

**CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL**

May 16, 2012

Committee Members Present: Carol Fox
Robert Imboden
Tim McCormack
Craig Wheeler
Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner
Robert Garcia, Associate Planner
Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner
Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Woollett opened the Administrative Session at 5:07 p.m. with a review of the Agenda.

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, stated there were no changes to the Agenda.

Chair Woollett asked if any of the Committee Members had a conflict of interest on any of the Agenda items before them? There were no conflicts; all Committee Members would be able to hear all the items.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meetings of April 18, 2012 and May 2, 2012. Corrections and changes were noted.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Tim McCormack
AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members were present.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

There were no speakers.

CONSENT ITEM:

(1) Approval of Minutes: (a) April 18, 2012, and (b) May 2, 2012

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular scheduled meetings of the Design Review Committee on April 18, 2012 and May 2, 2012, with changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Tim McCormack
AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4586-11 - LARSON RESIDENCE

- A proposal to construct a 7,343 sq. ft. single-family residence on a vacant lot.
- 1450 Nicky Way
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- Previous DRC Review: March 21, 2012
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Brian Brennan, address on file, stated he was available for questions.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was still work to be done on the roof plan. There were several things that appeared to be in error; they had spoken at the previous presentation about plate heights. The elevation showed two different heights, however, the manner in which the two roofs were shown had them at the same heights. He pointed out the area he was speaking to and reviewed that with the applicant. Committee Member Wheeler presented a sketch that he had prepared of the roof.

Committee Member Fox stated she found another area that had two more plate jumps. There was another one behind the garage. One required a jump, but the other had not.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a ridge that he could not understand how it could possibly work. He suggested the applicant take another look at the roof plan.

Committee Member Fox stated on the valley in the back it was just a clean-up issue and in drawing the roof plan the line was drawn in the wrong area. She pointed out what she was referring to. She stated there was a big discrepancy on the bay window; it would not appear as it was presented on the elevation. The shape would need to be changed on the plan; it was an important design feature for the back side of the structure.

Committee Member Wheeler stated another way to take care of the window would be to square off the roof.

Committee Member Fox agreed. She reviewed the plan with the applicant. There was a strange inflection point on the valley and there was nothing there to justify it. The reason she brought these points up, was if the building was built per plan it would not appear the way that it was presented on the elevation, or visa versa.

Mr. Brennan stated raising the plate line around the garage that would resolve the roof issues.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that was a minor change, but there were other issues. What worried him was that whoever drew up the plans had not known what they were doing and the project could end up with something that the applicant had not anticipated.

Committee Member Fox stated on a project that they were approving, she had very little confidence in the person who had drawn the plan; that they understood the valleys created by two roofs that intersected that were parallel and what that would create. She had concerns that what would be built out at the site would be a fix and not what was presented.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he appreciated the fact that some stone had been brought around the back and there were shutters too. There were instances where the stone stopped at an exterior corner and he suggested that the stone should return to a re-entrant corner. He laid out the plans and pointed out the areas he spoke to and pointed out the areas where the stone should be carried to. To wrap it around the breakfast nook and the south wall of the gallery and omit it on the south wall of the master bedroom. The Staff Report mentioned that the soffits would be stucco, but he had not seen that detail on the drawings. He suggested to carry out the same motif on the lower part of the windows to be stone; to tie it all in.

Mr. Brennan stated he could use some type of trim cap or river rock.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the building elevation of the pool pavilion he asked if there was a flat roof or a hole?

Mr. Brennan stated it should be the ridge line. It was supposed to be a hip roof that went to a ridge.

Committee Member Wheeler asked how the roof would be supported?

Mr. Brennan stated it would be with conventional framing and with two beams to support the ridge. The beam would be covered by the eave. In the past he had stained the beam with a sealant with the brackets painted black.

Committee Member Fox asked what a line was on the plans that went across on the north elevation?

