Minutes

Planning Commission May 7, 2012
City of Orange Monday 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Commissioners Buttress, Cathcart, Grangoff and Steiner
ABSENT: Commissioner Gladson

STAFF
PRESENT: Alice Angus, Director
Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner
Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner
Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner
Gary Sheatz, Assistant City Attorney
Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

ADMINISTRATIVE SESSION

Chair Steiner opened the Administration Session of the Planning Commission Meeting at 6:55 p.m.

Commissioner Cathcart stated there were only two items on the evening's Agenda that he would be able to hear, those were the items for the Shaffer Residence and Florio Residence, all other items he would be recused from.

Chair Steiner asked if there was anything additional to report from Staff? Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, stated there was nothing further to report.

Commissioner Grangoff asked if Staff was prepared to respond to the opposition letters that had been received on the Santa Fe Depot Agenda item? Senior Planner, Anna Pehoushek, stated she was prepared to respond.

There was no further discussion.

Administrative Session adjourned @ 6:58 p.m.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

None

REGULAR SESSION:

Chair Steiner opened the regular Session of the Planning Commission Meeting with a review of the City's appeal process.

Consent Calendar:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING OF APRIL 2, 2012

Commissioner Buttress made a motion to approve the minutes from the Planning Commission Meeting of April 2, 2012 as written.

SECOND: Commissioner Cathcart
AYES: Commissioners Buttress, Cathcart, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Gladson

MOTION CARRIED

NEW HEARINGS:

(2) SANTA FE DEPOT SPECIFIC PLAN UPDATE – ORDINANCE NO. 8-12 AND NO. 9-12; ZONE CHANGE NO. 1255-09 AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 1820-09

The proposed Santa Fe Depot Specific Plan Update represents the first update to the original 1993 Santa Fe Depot Specific Plan. The update expands the size of the 1993 Santa Fe Depot Specific Plan planning area by approximately 60 acres, from 42.8 to 101.6 acres.

The proposed Specific Plan Update sets forth updated zoning, along with refreshed programs for circulation and parking, urban design, infrastructure, and design guidelines for historic buildings. It builds upon those elements of the 1993 Specific Plan that were successfully implemented, and charts a proactive and strategic course for accommodating property transitions and context-sensitive growth in a manner that establishes the Depot District as a distinctive Old Towne neighborhood, while also improving its integration with the larger historic district.

LOCATION: The approximate 101-acre proposed area is irregular in shape, but is generally bounded by Walnut Avenue to the north, Palmyra Avenue to the south, Olive Street to the east and Parker Street to the west.

NOTE: An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for the Santa Fe Depot Specific Plan Update in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The public review period for the Draft EIR started on December 12, 2011 and ended on February 1, 2012. A total of six comment letters were received during the public review period. The letters and City responses are presented in Exhibit B.

Commissioner Cathcart stated he would recuse himself from the item's presentation due to his client, Chapman University, having a lot of property in the area of the proposed Specific Plan.

Chair Steiner stated the Commissioners had been provided a great deal of information with regard to the Santa Fe Depot Specific Plan and they had the public review draft of the Specific Plan from October of 2011 and the most recent document from April 2012. They had the Santa Fe Depot Update and each Commissioner had met with Staff for a briefing.

Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Chair Steiner opened the item for any questions to Staff.

Commissioner Grangoff asked on the zoning, going from multi-family to single family residential or R-1. There had been discussions at the City Council level to address possible grandfathering in of multi-use properties. Was the Specific Plan Update remaining consistent with that situation?

Ms. Pehoushek stated there were some different situations. At the time the City Council adopted the 2010-2011 Plan Update there was concern about creating legal non-conforming situations. The City Council adopted an amendment ordinance that provided for greater flexibility for the continuation of non-conforming uses that were caused by Zone Changes. There was an item going before the City Council on Tuesday night that brought them a little further. Council had provided direction to Staff regarding concerns that when the Zoning General Plan consistency went through for specific quadrants that there would be several multi-family properties that would become legal non-conforming as a result of zoning changes from R-3 or R-4 to R-1. Per the City Council's request Staff prepared an Ordinance Amendment that recognized existing legally established multi-family developments as legal permitted uses. The goal of that was to minimize any unintended consequences that property owners might run into.

