

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

January 16, 2013

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

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: David Khorram, Chief Building Official
Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner
Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Woollett opened the Administrative Session at 5:12 p.m.

Chief Building Official, David Khorram, announced that there was an upcoming Webinar, “Striking a Balance” (using fire protection in Historic buildings) on Tuesday, January 29 from 12:00 to 1:30 p.m. and he asked the Design Review Committee (DRC) Members if anyone was interested in attending. The Committee Members discussed the upcoming presentation with Mr. Khorram and most of them had an interest in attending. Committee Member Imboden stated he would probably participate at his work place. Mr. Khorram stated he would send out an email with further details.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the DRC would have an opportunity to provide any input to the City’s Street Tree Master Plan, as it had been discussed during a previous meeting.

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, stated she was not aware of the situation and asked if that was something that Anna Pehoushek had discussed with the Committee Members?

Committee Member Imboden stated information had been shared about the Master Plan update and Committee Member McCormack had expressed an interest in providing input.

Mr. Khorram stated he would follow up on that and report back to the Committee.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the December 5, 2012 DRC meeting. Changes and corrections were noted.

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

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 5:37 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: December 5, 2012

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of December 5, 2012, with the changes and correction 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: None

New Agenda Items:

(2) DRC No. 4642-12 - FARMER BOY’S RESTAURANT

- A proposal to construct a new 2,998 sq. ft. restaurant with a 253 sq. ft. outdoor patio and a drive-thru on a vacant lot.
- 1220 N. Batavia 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.

Chair Woollett asked if the “reader board” needed to be screened from the street?

Ms. Nguyen stated yes, from the public right-of-way.

Applicant, Dan Hinson, address on file, thanked Staff for working with him and he thanked the DRC for hearing the item. He was available for questions.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member McCormack asked if a “reader board” and “menu board” was the same thing?

Ms. Nguyen stated yes.

Committee Member Fox stated that she wanted to clarify what areas on the building were in the red color, and asked if the red color would not be in the recessed areas?

Mr. Hinson stated that was correct.

Committee Member Fox reviewed the plans with the applicant to clarify the color scheme on the proposal.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was an area that was not recessed.

Mr. Hinson stated he was correct. The area that Committee Member Wheeler spoke to popped out and he pointed out the area on the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the awning would be at risk of vehicles hitting it?

Mr. Hinson stated the area of the building he was referring to was set back with landscaping in front.

Committee Member Fox stated when the project was submitted to the Building Division, she would want it to indicate the color that would go on some of those areas where it was not currently indicated. On the elevations, the returns were not called out.

Ms. Nguyen stated a condition could be added that the color of the walls shall be in substantial conformance with the color elevations shown to the DRC at the meeting. She would verify the colors during plan check and in the field.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what the finish was for the trash enclosure?

Mr. Hinson stated generally they would use a split-face product.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that introducing a new element would not be a good idea and to use stucco to match existing stucco.

Mr. Hinson stated that was not a problem.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the location for the building had been explored further? It was unfortunate that the building, to some degree, would be hidden by the chain link fence that ran along the flood control channel. It would be difficult to see from Katella Avenue and asked if the location of the building had been explored in moving it closer to Batavia?

Mr. Hinson stated they actually had done that and in order to meet the parking requirements, circulation, and set back, the location of the building in the proposal before the Committee was the best they could come up with.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he often times referred to the area of the proposed project as a cornice-free zone. He would very much prefer if the cornices were a much simpler rectangular form as it would be much more compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Hinson asked if the cornice could still be stepped?

Committee Member Wheeler stated yes; he was suggesting a simple form with not too many steps.

Committee Member Fox stated the plans noted a 20' high parapet and the elevations noted 20' - 6" and it was not that she cared one way or the other, but there needed to be consistency. The top of the parapet on the roof plan indicated 20'.

Mr. Hinson stated it would actually be 20'.

Committee Member Fox reviewed the plans and stated the drawings scaled at 20' - 6".

Committee Member Wheeler stated the drawings in their packets had stated 20’.

Chair Woollett stated the roof line was called out at 20’ -6”.

Mr. Hinson stated 20’ -6” would ensure the equipment would be screened completely.

