CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

August 1, 2012

Committee Members Present:	Carol Fox Robert Imboden Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett Tim McCormack
Committee Members Absent:	None
Staff in Attendance:	Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Woollett opened the Administrative Session at 5:09 p.m. with a review of the Agenda.

Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, stated there were no changes to the Agenda.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of July 18, 2012; changes and corrections were noted.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:21 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 ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 18, 2012

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of July 18, 2012 with corrections and changes noted during the Administrative Session.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

The meeting was closed at 5:34 p.m. in order to wait for the applicant's representative on Agenda Item No. 2.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to close the meeting.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Woollett reopened the Design Review Committee meeting at 5:40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items: None

New Agenda Items:

(2) DRC No. 4631-12 – SMALL COLLECTION FACILITY (Evolution Recycling)

- A proposal to install a buy-back recycling facility to be located in the rear parking lot area of an existing commercial shopping center.
- 7540 E. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review

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

Applicant, Kiyoshi Graves, address on file, handed out an additional information packet to the Committee Members and Staff. He stated the basic operation of the facility would be a deposit recycle and buy back center. Patrons would deposit recyclable plastics, cans, and glass. The recyclable materials would be collected and stored in bins, which periodically would be off-loaded and replaced with empty bins. The components would be the storage bins and an enclosure, which were modified based on City standards and aesthetics.

Chair Woollett asked if the bins were actually placed on a truck?

Mr. Graves stated yes.

Chair Woollett stated the structure that was proposed would not sit on the bins, but would be an independent structure.

Mr. Graves stated yes, that was correct. He referred to Tab No. 5 of the hand out and stated that was the current design option. There were a few iterations that he had gone through with City Staff. On option 1, view C, that option indicated there would be two bins inside the enclosure and those would be free to move back and forth to be slid out to be loaded onto a truck for off-loading. The structure was self supported. The walls would be square steel framing that was welded. Wall materials were typically sheet metal, finished to match the development that the recycle center was adjacent to.

Chair Woollett asked what would keep the structure from tipping over when the bins were removed?

Mr. Graves stated there were reinforcements in the walls to withstand lateral force and the structure would be structurally engineered.

Committee Member Fox asked if the structure would be anchored into the ground?

Mr. Graves stated it could be as it was a site specific component. Typically that would be determined during plan check.

Mr. Garcia stated at other locations in the City with similar structures, those had been anchored to the ground.

Chair Woollett stated that he recalled the site had asphalt.

Mr. Graves stated the specific area where the proposed installation would be was concrete. He provided a photo detail of the site and reviewed the photos with the Committee Members.

Committee Member Fox asked if the doors faced the alley?

Mr. Graves stated yes, they would be parallel to the direction of the alley. On photo No. 1, there was some natural screening. The view from the façade down the access aisle had natural screening of trees to the right and there was no development on the west side of the property. On the left-hand side there was the commercial shopping building. There were sight lines to the townhomes to the south, but with the door options proposed that would mitigate any potential exposure.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the trees were on the shopping center site?

Mr. Graves stated yes. The property line extended approximately 20 feet to the west with more undeveloped property beyond that.

Committee Member Imboden asked if there was a landscaping requirement for the proposal?

Mr. Garcia stated there was not a landscape requirement.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he understood that under Tab No. 5 of the supplemental information provided, that was the best illustration of what was being proposed.

Mr. Graves stated it was the one that had been most acceptable in their conversations with Mr. Garcia. He wanted to have the opportunity to discuss their options, and it had been noted that Planning Staff had not taken a firm position and there had been a comment that the applicants would have a discussion with the Design Review Committee Members. There was a practical matter, as typically a 24' standard cargo bin was used for the operation throughout the industry, but they had an issue in maintaining the access aisle with that size of a bin; the City of Orange had a minimum width requirement of 25'. In order to meet the requirement the bins were staggered and Planning Staff had felt that aesthetically that was a bit clumsy in appearance; he referred to Tab No. 4, which was an alternate layout. Mr. Graves stated the alternate layout fell in line with their typical enclosure option with a 90 degree angle in the front, but they would lose space in the back with the bins. The idea would be to find shorter bins for their proposal, but that proved to be not plausible. One option that they felt would be workable would be to remove the concrete block wall at the rear of the proposed site and push the bins back with the enclosure at a 90 degree angle to the existing block wall to gain that area and allow the 24' bins to be used.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a catch basin behind that wall.