Commissioner Grangoff stated on the Urban Design requirements on private properties, he asked if Mrs. Pehoushek could explain what responsibility a private property owner would have in regard to Urban Design?

Ms. Pehoushek stated there were components in the Specific Plan Update that encouraged the incorporation of areas, such as outdoor dining or other amenities and the interaction of those spaces to people walking down the street; for restaurants that provided outdoor dining they would speak with them to discuss ideas for those types of spaces.

Commissioner Grangoff asked if that was a requirement.

Ms. Pehoushek stated in terms of the fundamental design features of a building those would be consistent with the Old Towne Design Standards. Staff would continue to encourage an open type store front.

Commissioner Grangoff stated on the in lieu parking, that was something the Specific Plan encouraged but had not approved?

Ms. Pehoushek stated the City would need to take a more detailed study to put that in place.

Commissioner Buttress stated there was a lot of information provided and she wanted to emphasize that the Specific Plan Update was to implement the General Plan. There had been community meetings to solicit input.

Ms. Pehoushek stated not only would the Specific Plan implement the General Plan Land Use designations, but also goals and policies of the Circulation Element, Cultural

Resources and Historic Preservation Element, and Natural Resources Element; it was more than just the Land Use component of the General Plan.

Chair Steiner stated Ms. Pehoushek had made reference to the communication received by Mr. Gonzales and there had been additional opposition comments received, he asked if those were additional written or verbal comments.

Ms. Pehoushek stated those were verbal, one individual had come to the public counter and the other was via a phone call.

Chair Steiner asked if there had been any additional communication received on the item? There was none. He opened the hearing for Public Comment.

Paul Guzman, address on file, representing the Orange Bario Historical Society, stated he commended the Staff and Planning Department, as they had worked a lot of years with them. They recommended the overall approval of the Specific Plan. There were some concerns, and specifically the parking. In the past they had understood that parking would be out front in one of the areas and there would be a parking structure on Lemon Street and Palm and that the existing parking across the railroad tracks would be maintained. They had concerns for the infrastructure, as he had worked construction for over 50 years, and he had come to the conclusion that people had to pay for what was built, if there was no fee on some of the properties that were built and if the public was not told what was really needed cost wise they would fail, they needed to be able to fund what they had talked about.

Craig Wheeler, address on file, stated he was an architect in Orange and also a member of the Design Review Committee. The DRC was going to have the opportunity to review the Plan, however, due to a lack of a quorum based on conflicts he had not had the opportunity to do that and he had a few things he wanted to discuss. He wanted to encourage people who were going to make changes to historic structures to provide some type of historic documentation and provide that information to the Public Library. He had not seen any discussion in the report on what would occur with properties in a historic area that were non-historic, but architecturally significant and how to protect those types of structures. On Page 44 of the Urban Design framework it spoke about placing utility wires underground; but at one time overhead wires were a significant feature of historic Orange; and maybe they should not all be underground. He had a question on the street lighting and he wondered if it wouldn't be better to consider a more simple industrial type light to preserve the industrial look. He also suggested that some sites use historic evocative sculptures and especially Chapman University that had a program that encouraged sculptures for buildings that were being restored; and he suggested a playground sculpture for the old school building that was being turned into a Law School building. On Page 79 under treatment of additions there was mention that an addition may be clearly contemporary in design or to reproduce motifs from the historic building and it was a real bane of his existence as he was not sure contemporary buildings would be appropriate, as the whole fabric of Old Towne was historic. Adding a contemporary building amongst historic buildings would be like adding an aluminum window in the

façade of a historic building. He hoped that the statement be nuanced and made clear that some contemporary forms were acceptable in Old Towne, but others could be clearly inappropriate and should be reviewed on a case by case basis.