Committee Member Fox stated the drawings might be an older copy and 20’ -6” was the newest dimension. She went on to comment that there was a chain link fence that ran up along the flood control channel, and the City did not approve chain link fencing. Since there was such a substantial amount of work being done within the site, she wondered if that could be changed. The view from Katella Avenue would be much more pleasant.

Mr. Hinson stated it was not their property or fence.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested if it was possible to explore another type of fence.

Committee Member Fox asked if the signage was being approved?

Ms. Nguyen stated no.

Committee Member Fox stated the tile appeared to be part of the signage and it was called out on the elevation as another material.

Mr. Hinson stated that was an error. The tile was part of Farmer Boy’s signage and it had not come out as one unit, but the tile was initially installed with the signage on top of that.

Committee Member Fox asked if they would be able to have a sample of the tile when the item came back for review of the signage.

Ms. Nguyen stated the signage would not come back as it was a single tenant in a free-standing building; the applicant was not required to have a Sign Program. If the tile backing was part of the signage it would be counted as part of the signage area allowance.

Chair Woollett stated at this point the tile would not need to be considered a part of the sign.

Ms. Nguyen stated on the 7-Eleven store’s signage they had a rainbow stripe on their sign and it was considered part of their signage.

Chair Woollett agreed that the 7-Eleven stripe would be part of the signage but Farmer Boy’s tiles should not.

Committee Member Fox stated she was not concerned with the signage, but was concerned with the tile.

Committee Member Imboden asked what her concern was?

Committee Member Fox stated the color palette and sometimes the rendering was not the same as the samples.

Ms. Nguyen stated there was a color board sample.

Committee Member Fox asked if they could condition the color of the tile as per sample.

Committee Member Imboden asked if Committee Member Fox would be comfortable if there was an added condition that the signage field shall be a 6” x 6” forest green tile as it appeared in the renderings?

Committee Member Fox stated that was fine.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the roof plan there was what appeared to be a gable, but on the southwest elevation there was the same gable designation, but it was not visible on the elevation.

Mr. Hinson reviewed the elevations with Committee Member McCormack and explained the elevation views as they would actually be seen by a person at grade. The Committee Members reviewed the elevations.

Mr. Hinson stated everything on the back of the building would be finished below the parapet.

Committee Member Fox asked if there was a reason the trellis posts were spaced in no relationship to the windows behind them?

Mr. Hinson stated an intermediate post could be added. The Farmer Boy’s associates liked the wood treatment. There was the same element inside the store and they used the same spacing to give it a universal feel.

Committee Member McCormack asked, referring to the patio plans, why there was stucco or stone treatment on a specific area?

Mr. Hinson stated it was a bit confusing; the front was a stucco finish and behind the wall was the dry stacked stone with a break line. On the building it was dry stacked and on the screen wall in front of the patio it was all stucco, interior and exterior.

Committee Member McCormack stated if it was the same material all the way around it would not make the space look so aggregated in its wall treatments, design-wise. It was a space.

Mr. Hinson stated the patio enclosure wall was not connected to the main building, it was set apart.

Committee Member Imboden stated it would appear more added-on to have stone on one side and not the other.

Committee Member McCormack stated it could go on both sides.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested stone on the pilaster portion to tie it all in.

Mr. Hinson stated they could do that.

Chair Woollett asked if there were any other comments?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was happy.

Committee Member Fox asked about the spacing of the Flax?

Committee Member McCormack stated he had some issues. On the parking space that was closest to the bicycle rack there were no wheel stops and a car parked in that space could hit the menu board. That space seemed problematic and seemed “added in,” in comparison to the other spaces. If they had not needed that space he suggested it could be used as a planting area.

Mr. Hinson stated they needed 33 parking spaces and they were right at the 33 spaces.

Ms. Nguyen stated it was a challenge to get all the spaces in.

Committee Member McCormack suggested moving the menu board.

Committee Member Imboden suggested switching the motorcycle parking with the space Committee Member McCormack was concerned with, closest to the menu board.

Mr. Hinson reviewed the plans to understand if there was enough space to make the switch and stated it appeared that it would work.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that in that case the space would no longer require the back-up area.

Committee Member McCormack asked how the access point had been arrived at; the 3’ path on the public right-of-way?

Mr. Hinson stated that was a function of the stacking. The area went between vehicles as much as possible. There was a 20’ allowance per vehicle and from the pick-up window it added up to where the access point was.

Committee Member McCormack stated they could treat it with a speed bump.

