CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

October 19, 2011

Committee Members Present: Bill Cathcart

Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Lucy Yeager, Contract Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Cathcart opened the Administrative Session at 5:12 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 October 5, 2011. Corrections and changes were noted.

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

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members present and there was 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: October 5, 2011

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting of October 5, 2011 with changes and corrections as noted during the Administrative Session. Chair Cathcart voted in approval of the minutes, noting that he was not present for all items presented.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4562-11 - ABUNIMAH RESIDENCE

- A proposal to remodel the existing dwelling and construct a second-story addition to a single family residence.
- 2230 E. Pepper Hill Drive
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- Continued from DRC meeting of September 21, 2011
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Haitham Hafeez, had nothing additional to add.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler provided a list of his concerns to the applicant and Committee Members and stated there appeared to be some contradictions in the drawings. Beginning with the front living room windows, the elevations showed two windows that were together, abutting each other; and the floor plan showed separated windows. He asked which one was correct?

Mr. Hafeez stated the elevation depiction was correct.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the right side living room window, there were a pair of windows 8' wide to scale, and on the floor plan it appeared as a 5' window. He asked which one was correct?

Mr. Hafeez stated the elevation depiction was correct.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the front window of the front upstairs bedroom, there was a window centered on the elevation, but the floor plan showed two windows. He asked which one was correct?

Mr. Hafeez stated the elevation depiction was correct.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the dormer front elevation there were two windows, but the floor plan showed one window. He asked which one was correct?

Mr. Hafeez stated the elevation depiction was correct.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the 2^{nd} floor master bedroom window, the floor plan showed a window scaled out to about 3'and 23'-10" from the back wall, but in reviewing the elevation it was lined up with the window below and it was wider than 3'. He believed the actual location would be more in line with the floor plan.

Mr. Hafeez stated the floor plan depiction was correct.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not found where the roof overhang was dimensioned; it appeared to be scaled 30" and that should be clarified. On the fascia boards they were nice and wide, but again there were no dimensions. They appeared to be about 10". He asked if that was correct?

Mr. Hafeez stated yes, they were 2" x 10".

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the new master bedroom window on the left elevation the trim had not matched the trim of the other windows on that same elevation.

Mr. Hafeez stated he was correct; that was an oversight.

Committee Member Wheeler stated for a quality project, he suggested that the same sill be carried around to the back elevation. On the front elevation, the chimney dimensions were listed as 2' above the highest point of the ridge. He believed the code read that it had not needed to be any more than 2' above the closest roof within 10'. It could come down some.

Mr. Hafeez asked if he was okay with the height, or would he want it dropped?

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was up to him; he could verify with the Building Division on that detail.

Committee Member Woollett stated it had appeared too tall.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on his sketch that he had offered the applicant at the previous meeting, he had shown a wider element and it also included the hallway that lead up to the bedroom. If it was not widened he should check the ceiling height at that doorway.

Mr. Hafeez stated the height had been determined based on the structural support located there.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared that it would work, but he suggested the applicant check it before they got too far into the project, to ensure proper head room. There had been a new window added to the 2^{nd} floor bedroom on the right and he wanted to check if there was a privacy issue with the neighbors.

Mr. Garcia stated initially there was not a window at the elevation and that was Staff's concern that it could pose a privacy issue. The DRC had suggested a window at that location. A higher opening would be fine.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they might be better off with a higher window, maybe a 2' height.

Committee Member Woollett stated on the rear elevation where there was a little roof overhang and a door there, he asked for an explanation of that detail and asked if the fascia should be level?

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was not drawn correctly.