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated they were in agreement that the Depot Specific Plan was in need of an update and supported most of the plan. They had some concerns and the OTPA had participated in all of the meetings and had provided input. They appreciated Staff just recently meeting with them to discuss their concerns and they had provided additional information to them. First of all they had an issue with the scope and size of the Specific Plan area, it went from 43 acres to 100 acres and was that too large an area? Had the proposal for low density residential along Cypress, Lemon and Olive belonged in the plan? The OTPA believed they had not related to the adjacent industrial elements in the area. They had discussed height limits; the current plan was for a 25' maximum; the Update limit was 28' with an overlay zone allowing 42'; they were told the 42' was to accommodate the proposed density in the area and maybe the proposed density was too high. A 42' height was not necessary for a 3 story development as they could see at the Depot Maple Walk and the housing project in that area that was completed at 32'. He believed the maximum height limit could be lowered or a portion of a building could be built below grade. Another issue was that the plan stated there was a conflict with the Old Towne Design Standards and the Specific Plan. The Plan Update stated that there was a conflict with the Old Towne Design Standards and the Specific Plan standards prevailed. He would disagree, as he felt that the Old Town Design Standards addressed industrial buildings and adaptive reuse, along with interior spaces and those were components incorporated in the Ordinance. Additionally, the Old Town Design Standards were in the process of being updated and why not add language to address the unique characteristics of that portion of the District, similar to the Plaza area. He also found a conflict in the Plan, on page 91, the statement "future closure or vacation of any street shall not be permitted"; which the OTPA agreed with, but on page 35, the Plan discussed closure of Atchison Street. They also needed to keep in mind that the National Registered District was the cultural resource and included everything that contributed to it; not only the buildings but also the trees, landscape, street, sidewalks, lighting, etc. They needed to ensure that proposals in the Plan would not adversely impact any of the contributing components of the District.

Chair Steiner asked Mrs. Pehoushek if she could respond to the Public Comments?

Ms. Pehoushek stated in terms of the zoning designation on the existing surface parking lot adjacent to the Lemon Street parking lot and the parking near the tracks; mixed used zoning that was being proposed allowed for not only parking to be built but also if a project came forward that was wrapped with some other types of uses the mixed use zoning would accommodate that. The mixed use zoning would not preclude the creation of parking; it provided for a better manner of developing a parking facility that would blend in better with surrounding neighborhoods that would be more integrated. Having stated that, it was not to say that the parking structure that might move forward for Metro Link parking may not be developed with mixed use; it would not require a mixed use development, but it was an option. On the issue of infrastructure funding and with recent

demise in development, the City would be looking at other funding sources, it might be that there would be infrastructure projects paid for through capital improvements and there would be potential as developments moved forward for identification of areas that needed infrastructure development to pursue other funding sources.

Chair Steiner asked if there were any current infrastructure projects and what their funding sources were?

Ms. Pehoushek stated there was a current Southern California Edison project and she deferred that question to the engineer consultant.

Frank Sun, City Engineer, stated for the upcoming fiscal year there would not be any funding from the redevelopment agency, but there was a project that they were working on with Southern California Edison to underground some of the street utilities.

Commissioner Buttress stated just to clarify there was a portion of the area that they were discussing that would contain a utility underground district.

Ms. Pehoushek stated in reference to comments regarding historic documentation, the Commission could make that recommendation to City Council. For the issue of street lighting that was suggested in using a more industrial design, as the Specific Plan came together they would rely on what already existed in Old Towne and keep things simple with a familiar palette. There was no proposal for anything new. With respect for protection of non-historic, but significant architecture in the area, that was something that would fall under the provisions of the Old Towne Design Standards and the Secretary of Interior Standards. There was information for such structures. On the comment regarding contemporary forms she would defer to one of the consultants from the Arroyo Group.