Mr. Brennan stated he had not known why the line was drawn.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the structure would need more vents than what was shown on the drawings; his rough estimate was 36 vents. His other issue was with the walls; he was opposed to having solid walls around the perimeter in the front of the property.

Committee Member Fox stated she had gone out to the site and with the two other properties nearby they had a lot of block wall, but there had not been any in the front. They used tubular steel. The other property that the applicant had referred to had concrete block in the backyard to create privacy as that property was right on the street. The front of that home had split rail and the only home that had not had tubular steel had vinyl instead and it went with that home's design. The other two homes in the cul-de-sac had tubular steel and provided for the openness. The project before them had the backyard to the rear and she was opposed to the use of the concrete block at the front of the lot. To be clear there was 6' tall tubular pool fencing, but on the landscape plan there was not a notation for the tubular fencing. There was precision block noted.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was quite confused with the manner that the plans had been presented to the DRC. There was an architectural site plan that had no grading information and it was not at the same scale. The landscape plan had no grading on it. He reviewed the plans with the applicant and Committee Members and he reviewed the grade of the property site and the areas noted to have block wall. There was an area that was all flat and it went to a 4'-10' contour. He asked if there would be tubular fencing along an area he pointed to on the plans?

Mr. Brennan stated there would not be a tubular fence in the area he indicated on the plans.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had done a sketch on the area that was going down and it was not clear on the plans if there would be a 6' retaining wall, with stepping for a required 5' pool fence, he asked if that was the situation in that area?

Mr. Brennan asked why the 5' on top of that was required?

Committee Member McCormack stated if someone was standing at the top they could get into the yard.

Committee Member Fox asked if she had read that there would be a pool cover instead of a fence?

Mr. Brennan stated yes that was correct.

Chair Woollett stated that should be called out on the drawings.

Committee Member McCormack stated if someone was picking fruit in that area they could fall down that slope.

Mr. Brennan stated no trees would be planted there, they had changed that area.

Committee Member McCormack stated the plans showed a vegetable garden and five trees for that area.

Committee Member Fox asked if the stairs going up to that area would be built?

Mr. Brennan stated no; it would remain natural native in that area.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there would be a 6' stepped wall with nothing on top?

Mr. Brennan stated they were at zero grade at the corner and he pointed out on the plans where the grade would begin. There would be 10' on both sides of the wall. The wall would be stepped; the wall would grow based on the grade.

Committee Member McCormack stated from the drawings he was not certain what was proposed.

Mr. Brennan stated that was why he included the topography map. It started out at 6' with the transition between the steel and block wall would be at the same level. When he turned at the corner the wall would grow to the needed 10'.

Committee Member McCormack asked how much would it be stepped?

Mr. Brennan stated probably 2'.

Committee Member Wheeler stated at the previous meeting the DRC Members had requested that elevation drawings for the walls be provided. The Staff Report had suggested that the applicant would be providing something for them to review.

Mr. Brennan stated he had done a detail on the intersection.

Committee Member Fox stated there appeared to be some misunderstanding, as the drawings showed the connection between the metal fencing and the block wall, however, had not addressed the block wall and where the grade changes would occur.

Mr. Brennan stated in order to get into that he would need to design the wall. If he designed the wall he would incur the cost to do that. He would not want to put the cart before the horse and design a wall as he would need to get into his soil values and then to find out it would not be acceptable could be the outcome.

Committee Member Fox stated with a schematic design, wall elevations would still be noted.

Chair Woollett stated the elevation of the wall would fall under the requirements of the City.

Mr. Brennan stated he had satisfied the requirements. The wall was specified at 10'.

Committee Member McCormack stated the landscape architect should have the contours on the drawing.

Chair Woollett stated if a maximum of 10' was noted on the drawings without reference to grade elevations, the applicant could come to find out, based on the terrain, that the wall was not tall enough.