Mr. Hafeez stated it was a curved wall.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4562-11, Abunimah Residence, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the additional condition:

- 1. (a) The front window in the living room on the first floor to match the elevation drawing and not the floor plan; (b) the right side window on the first floor to match the elevation drawing and not the floor plan; (c) the front windows on the 2nd floor front bedroom to match the elevation drawing and not the floor plan; (d) the dormer windows over the living room to match the elevation drawing and not the floor plan; and (e) the 2nd floor master bathroom window to match the floor plan and not the elevation drawing.
- 2. The roof overhangs at the eave and barge ends shall be a minimum of 2'-6" extension.
- 3. The fascia and barge boards shall be a minimum of a 10" width.
- 4. The window sill trim on the new master bathroom window match the other windows on that elevation.
- 5. The windows on the back wall trim shall match the trim of the other windows on that elevation.

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. 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
- Preliminary Review at DRC meeting of October 5, 2011
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Community Development Director

Chair Cathcart recused himself from the items presentation as he was the landscape architect involved in another project on the Chapman University campus.

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

Applicant, Ken Ryan, address on file, stated they had reviewed the Staff Report which was very thorough and very responsive and they were in agreement with that document. At the last meeting they had provided a very lengthy presentation and that had opened up to some very good dialogue. They had an army of people with them that were available to answer any of their questions. It was an important project for the City and very important to the University. They had taken the comments from the DRC to heart and they were available to answer any further questions the Committee Members might have. The presentation would highlight some of the suggestions that had been presented. They had gone through the minutes and they appreciated the written documentation that had been provided by Committee Member Wheeler and they had gone through that. There were a couple of comments on the bigger picture items. On the entry access there had been discussion on how that would work and the safety concerns. Fundamentally the main idea was to ensure safety in crossing at that site, there would be a curb that existed all along the curved area. He presented drawings of the area and pointed out the area he referred to. Pedestrians traveling in that area would clearly understand that the sidewalk was the path to be utilized and they would cross at a designated location. There was good visibility and setback and they had revisited vehicle access and it would not be confusing. The pedestrians would be lead in a clear path. He reviewed the drawing with the Committee Members.

Vice Chair Woollett stated for a student leaving the front of the resident's hall, he asked how they would get to the area Mr. Ryan spoke to?

Mr. Ryan pointed out the area and stated they would walk along the sidewalk to the point where it narrowed down and they would cross and come down the adjoining sidewalk. The sidewalk would lead them to the depot area. The sidewalk continued along the perimeter of the buildings.

Mr. Ryan stated they had spent time with the team evaluating the area and ensuring it was addressed appropriately. There had been some good input relative to the landscape in regard to the winter and summer solstice and if they had chosen the appropriate plant palette based on the solar orientation. Their landscape architect had spent considerable time researching the appropriateness of the species of plant materials that would be used. The larger area that they looked at was the spacing of trees and that had been based on Fire Department access and safety issues. They looked at the specie of tree that would be used on Palm and Maple and how they would affect the electrical lines that ran along those areas.

Mr. Ryan stated the suggestion of adding turbine ventilators was a good idea to help celebrate the industrial character of the site, and they would be functional. There would be a total of eight on each building.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they had come off at an angle and he had seen that done on a pitched roof, however, they would transition to a vertical. They had not gone off at an angle and remained that way as he thought the turbine would not function unless the axis was vertical.

Applicant, Tim Smith, address of file, stated that was correct and they would probably need a transition piece.

Mr. Ryan stated the other comment was on the cornices and those had been modified based on the suggestions provided.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the only minor thing he suggested was instead of starting the first modillion inset, he suggested bringing it back out to the corner. It would appear more authentic.

Mr. Ryan stated there were a couple of details on issues that had been addressed. On the stairwell he presented the detail to the Committee Members on that area. The third floor ladder location was highlighted for them and added to the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a beam at the northwest corner and it would need to be above the parapet, but it should not be visible.

Mr. Smith pointed out where that detail would be.

Public Comment

Steve Bennett, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he was pleased that the elements that they had been concerned with were being preserved and they totally supported the efforts of Chapman University and the proposed project.