Simran Malhotra stated the Secretary of Interior Standards spoke to additions to buildings that would clearly demarcate the historic and the new. The guidelines provided that there would be clearly visible demarcation and different from what was there. That there be new construction and not fake historic; to be able to tell what was new and what was old and that was what the guidelines would address.

Chair Steiner stated he understood that Ms. Pehoushek had met with Mr. Frankel and asked if she could respond to some of the items he had brought up during Public Comment?

Ms. Pehoushek in terms of the size of the planning area, the original Specific Plan area was a very concentrated, isolated area, around the Depot. In reviewing the Depot area as a larger district, and with the boundaries of the 1992 plan, there was no information on how that area connected with the business to the north and neighborhoods to the south. At that time there was no Metrolink service. Now with the success of Metrolink and the vitality in the downtown district, they wanted to take an opportunity in better integrating the neighborhoods, University and down town areas with the Depot area. The Specific Plan boundaries were expanded to look at it as a larger more cohesive district. Among

the functions of the Specific Plan were streetscape improvements and infrastructure and by casting the net a bit further they were able to capture the Cypress Barrio area and the neighborhoods south of Almond on Olive, Lemon and Cypress to integrate the neighborhoods into being a more cohesive part of the Old Towne area. It would allow for improvements in the more concentrated industrial areas. The boundaries would weave the larger neighborhoods and business districts into the Depot; and with all the transit services they wanted commuters to have a pleasant experience in a larger area.

Ms. Pehoushek stated in regard to the height limit increase the rational was that in the historic district there could be a 1 ½ story and have that in a residential quadrant with a 1 ½ story at 28', and there could actually be a house that would end up taller than an industrial building. They wanted to reconcile that. With respect to the 3 story overlay, much of the Specific Plan had a mixed use zoning with a lower density of 15 units per acre. The General Plan density allowed for 24 units per acre. With the possibility of having less concentrated areas with additional height, and they reviewed the Block, railway corridor, Second Harvest Food Bank and other buildings that were already industrial. The area of south Pixley was a reasonable place for a 3 story overlay and already had a lot of constraints. For the issue of density, 24 units per acre were allowed for in the General Plan, they needed to provide for some predictability for property owners of that area. In terms of the Specific Plan overriding the Old Towne Design Standards there were areas where there were differences in setbacks and height limitation. The Design Guidelines and there were many clear references to the Old Towne Design Standards and Secretary of Interior Standards and the content was not intended to undermine anything about either of the two. In terms of industrial guidance, the Old Town Design Standards had not provided very much guidance. The Secretary of Interior Standards had a bit more. In terms of the updates to the Old Towne Design Standards, it was something that was being worked on and it would be nice if they could be completed during the same time frame, but that was not the case. She was currently working on those updates along with Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, and they would be including more direction in those standards, and height would be one component that would be addressed.

Ms. Pehoushek stated that the closure of Atchison was presented in a conceptual layout graphic for the Depot courtyard. There had been a lot of discussion of whether to close

or not close Atchison. It was not something that was a hard and fast component, but more of a conceptual idea for that street. It might be something that the City may or may not choose to do.

Chair Steiner stated there was one more speaker for Public Comment.

Rosalina Comacho, address on file, stated she was present to discuss the south Cypress re-zoning that she was opposed to. She lived in Orange all of her life and her family had lived in Orange over 50 years and she loved that it was a historic City. One of her concerns was that her area was proposed to be re-zoned from an R-4 to an R-1. In walking that street most of the street are apartment buildings and multi-use duplexes and

it is an area that they had lived in a long time. One of her concerns was that if the area was re-zoned her house was the only one that had not built units in the back and it was not because they had not wanted to. Her brother already had one design for them. Everything around them had been built up and the area was no longer historic. There were a lot of college students that needed places to rent and that would be good income for her parents when they retired. Her concern was that there would be re-zoning to R-1, but across the street there were houses that had businesses. She wanted to voice her concern and she would be present at all of the meetings as her parents had not spoken good English. She would hope that future meetings would be available in other languages. There were people in her neighborhood who were renters and had been there for over 40 years and there were people who would rent from them. She had spoken with Ms. Pehoushek about the fact that when lighting was done through redevelopment it was done all over Cypress except for her street and it was very dark and one of the concerns was for the drunkenness in public that had been occurring.