Ms. Nguyen stated Staff had the same concern and had noted if that occurred the applicant would need to return for a variance. The DRC could modify the condition to have the project return to the DRC if the wall heights needed to be changed.

Mr. Brennan stated he had done overlays of where the walls would go and it had been a series of people who had been involved in the project and he had done the research on the proposed project. As soon as it was feasible the wall would be stepped down.

Committee Member McCormack stated that would be good as the view for both sides would be critical. On one area he had noted it was 3” above grade and actually there would be a V ditch on the other side to get the drainage out.

Ms. Nguyen stated Staff had the same concern with a safety rail on top of a 10’ wall, because the plans and applicant was adamant that the wall would not be more than 10’ there had been a condition added in the event a variance was required.

Committee Member Fox stated if there was a 10’ maximum on the retaining wall with a guard rail on top of that, she asked if that would exceed the height limit requirement?

Ms. Nguyen stated that was correct.

Committee Member Fox stated if someone was on the adjacent property they would encounter the wall, if they climbed the slope. She suggested tapering back the wall so that a situation of a retaining wall without a guard rail would not be created for a neighbor.

Mr. Brennan stated with the wall itself the grade would be lower and the concern with not having a guard rail, would be taken care of with the wall itself. The grade would not pick up until the back of that area.

Committee Member Fox pointed out areas where a neighbor could fall over the wall.

Chair Woollett stated that was a Building Department issue.

Committee Member Fox stated there were some design issues that had not been addressed on the proposed project.

Ms. Nguyen stated the applicant had another proposal to actually move the trail further south from where it was and it would go further up the hill and it was a further concern.

Mr. Brennan stated he could place some sort of fence to act as a barrier to the barrier, he understood that and the liability involved.

Committee Member Fox stated if a fence was not being installed along the property line a hazard would be created for the adjacent properties. It was a hazard issue that was outside the DRC’s purview, but the design was within their purview.

Committee Member McCormack stated typically a wall would be placed at 5' just to keep the neighbors out, if it was flat, but with the situation provided the neighbors could jump over the fence into the yard.

Mr. Brennan pointed out where the property lines were on the plans. There was a 3 ¼ to 1 slope and it was very steep right off the neighbor's property.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans and discussed the slope, property line and where the proposed walls would be. The applicant pointed out where the trail was located.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the 6' wall along the trail was what Staff was requesting?

Ms. Nguyen stated along the trail itself was tubular steel.

Committee Member McCormack stated the landscape plans noted a 6' block wall.

Mr. Brennan explained where the various walls would stop and start on the drawings and what type of fences were proposed in the various areas of the property.

Committee Member Imboden stated he wanted to get a better understanding of where the trail existed. He had concerns about the 10' retaining wall as there was an immediate drop off and it was not naturally occurring; it was caused by the project. He was attempting to understand that better. Without a stairway there would be no access to that area. He wanted more information about what occurred on the neighboring property in relationship to the fence and so forth. The proposed project design was creating a hazard and he wanted more clarification on the situation.

Committee Member Wheeler stated instead of one tall wall, he suggested a series of shorter stepped walls. He asked Staff if a guard rail could be placed on top of a stepped wall?

Ms. Nguyen stated two parallel walls could not be within 5' of each other without Community Development Director determination. There had been situations where planters were built along side a fence, as long as there were no gaps in between. Stepping the fences might fix the situation.

Committee Member Wheeler stated with two fences, it would be further back and the fence would be a bit higher. There could be a 6' wall, then a 5' separation with another 6' wall. A guard rail could be placed on the second wall.

Ms. Nguyen stated in the past, the guard rail on a wall had been determined to be one singular wall and the applicant was required to obtain a variance.

Chair Woollett stated the regulation kept a single wall from being more than 10'. In separating the walls, there would be two fences without the height. The tubular steel fence could be 5' back and up the hill and not even at the same height of the retaining wall, with the visual effect being less than 10'. If there was a safety issue the tubular fence could be placed 5' up the hill to protect that.