Mr. Hinson stated they would rather not do that for two reasons: (1) a grading issue, and (2) it could be problematic with a vehicle pulling half-way up and rolling backwards; it was something they would not want to do in a drive-thru.

Committee Member McCormack reviewed the landscape plans with the applicant and pointing to the grease interceptor, he asked how often it required draining?

Mr. Hinson stated it was dependent on the store’s volume.

Committee Member McCormack stated with a 5-gallon shrub there would be 8” of soil it would sit on before it hit the grease trap.

Committee Member Fox asked if Committee Member McCormack was concerned with having the Flax work in that space?

Committee Member McCormack stated typically they were installed plum level and water sat there on top and would not drain. There was always a layer of water; the roots would hit that and the plant would die. The person installing the grease trap would not care about the plants. What would occur was that the plants would not perform well in that zone. Initially they would do okay for about a year, but after that they would not perform very well. He suggested ground cover planting in that zone rather than relying on larger plants to survive on top of the grease trap. Also, he counted five different trees. It appeared there was a different tree for every condition on the site, which put many different trees on a fairly small lot. There was a small tree for the small planting zone. There was only one deciduous tree and he would suggest the same tree treatment for the street edge, for some continuity. There was also a Bottle tree that would not perform well; it would do much better in the desert. As for using Flax for a screen, it had been done and it would get big. He questioned the use of Sunset Flax and he asked who made it? Other than that, he thought it was fine. They would not get the screening that they wanted in the first five years. Typically for screening he would use Ligustrum, that would come out as a screening element and spaced appropriately would screen in a year. The Flax at 5’ on center was a problem; if it was planted closer for immediate screening it would be too close together five years out.

Committee Member Fox asked what if they used a larger size?

Committee Member McCormack stated that could be done, but it was generally not done due to the costs associated with the larger plants.

Committee Member Fox stated if the spacing was greater they would not need as many plants.

Ms. Nguyen stated Code required that the landscape grow to maturity to screen within two years. The specie and plant size would need to be chosen to meet that Code requirement.

Committee Member McCormack stated in that case, Flax would not be the best choice as it was usually used as an accent plant and not a screening plant. If they wanted screening, Flax was not at the top of the list; it would screen in five years. It was a strappy plant and when it needed to be trimmed the fronds needed to be removed and then the plant became smaller. It was not like a hedge that would fill in.

Committee Member Imboden stated his response to those comments would be how much of the screening would they actually get at the height that it was supposed to be? More often than not it was kept shorter. Flax was not trimmed as other plants were.

Ms. Nguyen stated Chocolate, Sunset Flax, or Variegatum were specified by the applicant and she asked if those had the same problem?

Committee Member McCormack stated if they used the Tom Thumb variety, that was smaller but it would not screen.

Mr. Hinson stated in five years it would provide the screening and it would not be cut short.

Committee Member McCormack stated over time it would screen and he was relying on the planting growing without being cut. It could be cut, but it would not look very good.

Chair Woollett stated why couldn't they just allow it to grow naturally, to provide the screen?

Ms. Nguyen stated it would take five years and the Code required screening in two years. She asked if there was another plant that could be recommended?

Committee Member McCormack stated for screening he would go to the "heavyweights" such as Ligustrum or Prunus Caroliniana, a hedge.

Chair Woollett stated ultimately the Flax, planted at 5', would be the best solution.

Committee Member Fox stated they could put in the larger gallon size.

Committee Member Imboden stated that would be his suggestion.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would use a Pittosporum, which would naturally fill out and be naturally managed. There were a sub-group of shrubs, if left alone, which would just fill in.

Committee Member Fox stated a maintenance person could then "lollypop" them; she believed the Flax would make a nice screen on that side of the street and asked that a larger gallon be planted.

Committee Member McCormack stated to have proper screening it would require 15-gallon plants at the proper spacing.

The Committee Members discussed the options for planting and what areas would be screened.

Committee Member McCormack stated the "reader board" was in a different location on two different renderings.

Mr. Hinson stated it was off by a couple of feet.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the site plan it was in a different location.

Committee Member Fox stated in that area there were two different types of Flax. There were the larger ones at 8' on center.

Committee Member McCormack stated with the 5-gallon at 8' on center a wheel chair could get through there.