Chair Steiner closed the Public Hearing and brought the item back to the Commission for action or further discussion.

Commissioner Grangoff asked Ms. Pehoushek in response to Ms. Comacho's comments; would that property owner be allowed to be grandfathered in to build multi-use units?

Ms. Pehoushek stated if there were properties that were single family residences and the zoning changed to R-1 there would not be the ability to add units to the building, other than an accessory second unit.

Commissioner Grangoff made a motion to adopt PC Resolution No. 21-12, PC Resolution No. 19-12, PC Resolution No. 20-12, recommending approval to City Council of Santa Fe Depot Specific Plan Update, Ordinance No. 8-12 and No. 9-12, Zone Change No. 1255-09 and EIR No. 1820-09, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report, and for No. 4 to provide direction at the property owner's request at 130 S. Lemon to remain consistent with their other property; and at the discretion of the Commission to add direction that for all the Public Comment that was received to forward those comments to the City Council with Staff's responses.

Commissioner Buttress stated for the last speaker, Ms. Comacho, the item would move forward to the City Council and she had every right to be present at that meeting to voice her concerns and to continue her dialogue with City Staff.

SECOND: Commissioner Buttress
AYES: Commissioners Buttress, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Gladson
RECUSED: Commissioner Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED

COMMISSION BUSINESS:

(3) DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE NO. 4554-11 – GLOS BARN

The applicant proposes to relocate an existing two-story barn/garage approximately five feet from the east property line and convert the second floor area to an accessory unit.

LOCATION: 816 E Culver, Old Towne Historic District

NOTE: The proposed project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (Class 3 – New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures) and Section 15331 (Class 31 – Historical Resource Restoration and Rehabilitation) which consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation reconstruction of historical resources.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 04-12 approving the relocation and conversion of a contributing two-story barn/garage into parking with a new accessory second unit on the second floor.

Commissioner Cathcart was recused from the items presentation as he was a member of the DRC when the project went before that Committee.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Chair Steiner opened the item for any questions to Staff. There were none.

Chair Steiner opened the hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Rebecca Glos, address on file, stated she was available for questions.

Michael Williams, address on file, stated he was a general contractor helping to protect, reconstruct and preserve historic properties. He was involved in historic preservation

Chair Steiner opened the hearing for Public Comment.

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA stated the proposed project was the only existing barn of its type in Old Towne, a big red barn, and it was important to maintain the structure. The Secretary of Interior Standards would not recommend the relocation of historic structures as it changed the relationship to the site and other existing structures on the site. Changes to elevations were also not recommended; but sometimes to adaptively re-use a structure it might be necessary to relocate it. The proposal had that

situation, although the OTPA recommended that it not be moved at all, the property would still maintain its relationship to the main structure. We understand that the structure needed to be moved to maintain the required set back and the OTPA was pleased that the building height would be maintained. In reviewing the plan, the applicant, was using in kind materials throughout the project. A major concern was that the property be properly shored up to prevent collapse. It was quite a large building and in light of the recent porch collapse on north Cleveland. The DRC's recommendation was supported.

Chair Steiner brought the item back to the Commissioner for further discussion or action.

Commissioner Buttress made a motion to adopt PC Resolution 04-12 approving DRC No. 4554-11-Glos Barn, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report, noting the item was categorically exempt from CEQA.