Committee Member Fox stated except in the corner, where the 5' away would be on the neighbors property. The corners need to be designed with a system that would take care of all those things.

Committee Member Imboden stated he felt strongly that the situation should be solved on the proposed project's property. The project was creating the hazard and there was an opportunity to solve it.

Chair Woollett stated it became a design issue when the retaining wall was pushed into the property more. It changed the space around the building.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was a code requirement on the set back between the wall and the pavilion?

Ms. Nguyen stated all set backs were determined from the property line.

Chair Woollett asked if there was a precedent in obtaining an opinion from the Building Department on how they would evaluate the proposal?

Ms. Nguyen stated they could definitely ask and they could ask for an opinion on the wall issue, as there had been a previous project that had very steep hills with stepped walls and those walls were considered to be one wall.

Committee Member Fox stated Chair Woollett had hit on something important, that the 5' tubular steel fence could be put up the slope and far enough away to alleviate problems of people or children climbing in that area and reducing the hazard. The corners were still problematic.

Mr. Brennan stated if he came off of a corner and came back and the only area that would be higher would be in a corner, he asked if that would be acceptable?

Committee Member Fox stated it was not a design solution.

Chair Woollett stated he was involved with a project a few years ago where someone was running at night and he fell off the edge of the slope and hit the wall at the bottom. It was a big expensive item. He suspected that anyone with a potential danger area, whether it was the property owner, the designer, or the City, needed to be careful. Theoretically the safety issues were not the issue of the DRC, however, if the changes altered the aesthetics significantly the project would need to return to the DRC for review.

Mr. Brennan asked what would trigger that? He stated he felt at a loss, with a higher fence he would have issues at the corners, but he was also hearing that bringing the fence off of the property line could alleviate those issues and he was not certain what the DRC was requesting.

Committee Member Fox stated he needed to work that out keeping in mind that the Planning Department was going to have an issue with tubular steel fencing that was only 2' away from a

wall; if they wanted 5' away the fence needed to be 5' away and then the fence could be designed back from there.

Chair Woollett stated the project was a final determination, the DRC could theoretically condition what the applicant was presenting if security or hazard fencing was required it would need to be stepped off the property line.

Ms. Nguyen asked “stepped off the property line or the retaining wall?” The retaining wall was not on the property line.

Chair Woollett stated it would need to be stepped off of the property line. The fence could not go on the neighbor's property. He asked the Committee if they could conceive of a condition that would anticipate that potential fence placement?

Committee Member Fox stated with the fence there were other issues. She had issues with other parts of the project, such as the accessory building and some of the issues she had last time that were not changed.

Chair Woollett stated they had spent a lot of time discussing and airing the issues.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the applicant had looked into stepping it as he had done in a sketch he presented to the applicant?

Mr. Brennan stated he had looked at that. He had looked at it in everyway and for the best design in what the property owners were looking for. At some point the block wall would be the hazard itself as he was at zero grade and going up and he would be stepping the wall, if the wall got clipped at the corner it would be what it was. He was not attempting to dispute a hazard, but with his conversations with Ms. Nguyen he needed to get every bit of that 10' and he had explored everything.

Committee Member Imboden stated the situation was caused and created by the project. There was another item he wanted to bring up; there had been a previous question about the driveway?

Mr. Brennan stated it was originally 8' and he had made the change to 12'.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had reviewed the planting palette and the Joshua trees had been left there. They would not grow.

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, stated just because the Staff Report had listed the project as a final determination, the determination had not needed to be done with the proposal before them; the item could be continued.

Committee Member Fox stated there were plenty of errors on the roof plan that needed to get solved and to have elevations to review; elevations that correctly reflected what was contained in the roof plans. The wall situation needed to be solved with contour lines and some coordination between the plans provided. If all of that was done, the DRC might be able to come up with conditions to approve the project. The corners needed to be solved.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the roof issues had been brought up on the initial review of the project, it was not something new. The errors were not fixed and they needed an accurate set of drawings.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had made a list of the issues.