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

Committee Member McCormack stated he had a few questions on the entry; he liked what they had done in regard to ramping the area up. He reviewed the drawings with the applicants and

asked for further clarification on the detail provided. He was concerned how the concrete was formed and how the transition in such a short space would be completed. With all the slope planes on a curb it might be easier if it was pulled back a bit and not to have such an abrupt slope. He suggested they take a closer look at that when the details were all laid out. He asked if there was a 6" curb along an area he pointed out on the drawings and if there would be a handicap ramp at that site as well?

Mr. Ryan stated he believed it was all at-grade at that point.

Applicant, Warren Williams, address on file, stated it was at-grade on either side of the sidewalk. It would be ramped down on the other side of the sidewalk. It would ramp down to lead into the parking structure. The other area was an infiltration basin and it would be intentionally deepened 8" or so, from all of the perimeter edges, it was for Fire Department access and water retention purposes. There was a 2.5% grade, at an area he pointed to on the drawings; the sidewalk would be level with the 8" being a gradual deepening at that point. Handicapped ramps would not be needed.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a 6" curb face.

Mr. Williams pointed out the area of travel on the drawings.

Mr. Smith stated there was controlled access for everyone.

Mr. Ryan stated there was no access through the courtyard area; it was a security feature that there would be a one point entry and exit access.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if handicapped students would be on lower levels?

Applicant, Kris Olsen, address on file, stated they would randomly place wheelchair accessible rooms with equal access. There would be some upstair rooms, some downstair rooms, some with a view of the train tracks, and so on.

Committee Member McCormack stated with that all being stated there would be a lot of people coming and going in that situation and he wondered if the sidewalk was wide enough to accommodate the large number of people who would be accessing that area. He asked how wide would the sidewalk be?

Mr. Olsen stated in a dormitory situation vs. a classroom situation kids would filter in and out at their own schedule. There would not be a 10:00 a.m. flood of people exiting or entering, it would be more of a continuous trickle. He believed it was a non-issue.

Mr. Williams stated the sidewalk would be 5' wide and met the City code.

Committee Member McCormack asked what a space on the plans was designated for?

Mr. Smith stated that was the trash receptacle area.

Committee Member McCormack asked how a trash truck would get to that space?

Applicant, Claudia Kath, address on file, explained how the truck would enter to that space and back-in to roll the dumpsters out to the truck. It was a rolled curb at that point. She pointed out the area where the standard curb would be. There was planting and sidewalk in that area.

Committee Member McCormack stated if that was a 6" curb and there was an 8" drop to the infiltration area, there would be a 2" delta there. There appeared to be a lot going on in that tight space. He asked if there was a gate there?

Mr. Smith stated it was at the entry to the garage.

Committee Member McCormack suggested they take another look at how the trash area would work and if the bin size was correct. There were trees there too. As a recommendation, to seal the concrete so there was no staining. The trash pick up would be a weekly or bi-weekly event right at the entrance. Those were his concerns and he was really jazzed about the whole project and he wanted the details to be correct.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt a lot better about the traffic calming and had not realized that there was a gate there.

Mr. Olsen stated the gate worked on a transponder system.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there were pavers shown for strips across the driveway and he suggested getting as much texture in that area for further traffic calming.

Committee Member McCormack asked on the corners was it all paving or concrete, or DG?

Ms. Kath stated it was crushed rock, or pea gravel. If there was a person in a wheel chair they would enter and access a sidewalk inside along the seat wall. The interior was gravel.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested a simulated smudge pot in the Orange grove.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was signage for the project?

Mr. Olsen stated the signage would come back separately and they held off on the signage in the event a donor came along which could potentially change the project's name.

Ms. Yeager stated the signage and lighting would come back separately.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they could share the lighting concept with them?

Mr. Olsen stated the intent was to use the signature Bega lamp post that were installed throughout the campus. They were used at the film school. They were black in that area and beige at the law school; and in other areas of the campus they were white. The idea would be to use acorn lamps along the perimeter, including the Orange grove area.