SECOND: Commissioner Grangoff
AYES: Commissioners Buttress, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Gladson
RECUSED: Commissioner Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED

(4) DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE NO. 4567-11 – PLAZA BIBLE CHURCH

The applicant proposes new façade, signage and parking lot improvements for a non-contributing commercial building within the Plaza Historic District. All façade changes in the Plaza Historic District require Design Review Committee and Planning Commission review and approval.

LOCATION: 240 W Chapman, Old Towne Historic District

NOTE: The proposed project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (Class 1 – Existing Facilities) that consists of the repair, maintenance, or minor alteration of existing private structures, exterior alterations and/or topographical features.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 03-12 approving façade modifications, signage, and parking lot improvements on a non-contributing commercial building in the spoke street corridor of the Old Towne Orange Historic District.

Commissioner Cathcart was recused from the items presentation as he was a member of the DRC when the project went before that Committee.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Chair Steiner opened the item for any questions to Staff.

Commissioner Grangoff asked on the tree issue, was that something that Staff felt looked nice and that they recommended to be added, or was it something that was required and it would be an added cost to the applicant?

Mr. Ryan stated there had been a lengthy discussion about that and they decided that street trees would be a good screening element for the site. It was brought up at the DRC meeting and agreed upon by the applicant.

Chair Steiner opened the Public Hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Craig Wheeler, address on file, stated he was the architect for the project and was available for any questions.

Mark Lebsack, address on file, stated he was present to answer any questions.

Wes Hayes, address on file, stated he had lived in the City of Orange for 40 years and served on the local Fire Department for 12 years and he was well aware of the down town area and the dynamics that went with it. In regard to the tree issue he thought it was important to go along with the City's recommendation of 3 trees and they placed one on the wrong side of the parking lot and if it became an issue they would put in the trees as requested.

Chair Steiner brought the item back to the Commission for discussion or action.

Commissioner Grangoff made a motion to adopt PC Resolution 04-12, approving DRC No. 4554-11-Plaza Bible Church, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff report, and with the additional note that there was not an expectation to install the tree. The item was categorically exempt from CEQA.

Commissioner Buttress stated she would second the motion and stated she had reviewed the plans and it would be a lovely improvement.

SECOND:	Commissioner Buttress
AYES:	Commissioners Buttress, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Commissioner Gladson
RECUSED:	Commissioner Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED

(5) DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE NO. 4576-11 – SHAFFER RESIDENCE

The applicant proposes to remove a small open porch landing and construct a 23'5" x 12'0", 285 square foot addition to the rear of the 1919 Craftsman Bungalow. The rear addition will consist of a new bedroom and service porch/laundry.

LOCATION: 247 N Cleveland, Old Towne Historic District

NOTE: The proposed project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (Class 3 – New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures) and Section 15331 (Class 31 – Historical Resource Restoration and Rehabilitation) that consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 01-12 approving construction of a new 285 square foot addition for a contributing residence.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Chair Steiner opened the item for any questions to Staff. There were none.

Chair Steiner opened the Public Hearing for Public Comment.

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated the project was a sympathetic addition and it was out of public view. The OTPA supported the DRC's recommendation. In regard to the demolished porch, the Secretary of Interior Standards required a structure to be supported when work was being done and it had not happened in the case of the project before them and much of the original materials had been lost. He suggested that the applicant refer to the Secretary of Interior Standards in using in kind materials to match the roof and use of original missing elements and materials.

Chair Steiner brought the item back to the Commission for discussion or action.

Commissioner Buttress made a motion to adopt PC Resolution 01-12, approving DRC No. 4576-11-Shaffer Residence, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff report, noting the item was categorically exempt from CEQA.

SECOND: Commissioner Cathcart
AYES: Commissioners Buttress, Cathcart, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Gladson

MOTION CARRIED

(6) DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE NO. 4578-11 – FLORIO RESIDENCE

The applicant proposes to obtain approval of an unpermitted 356 square foot, one story addition to the rear of a 1955 non-contributing Post War styled residence. The floor area of the original construction (1,009 square feet) plus the addition (356 square feet) will increase the floor area to 1,365 square feet, which is over 20% of the existing area requiring approval by the City's Planning Commission.