1. Clean up the roof plan inconsistencies.
2. Wrap the stone at the outside corners.
3. Provide clear definition, perhaps a detail of the eave treatments.
4. Use consistent cap at the top of the river rock and continue a sill for the windows.
5. Resolve the roof configuration or pitch on the pavilion structure and the beam issue.
6. Remove the block wall at the front of the property.
7. Call out the location of the pool fence.
8. Specify planting information.
9. Clarify where the stepping of the block wall would occur, including contours.
10. Resolve the design issues for the rear retaining wall and if guard rail was included.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the plan could also include where the trail was located?

Mr. Brennan stated it was not a part of the project.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was relevant to the project.

Mr. Brennan stated it was on Lot No. 4 and it was getting relocated to where the easement was initially. He was still unclear of what the DRC needed to see in regards to solving the wall issue; he was at a loss as he thought they had solved it.

Chair Woollett stated he understood from the Committee Member's discussion if there was not a guard rail shown to be on the top of the fence and when the proposal got to the Building Department it was deemed as a requirement, that a change at that point would need to be made. The proposal could then be conditioned for a return to the DRC for review of the design. It was difficult to condition the wall as presented as the DRC had not known what the implications would be.

Mr. Brennan stated basically he needed to review the proposal with the Building Department.

Chair Woollett stated if the Building Department determined that a guard rail was not necessary, it would not be an issue with the DRC.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not agreed with that. He asked Mr. Ortlieb if an applicant brought forth a design as part of project that the DRC felt created a hazard, would it be within the purview of the Committee to condition that component of the project?

Mr. Ortlieb stated if the design created a hazard, it would be within the DRC's purview to condition that.

Committee Member Imboden stated he could not tell from what had been presented if a hazard existed and whether the Building Department required a rail or not, he was not confident that it was not a hazard.

Chair Woollett stated the definition of a hazard was defined by code. The code was specific and he felt it was not the responsibility of the DRC to determine what was a hazard, it was determined by code. If they started doing that they could get into trouble. They could call attention to a potential hazard.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he agreed that it was something the DRC shouldn't be involved with.

Committee Member Imboden stated the Building Department had not relied solely on code to determine a hazardous situation and they had the purview to require x, y, and z be completed if a situation was deemed as hazardous.

Chair Woollett stated the Building Department, based on their job description, had the authority to make those determinations.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was not a building code issue for him.

Committee Member McCormack stated when he reviewed a situation where there was a 10' drop he looked at it as he would not want anyone to fall 10', and then he looked at the situation from a design point of view. All the factors came into play and they had to determine what was more important, safety, aesthetics, or money.

Mr. Brennan stated he had just completed a building with a 10' block wall right on a property line and he had to do some things to the slope to meet the soil engineer's requirements. He had done that to recapture land and there was not a building code that would require a rail on top of that fence. It was similar to the situation that was being presented in the project before them. If a guard rail was required he was not opposed to that, but he was familiar with code and how to build; he had built a lot. He felt he was not getting clear direction. He wanted to move forward.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would want to review a design that would prevent a 10' drop at the rear of the property.

Committee Member Fox stated there were a lot of options to create that.

Mr. Brennan asked if he placed a guard rail in the back with a 10' wall would that be acceptable to Staff?

Ms. Nguyen stated it would need to be determined if that would be a single wall or whether it would be considered two walls.

Mr. Ortlieb stated there were a number of items that the DRC had concerns with and the point of the wall may be moot if Staff was able to have a discussion with the Building Department in the mean time and they would work with the applicant to find solutions.

Mr. Brennan stated the concerns were very subjective.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to continue DRC No. 4586-11, Larson Residence, with the comments provided.