Committee Member Fox stated for screening there should be some at 15-gallon, with some of the smaller ones layered in.

Committee Member McCormack stated the 15-gallon could be at 7' on center.

Committee Member Fox stated the plants were staggered at three-deep and there was a wide zone for screening. Driving on Batavia with the effective spacing would be adequate to meet Code and she would want to see a few larger specimens with the Flax providing screening as they would grow nice and tall. They would not be hacked off and there would not need to be instructions left for maintenance people.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was not the instructions, but the choice of the maintenance person and how they wanted to or not want to trim a plant.

Committee Member Fox stated she would vote to keep the Flax and up their size.

Chair Woollett asked how many plants were they talking about?

Committee Member McCormack stated three. He went on to summarize what they had just been discussing; to focus on the proper planting over the grease trap. To have consistent trees at the front entry and use *Tristania conferta* to be compatible as a sibling plant and to not have the Bottle tree out there that would not perform well. He suggested for the Crape Myrtle to use an Indian tribe variety that was resistant to mildew and to specify whether they would be standard or multi-trunk.

Ms. Nguyen asked if he had a preference?

Committee Member McCormack stated the ones closer to the patio and entry area would look better in a multi-trunk; but if they were standard they would look fine too. They just needed to note which type on the landscape plans. On all the other trees, they should be a standard variety. In reviewing the planting area he would suggest the use of standard variety for all the trees.

Mr. Hinson asked if the trees should all be the same type, for consistency?

Committee Member McCormack stated there was no need for consistency and they could use a variety of trees. They were not set in an architectural fashion.

Committee Member Fox stated she had never seen that many conditions on a proposal and many of them had to do with the Water Quality plan. She asked if that would change the landscape plan when that was performed?

Ms. Nguyen stated because the DRC was the final determining body on the proposal they were also the final determining body on the Minor Site Plan Review (MNSP). Technically the DRC had the right to speak to things that were normally out of their purview; for example, if they wanted to speak to parking spacing, or things outside of architecture and landscape, they could. It is rare that the DRC is the final determining body for both a MNSP and DRC.

Committee Member McCormack stated with that being stated, he asked the applicant to explain the drainage concept on the site.

Mr. Hinson stated there was an underground catch basin that would go to the flood control channel. Unfortunately, due to the existing slopes on site, existing improvements, and the configuration of the pie shaped lot, they had to use an underground retention.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was a bio-swale?

Mr. Hinson stated there was not one. On the civil plan the drainage flowed along the gutter from the surface of the parking area. He reviewed the flow with Committee Member McCormack and stated everything would flow to the catch basin; it was more of a sheet flow.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was draining at .5%; there was no drain and there was a high point. He asked if there was a ridge in a certain area that he pointed to on the plans?

Mr. Hinson reviewed the civil plan with Committee Member McCormack. He stated they had gone back a couple of times with engineering and his civil engineer.

Committee Member Fox asked if the applicant had received permission from Orange County Flood Control to drain into their channel?

Mr. Hinson stated yes.

Committee Member McCormack stated all that water would drain around there, to go all the way around, and it seemed like a lot of water would go through the drive-thru. That was a lot of water.

Chair Woollett asked if the plans would be reviewed for drainage?

Ms. Nguyen stated Public Works would review the plans.

Chair Woollett stated then the Committee Members didn't have to discuss all of that.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if there would be any benefit to adding permeable paving?

Committee Member McCormack stated yes. When there was a drainage issue he had seen projects put the water through a bio-swale.

Ms. Nguyen stated there were very strict Water Quality Department requirements and if they were okay with the plan she would not want to change it. The plans before them were the Staff Review Committee (SRC) set that had been stamped and approved.

Mr. Hinson stated he had been back and forth with them for approvals. There was a reason why they had to take the water all the way around; it was some time ago that those plans had been prepared, and particularly with the client he was working with, they had not liked to have the underground retention. But because of some of the site constraints it had been their only option.

Chair Woollett stated he felt they had not needed to get involved with the Water Quality issues.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he agreed.

Committee Member Fox stated her concern was that if the Water Quality issues had not been addressed that could affect the landscape layout and all of their landscape discussion might not be relevant. If there were changes to the landscape plan she would want to see it again.

Mr. Hinson stated the Water Quality plan had already been submitted.

Chair Woollett stated they should move ahead with the proposal.