Mr. Graves stated they would need to address reinforcing that wall and he believed that would allow the room they required for their proposal and still be within the property line.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if an engineer had reviewed that option?

Mr. Graves stated not yet.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the wall modification would be required in order for the current application to work?

Mr. Graves stated it would not be required to be approved to meet current development standard criteria, but it would be required for operational reasons.

Committee Member Imboden stated he understood that; what he was asking was if the catch basin that existed on site would work in removing the wall?

Mr. Graves stated he wanted to discuss that possibility to allow for the longer bin.

Committee Member Fox stated what the applicant was stating was that the 18' 6" bin would not work on its own because those bins were not available.

Mr. Graves stated that was correct.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the reason for the wall's length was based on the bin size?

Mr. Graves stated the wall he referred to was depicted in the rendering of the current design proposal that proposed the use of an 18' 6" bin. If they went with the longer standard bin the wall length would be longer. The wall would be long enough to screen the bin. The bin surface could not be matched to anything.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it seemed to him that they might be stuck without knowing if the masonry wall at the rear could be removed.

Mr. Graves stated there was the other option that had the staggered layout and that would allow the full length of the bins to be utilized without needing to remove the back concrete wall and maintained the access aisle. The initial layout had been bins with a screen wall, and that scenario would work to some extent with the staggered bins, but with the enclosure at the front it created a problem.

Chair Woollett stated the applicant was before them for a preliminary review and not for an approval. He felt the reason the roof had been added was per Staff's request.

Mr. Garcia stated that was correct.

Chair Woollett stated the DRC Members might feel the roof was not necessary; the applicant was before them to discuss ideas.

Committee Member Fox stated she questioned why the roof had not covered the entire structure?

Mr. Graves stated the roof was not there to protect the bins as the bins were water proof; the roof was added to provide a working area for the attendant.

Committee Member Fox stated with the primary view of the structure the roof appeared to not be aligned with the walls.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had been to recycling centers and understood how they worked. When the doors were open there would be a staging area out front and there were a number of ways they worked. Typically the sites were near a market that redeemed the money from the recycling center's receipt; at the proposed location he asked if Staff had reviewed any designated areas for pedestrian movement from the recycling area to and from the market and to vehicles?

Mr. Graves stated the recycling center paid at the site, there would be no need for redemption at the market.

Committee Member Wheeler asked where would the scale be located during business hours?

Mr. Graves stated it would be inside the bins or in the enclosure area.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the bins had doors as well and how would the doors work and would they swing a full 270 degrees or would the doors stick out?

Mr. Graves stated they would review that and typically the doors would swing out within the enclosure area; the drawings that were provided were not drawn to scale.

Applicant, Luis Ordonez, address on file, stated the doors on the bin were only 4' and would not extend more than 4' when open and they would be double hinged. Each bin would have two doors and they would be covered within the enclosure; they would not extend beyond the enclosure.

Chair Woollett asked if the enclosure would extend 4' beyond the bins?

Mr. Ordonez stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if that would then require a shorter bin?

Mr. Ordonez stated that was the reason they would need to research if the back wall could be removed to allow the bins to be moved further back.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he understood that an 18' 6" enclosure would require a 14' bin.

Mr. Ordonez stated if the wall could not be moved back and they kept the enclosure and bins as proposed, and with one door open on the bin, it would not extend beyond the enclosure.

Mr. Graves and Mr. Ordonez discussed with the Committee Members how the doors would work on the bins and enclosure.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if there was a hinge on the door that would allow the door to open 270 degrees?

Mr. Ordonez stated they had doors that would do that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if that was what would be proposed it would be odd to place the signage on the wall that would be hidden by the door.

Mr. Graves stated the doors would only be open in that configuration for off-loading of the bins, which would occur every 7 – 10 days. Other times that door would be closed.

Committee Member McCormack stated for normal operation one door would be open with the attendant standing in front, as shown, and he would do all of his business in that contained space.

Mr. Graves stated the photos and drawings were not to scale, but depicted a typical set up with the door openings not extending past the enclosure; with room for a scale and basic work area.