LOCATION: 445 N Harwood, Old Towne Historic District

NOTE: The proposed project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (Class 3-New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures).

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 02-12 approving a 356 square foot addition for a non-contributing residence.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Chair Steiner opened the item for any questions to Staff. There were none.

Chair Steiner opened the Public Hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Cecelia Florio, address on file, stated she was available to answer any questions.

Michael Williams, address on file, stated he was present to answer any questions.

Chair Steiner brought the item back to the Commission for discussion or action.

Commissioner Grangoff made a motion to adopt PC Resolution 02-12, approving DRC No. 4578-11-Florio Residence, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff report, noting the item was categorically exempt from CEQA.

SECOND: Commissioner Buttress
AYES: Commissioners Buttress, Cathcart, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Gladson

MOTION CARRIED

(7) DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE NO. 4594-11 – ARCHITECTS ORANGE

The applicant proposes new front and rear façade and signage improvements for a non-contributing commercial building (former Glen Johnson model shop) within the Plaza Historic District. All façade changes in the Plaza Historic District require Design Review Committee and Planning Commission review and approval.

LOCATION: 321 W Chapman, Old Towne Historic District

NOTE: The proposed project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (Class 1 – Existing Facilities) that consist of the repair, maintenance, or minor alteration of existing private structures, exterior alterations and/or topographical features.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 18-12 approving façade changes on a commercial building in the spoke street corridor of the Old Towne Orange Historic District.

Commission Cathcart stated he would be recused from the item's presentation as he was a member of the DRC when the item went before that Committee.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Chair Steiner opened the item for any questions to Staff. There were none.

Chair Steiner opened the Public Hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Darrel Hebenstreit, address on file, stated he was available for questions.

Chair Steiner asked Mr. Hebenstreit if he had read through the 26 Conditions of Approval for his application and was he in agreement with the conditions.

Mr. Hebenstreit stated he was in agreement.

Chair Steiner opened the item for Public Comment.

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated aluminum framing for the windows was inappropriate and not permitted in the Plaza area. There were buildings in the area that had aluminum frame windows, but those were placed there prior to having design standards in place. The building's windows had been wood framed windows. All the previous changes had met the standards. The aluminum frame windows were

currently in place and not appropriate materials. Although the building had been altered and had not been recognized as a contributing structure, moving forward with aluminum frame windows was inconsistent with the Old Towne Design Standards. Instead of moving in that direction, to moving in the direction of restoration and maybe in some point in time the building could be re-categorized as a contributing building for the district. As far as the signage the DRC conditioned that, the use of plastic was prohibited in the District. Approved materials were aluminum, metal or wood. The aluminum windows that were currently installed should be replaced with wood on the north and south elevations. The OTPA agreed with all the other conditions as proposed.

Mr. Hebenstreit stated they were aware of the request to have the aluminum frames replaced and they would be replacing those with wood. The main issue on the project was that they were attempting to expedite getting approximately 25 employees moved and into the new building and they were able to do that with a great amount of assistance from the Building Department. They installed a store front. The signage would contain aluminum letters.

Chair Steiner brought the item back to the Commission for discussion or action.

Commissioner Buttress made a motion to adopt PC Resolution 18-12, approving DRC No. 4594-11-Architects Orange, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff report, noting the item was categorically exempt from CEQA.

SECOND:	Commissioner Grangoff
AYES:	Commissioners Buttress, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Commissioner Gladson
RECUSED:	Commissioner Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED

(8) ADJOURNMENT:

Adjournment to the next Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for Monday, May 21 2012.

Commissioner Buttress made a motion for adjournment to the next regular scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission on Monday, May 21, 2012.

SECOND: Commissioner Grangoff
AYES: Commissioners Buttress, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cathcart and Gladson

MOTION CARRIED

Meeting Adjourned @ 8:55 p.m.