new use there would be an opportunity to make changes to the building to comply with the new use.

Mr. Meyer stated they had signed a 20 year lease.

Committee Member McCormack asked for an explanation of the barrier?

Applicant, Richard Gardner, address on file, stated they had met with a barrier or crash consultant that worked with projects such as the one before the DRC. They had rated the different areas of the 50 zones on ram-ability of the project and how much of a straight shot there was in different areas and that gave them different K ratings. The idea from the beginning was to make the barriers non-intrusive; there was a fairly high rating at the front of the building and there was a K12 bollard that was buried in a hedge, which aligned along the street. Along the

other areas with a K rating that was not as high there would be a cable bollard system running between the hedge. There would be more closely spaced bollards as the K rating became higher with high impact lift gates. On the parking structure there was a retention basin and there were more cable systems, with bollards at the loading dock. There was another lift gate and fence with a metal fence that tied into the freeway fencing.

Committee Member McCormack stated most of the landscape was a hedge system.

Mr. Gardner stated that was correct. The security system would not stand out due to the landscape and they had added more landscape to the site, with trees at the front to frame what was there and there would be three flag poles at the front of the project. The parking lot would remain as currently planted unless reconfigured and those areas would have new trees planted. The streetscape would tie into what had previously been approved. The planting would be drought tolerant and there would not be any turf but would have some ornamental grasses.

Committee Member McCormack stated the shrubs would be kept at the bollard level of 42" high. Would there be a situation where they would need to see behind that 42" hedge?

Mr. Gardner stated there was a grade change through that area and that would enable a good line of sight.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the trash enclosure was being built according to City standards?

Mr. Gardner stated yes. It would be block and it was in the back of the truck dock.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they could add some split-face to the block of the enclosure?

Mr. Gardner stated that could be done.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a visual screen on the drawings and he asked what that was?

Mr. Gardner stated a photo had been submitted and it was a screen material. The applicants and Committee Member Wheeler looked through the plans for that detail. He explained that the screen would be painted gray.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on sheet A200, the pedestrian bridge appeared perpendicular to the building and parking structure, but the other drawings showed at an angle.

Mr. Gardner stated there was a slight angle.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he might take a look at E100. He stated that there was some sort of object shown on the elevations.

Mr. Gardner stated that was a hose bib.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the photos seemed to show a three-cable railing, but the plans showed just two.

Mr. Meyer stated it depended on the K rating whether it was two or three wire.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the cables went down through the tube and into the concrete and would seem difficult to repair if damaged. At Disneyland a cable system was used where the cable came through and ended at a dead man with a turn buckle arrangement to adjust the tension. There was probably a low current that ran through the cable that would allow them to know when a cable had been tampered with.

Mr. Gardner stated the systems were designed and installed by specialty subcontractors. They were not part of that decision.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he understood there would be a lot of landscape to hide the security systems; however, it still appeared to be a lot of scary stuff out at the site. He wondered if they had considered less obvious forms of security such as concrete planter boxes or step-up terraces. It might have been nice if there had been something different. On the security system drawing there was no color listed. At Disneyland the cables were covered with a green plastic and blended with the landscape.

Mr. Gardner stated they could look into that.

Vice Chair Woollett stated the idea was that the security system would exist, but it would not broadcast that it was there.

Mr. Meyer stated on Condition No. 30, which had been discussed with Staff, there was a condition that stated the permit could not be pulled until they received the lease on the slope and resolved the issue with the City Attorney. They would like that changed to allow the permit to be pulled for all the work on the site, with the exception of the areas within the slope.

Mr. Ortlieb stated in reading the manner in which Condition No. 30 was structured it read that there shall be no disturbance on the City-owned slope adjacent to Willow Street until a signed lease was in place between the City and property owner for use of the slope. Technically they could issue a building permit for everything else except the slope/City-owned property, and it would not preclude them from obtaining the permits.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4570-11, 4000 Metropolitan Drive-Pedestrian Bridge, Annex Building, and Security Barrier, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

1. The design of the trash enclosure be in accordance with City standards and split face block to be incorporated in the design to suggest similarity with the annex building.

Committee Member Wheeler provided a handout of his concerns/suggestions to the applicant and Staff.

SECOND: Tim McCormack
AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, October 19, 2011.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler
AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:49 p.m.