SECOND: Tim McCormack
AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4621-12 – MENCHIE’S SIGN

- A proposal to add two wall signs and one window sign within the Tustin Redevelopment District.
 - 1267 N. Tustin Street
 - Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
 - DRC Action: Final Determination
-

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

Applicant, Kelly Miller, address on file, stated she was available for questions.

Public Comment

None.

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

Committee Member Wheeler asked on page 6 of the Staff Report, the aluminum sign was noted as not illuminated, but one side was illuminated; was one side opaque so the light would not come through?

Ms. Miller stated that was correct. The call out was translucent vinyl film and she believed the light would only be coming through the front of the sign.

The Committee Members reviewed the proposal.

Committee Member Imboden stated there was a film placed over the acrylic to provide the colors to the sign.

Ms. Miller stated that was correct, for the letters of the frozen yogurt.

Committee Member Fox stated she was fine with the proposal and she asked if the monument sign was being modified?

Ms. Miller stated it was not a part of the proposal.

Committee Member Fox stated the Big City Bagel sign was still there and on the Yoshinoya sign the previous business name was still visible.

Chair Woollett stated they could condition that clean up be done.

Ms. Nguyen stated that condition could be added for clean up.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve DRC No. 4621-12, Menchie’s Sign, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the additional condition as follows:

1. The prior business signage be painted over or restored to an original condition, prior to issuance of a building permit.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

(4) DRC No. 4568-11 & MNSP 0672-11 - STORAGE WEST

- A proposal to renovate an existing office commercial building at the Storage West facility. Landscaping modifications and parking have been incorporated into the proposal.
 - 681 S. Tustin Street
 - Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
 - DRC Action: Recommendation to the Community Development Director
-

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

Applicant, Pat Sullivan, address on file, stated there would be no new work on the west elevation.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the glass appeared to be wrapping around the west elevation.

Mr. Sullivan stated there was no work being doing to the west side.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the drawings noted glass to wrap around corner.

Mr. Sullivan stated that must have been added.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they had samples of the glass and would it match in color?

Mr. Sullivan stated it would match and have an opaque finish.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was not a dimension noted for the parapets that wrapped over the edge, and he asked what that dimension would be?

Mr. Sullivan asked if 4' be acceptable?

Committee Member Wheeler stated when they were wrapped around, whatever the trim was should be wrapped around the back. There was a little confusion on the east elevation, it was shown as stucco but he believed it was supposed to be metal.

Mr. Sullivan stated it should all be metal.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the east side elevation showed a pilaster that stopped, but the other drawings on the west showed similar pilasters that had not stopped. He asked if those would end with a pilaster or be wrapped down and would those extend past the roof?

Mr. Sullivan stated on the south elevation it went across with a canopy, wrapped the corner and then dropped down. The Committee Members reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Fox stated it was a huge improvement and she was just sad that it was not occurring on the north side. There were those lovely corrugated awnings on the north side.

Mr. Brennan stated that would be a future phase. His client was taking the initiative to fix up their properties. They were planning on hitting the other portion of the building at a later date.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the property owner would be retaining the same gardener? The shrubs were all clipped into cylinders, he had painstakingly created tuna fish can-like shrubs in various sizes, and he would continue that concept. If they were keeping the “Edward Scissor Hand”-clipped landscape, the new plants proposed would need to be dealt with. To make the proposed plants work, the existing “works of art” would almost need to be removed. The maintenance would be the issue.

Mr. Brennan stated he would speak with the property owners.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval to the Community Development Director of DRC No. 4568-11, Storage West, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report with the following conditions:

1. Prior to building permit submittal that the applicant shall provide the Planning Department with a west elevation that the Planning Department may review for consistency.
2. The applicant shall specify the minimum return distance for the parapets over the roof, to be at least 4’.
3. The cornice around the raised tower elements be extended as far to the rear, to indicate that there was wrapping around the corner.

SECOND: Carol Fox

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on June 6, 2012.

SECOND: Carol Fox
AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m.