Committee Member Fox stated she could take a try at the motion and she would need some assistance with the landscape details. The Committee Members discussed the additional conditions and suggestions for the proposed project.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve DRC No. 4642-12, Farmer Boy's Restaurant, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the additional conditions:

- The parapet height to be 20' -6" as indicated on the roof plan and to be corrected on the elevations.
- The shape of the cornice to be square instead rounded.
- The paint on the walls to be in substantial conformance with the colored renderings.
- The tile in the signage area to be 6" x 6" forest green in conformance with the colored renderings.
- Stone to be placed on all faces of the patio pilasters.
- The trash enclosure to be stucco.
- Swap the motorcycle parking with the parking space nearest the entry by the "reader board" and to remove the need for a 5' back-up area at the end of the drive aisle and replace it with hardscape.
- Correct the menu board location on all plans to match the architectural site plan.
- To have appropriate planting in the reduced soil area over the grease trap.
- Three of the Flax shrubs nearest the menu board to be the larger 15-gallon plants for screening, planted 7' on center.
- Remove Bottle tree and replace with Tristania Conferta of the same size.
- Select Indian Tribe variety Crape Myrtle and specify multi-trunk or standard. All other trees on-site are standard.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

(3) DRC No. 4664-12 – SPIN! NEAPOLITAN PIZZA

- A proposal to remodel the exterior façade and move the existing outdoor patio to the north elevation. The new patio would be smaller than the original patio.
- 1623 W. Katella Avenue
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member McCormack recused himself from the item's presentation stating he had previously worked with the applicant.

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

Applicant, Steve Prothero, address on file, stated the proposal was straight forward and it involved two sides of the building. They were just addressing some changes to paint colors and signage. The patio would be located to the north side where there was more activity. It was a simple project. The look was Urban-Industrial with cement panels, and the trellis was galvanized steel with wood lattice and woven fabric.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had one very small item. On the signage he asked how the channel letters were constructed; he wanted it to be clear that there would not be an exposed raceway.

Mr. Prothero stated currently the existing signs had an upper and lower channel support. Basically it blended into the building as it was painted the same color.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they were proposing to use the same application?

Mr. Prothero stated he had not had that detail.

Committee Member Imboden stated there was a detail on page 5 of 11; there was an existing and proposed.

Committee Member Fox stated the letters would have light shining back at them and the shadow lines would be more visible.

Applicant, Robert Atkinson, address on file, stated the signs had been approved by the landlord and were consistent with the City approved sign criteria and there would not be a raceway on the new lettering. They were reverse channel. The tenant was very approachable in ensuring the

proposed color scheme was consistent with the colors in the center. In the context of the other signs it was more consistent.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the only condition would be to ensure there were no solid raceways.

Committee Member Fox stated she loved the design and she was excited to visit the restaurant. She asked how the awning material would be connected to the trellis.

Mr. Atkinson stated the edge would be seamed and stretched. It would be screwed in on top of the wood trellis with a washer system.

Committee Member Fox stated it appeared that the awning had its own frame structure on page A8.2, there was a notation of fabric stretched over metal framing; and there was a cantilever 7” off of the edge. There must be some other frame system. She asked if the fabric was wrapping around a tube frame?

Mr. Prothero stated that those details had not been worked out yet.

Mr. Atkins stated it was a shop drawing.

Committee Member Fox stated there would be this taut material that would cantilever out.

Mr. Prothero stated he was not certain it would cantilever.

Committee Member Fox stated she thought it was a great project.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was pleased with the project and they had gotten a lot of mileage out of the materials that they had chosen.

Chair Woollett asked if the sample was the actual thickness of the fiber cement panels?

Mr. Prothero stated yes. A cut piece was used to space it as they applied the material and it was secured through the face to a channel behind it. The color was painted onto the material or it could be left natural. It was made by a European company, and the product had been around for about 15 years.

Mr. Atkinson stated he had questioned the material at first, as it appeared more like a fiber board material. It was almost a substitute for Alucobond, in terms of exterior applications. It was used on tech buildings in the Silicone Valley. It was very nice.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4664-12, Spin! Neapolitan Pizza, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional condition:

- Signage to be reverse channel lettering applied directly to the wall without the use of exposed raceway and the existing raceway to be removed.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Fox made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on February 6, 2013.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 6:56 p.m.