Committee Member Imboden stated with the proposed hours until 7:00 p.m. what would the lighting options be?

Mr. Ordonez stated the facility would not be open beyond 5:30 p.m. and they would not work after sunset.

Mr. Graves stated in planning they asked for the maximum hours of operation and those would be cut back with final plans. There would be no power proposed to the facility.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the scale worked without power?

Mr. Ordonez stated yes, it was battery operated.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the bins were dedicated to the facility or if they would be swapped out with other sites?

Mr. Ordonez stated they would be swapped with other bins. The bins were pressure washed and maintained with graffiti removal and signage maintenance.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the back of the facility was not shown in any of the renderings provided and he assumed the back of the bins would be visible over the masonry wall from the other parking lot. He asked if the bin colors could be the same color as the building?

Mr. Ordonez stated the bins would match; they would be a tan color with a faded green and orange sign on the side.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the bins were owned by the company?

Mr. Ordonez stated yes they were.

Mr. Graves stated on Tab No. 7, item 2, there was a picture of what was behind the block wall. There were some trees and if sitting in the coffee shop to the right there would be some visibility, but not full exposure. There was not a photo from behind the wall, but they could get that.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that the applicant speak to the property owner about cleaning out all the trash in the catch basin before the next rain as it was a mess back there. This was not the DRC's concern.

Mr. Graves stated they could bring that up with the management.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the wall was 5' and the bins were 8', and 3' of the bins would be visible above the wall.

Committee Member Imboden asked how close to the wall the enclosure would be?

Mr. Graves stated the wall at the northern portion would be at the property line and then angle away.

Committee Member Imboden asked Mr. Garcia if there was a zero set back for the proposal.

Chair Woollett asked if there would be designated parking for the recycling facility?

Mr. Garcia stated parking spaces would not be allowed to be reserved specifically for the recycling facility. In reality the parking spaces that were close to the site would typically be used, however, specific spaces would not be allowed to be reserved for exclusive use of the facility.

Committee Member Imboden asked if an ADA space would be required?

Mr. Graves stated the development standards had not required additional parking or handicap space provisions.

Mr. Garcia stated he would check on that with the Building Department.

Chair Woollett stated the site would be situated at the back of the commercial buildings and not a place where anyone would go, unless they were going to the recycling facility, and he had not

felt it was necessary to have a roof on the facility. If the wall was high enough and the bins would be enclosed on all three sides, he would be okay with that. He had no problem with the doors being open during business hours.

Committee Member Wheeler stated as long as the view would be only from the alley side then he would not have a problem with it.

Committee Member Fox stated she had a problem with the staggered proposal looking haphazard and appearing more of a temporary situation. She liked the more flushed front; it appeared a bit more upscale.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the applicant would need to find out if the masonry wall could be removed; it could be more of a problem with the catch basin being moved. He would want more accurate and complete drawings with details such as the view with the bins being 4' back, where the scale would be located, how the doors would operate, and all of that information.

Committee Member McCormack stated with the wall being removed it would appear as if the facility was meant to be there and it would be an improvement.

Committee Member Fox stated there was a slope situation at the wall.

Committee Member Imboden stated the applicant would need to know the topography of the site, and if the enclosure was a pre-fab thing that would be sitting on a sloped piece of paving what would that mean; would there be a gap?

Committee Member Fox stated the roof was not needed but to have the enclosure on all four sides with the benefit of a cleaner, more streamline appearance.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the view from the restaurant parking lot would be more important than the view from the alley.

Committee Member Fox stated she wondered if the enclosure doors were needed for security?

Mr. Ordonez stated at some of their sites the bins sat by themselves without the need of an enclosure.

Committee Member Fox asked if there would be room for lurkers in there?

Mr. Ordonez stated not if the enclosure went all the way around.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if a roll-up door was considered?

Mr. Garcia stated the roll-up door was the first type of door that was considered, however, with a roll-up door the access to the bins would be hindered.

Committee Member Wheeler stated a 16' segmented roll-up door would work, however, that would require a roof. The applicant would want to ensure that the doors would swing all the way over.