Vice Chair Woollett stated the applicant had taken so much care that it invited picky questions from the DRC Members. On the cooling tower that was steel and it had a brown patina to it; it appeared that they would duplicate that finish. There was a difference in a coating and real rust and he asked what they proposed to use? He wondered if they would use Cor-ten?

Mr. Smith stated they proposed to use the existing panels and to seal them. That detail had not been ironed out yet.

Vice Chair Woollett stated Cor-ten would rust to a point and then seal itself. It would remain as a rusty look without rusting through. During the early years of the process there would be a rusty residue that would create a rust stain.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the new downtown Los Angeles Police Station used some Cor-ten and they had used some beautiful detailing that controlled the rust.

Ms. Kath stated there would be raised Cor-ten planters in the Orange grove area.

Mr. Smith stated they had not gotten that far in their materials for the panels, but the intent was to reuse the panels.

Vice Chair Woollett stated the thing he was concerned about was using a material that had some type of enamel or coating on it that would appear false.

Applicant, Peyton Hall, address on file, stated he was thinking about a rust converter; maybe botanic acid, tested to ensure it would not be too dark and that would be a chemical conversion of iron oxide that would be stable.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the proposal would come back to the DRC or were they at the final review?

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated the presentation was for final review.

Committee Member McCormack stated, regarding the plant palette, the Platanus could be a standard or multi, the Camphor could be a standard or a multi, the others were standard and he asked if they would all be standard or would some be the multi-trunk variety?

Ms. Kath stated they could use the multi-trunk Platanus; it was a tight area and depending on the branching it could take up more space. It would depend on the trees that would be tagged out at the nursery. They would want a tighter V shape.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had asked the question as all the other tree choices were a variety that were a more "prim and proper", more formal variety and the Platanus could be the one that would stand out and be out of place. On the Washingtonia filifera, he wanted to ensure that it was the tree they planted. There were only a few people who carried that tree and if they had not insisted on that tree they could get a hybrid. He wanted to find out on the railroad landscape palette, which would be visible from the rail line; he asked if it would have the same industrial feel? He suggested opening up the flood gates and having fun with it, it would be

viewed by many and it should be celebrated. He asked if the sidewalk was right up against, an area he pointed to on the plans, and asked if there was any Cor-ten on that edge? He wondered what would go in that edge.

Ms. Kath stated there could be planting in there and there would be enough space for irrigation.

Committee Member McCormack stated the rock mulch might be better if they were anticipating using some ground lighting at the Baja Shop.

Ms. Kath stated in using a plant in that area it could spill over into the walkway.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it may also be going against the industrial feel of the area.

Committee Member McCormack suggested just using rock mulch with some lighting. The lighting was an important part of the landscaping.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the applicant had mentioned the use of some acorn fixtures in the grove area and he suggested that they might use some up-lighting in the Orange grove area, because there are not street lights in an Orange grove.

Vice Chair Woollett asked to review the material board that had been on display.

Mr. Smith gave an overview of the materials board. He described the materials, colors, and textures that would be used in the various areas of the project.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if the existing windows were steel?

Mr. Smith stated they had been painted over so many times he was not certain what the material was. They were shown as black on their proposal, but they would want to strip the paint and understand what the material had been. The black was a bit harsh and they were thinking of a gun metal finish.

Committee Member Wheeler asked Staff for clarification of the removal of the historic building?

Ms. Yeager stated on the recommended action in the Staff Report it would walk him through that information, and the Design Review Committee in recommending approval of the replacement structure and the use of the site was appropriate.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if there was value in the DRC commenting on the advisability of the variance that was being required?

Ms. Yeager stated that couldn't hurt.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval to the Community Development Director for DRC No. 4565-11, Chapman University Filmmaker's Village, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the comments discussed as provided during the meeting, and with a recommendation for a variance as proposed.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

RECUSED: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, November 2, 2011.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 6:32 p.m.