Mr. Ordonez stated at another one of their sites they had that type of set up with hinges that would allow the door movement, and at that same site the bin signage was painted inside the door.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was some signage at the back side of the enclosure where it would not be visible.

Mr. Graves stated that had been on one of their earlier iterations, but they were no longer going with that.

Committee Member McCormack stated the space was not plum level and he asked how they would deal with that?

Mr. Ordonez stated the enclosure would be prefabricated to the site. His guy would come out, measure it, and run it through approved drawings; it would not be just set down there, it would be unique to the site. Everything would be level and perfect.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the wall finish would run all the way to the ground?

Mr. Ordonez stated yes, the bin would not be visible.

Committee Member McCormack asked how the bins would be leveled?

Mr. Ordonez stated the enclosure wall would be higher than the bin and that would accommodate for any unevenness, it would not be visible if the bins would be a bit off.

Committee Member Imboden asked without a roof and with the walls meeting the ground, how would water drain from the site?

Mr. Ordonez stated there would be an access area; there might be a small space.

Committee Member Imboden stated it would need to be specified as a large gap vs. a small gap, aesthetically it would make a difference.

Committee Member Fox stated the water would run right out the doors based on the slope.

Chair Woollett asked how they would react if the storm drain needed to remain where it was and water might need to drain right under the bins; would that be a problem?

Committee Member Wheeler stated the storm drain was for the drainage on the other side and the slope at the bin site would be a sheet flow to the front.

Committee Member Fox stated at this point the applicant was looking for feedback from the Committee and she asked if everyone was in agreement that the staggered proposal was not acceptable?

The Committee Members agreed that the staggered proposal was not the best option.

Mr. Garcia asked as they had moved away from requiring a roof, would the DRC want to see a square wall or something with a break that would be similar to the commercial buildings at the site?

Committee Member Imboden stated he would say no to that.

Committee Member Fox stated there were many buildings in the center that were flat and she would support just a flat finish. She would want a condition that the top of the wall might need to be raised to a height that would conceal the bins.

Committee Member Imboden agreed with that and he would feel comfortable that the bins would be screened. He would want to review the finish materials.

Mr. Ordonez stated the finish would be a smooth metal finish with a textured paint. The paint itself would have a bit of a texture.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there would not be any automated machines out there and that should be made clear on the drawings. That could be a noise issue.

Mr. Ordonez stated there would be no machinery and no power to the site.

Chair Woollett stated with the steel walls sitting on the pavement he asked how would rust be handled and had they considered adding a concrete base with the wall on top of that?

Mr. Ordonez stated they had not done that and even if the walls went all the way to the ground, there would be enough space for water to flow.

Chair Woollett stated what he was hearing was that there would be posts to hold the wall.

Mr. Ordonez stated yes, there would be individual footings approximately every 48". There would be posts with the walls between them.

Chair Woollett stated the steel post would be subjected to the water.

Mr. Ordonez stated the post would be treated with paint.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would not be any worse than a fence post.

Committee Member Fox asked if the structure was considered a permanent structure or had they required a temporary permit?

Mr. Garcia stated since the structure would be anchored to the ground it would be looked at as a permanent structure.

Mr. Graves stated a building permit would be pulled. The structures could be moved, although there was no plan to move them.

Mr. Garcia stated with the discussion he was hearing that conditions should be added prohibiting reverse vending at the site and increasing the wall height to screen the bins.

Committee Member Fox stated the height of the wall could increase to conceal the bins.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that the applicant gain a better understanding about the wall removal before they went forward, and he was not certain who owned the catch basin.

Mr. Graves stated he wanted to clarify that the recycling facility would have an enclosure all the way around, with two doors at the front and that the bins would be far enough back to allow the bin doors to open and the scenario for normal operation would be the one door open flush against the wall.

The Committee Members agreed.

Chair Woollett stated there was a need for a facility in that area.

Mr. Ordonez stated the State of Californian conducted studies and took the amount of CRV that was sold in the area to determine need.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there had been a recycling facility behind the Albertsons at Chapman and Jamboree with signs outside the store and the bins were still there, but the last time he looked they were all locked up.

There was no further discussion.

The proposal was submitted for a preliminary review and no action was taken on the item.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Fox made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, August 15, 2012.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 6:24 p.m.