CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

February 6, 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 Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Woollett opened the Administrative Session at 5:00 p.m.

Chief Building Official, David Khorram, stated there was no Policy or Procedural information.

Committee Member Fox stated there was an item on the Agenda that they might be able to approve without discussion, for Linx signage. Committee Member Wheeler stated he would be recused on the item. Committee Member Imboden and Chair Woollett agreed, and it would be brought up during the Regular Session.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would be recusing himself from the presentation of Item No. 4, Yaghi Residence, as he had provided input on the project and had worked with the applicant for the past year.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the January 16, 2013 Design Review Committee meeting. Changes and corrections were noted.

Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, stated she was joined by Deputy Director of Public Works/Field Operations, Michael Wolfe, and they were present to provide information on the City's Street Tree Master Plan Update. The Public Works Department had retained a resource group to update the City's 1999 Street Tree Master Plan. The City had found that in working with the 1999 plan, in the "real world" in dealing with mature trees and also responding to the public's increased expectations, the existing Master Plan was becoming a diminished plan in its effectiveness for Staff to work with. There was an internal City team that was working together understanding the issues of maintenance, City projects, and private projects. For a brief overview the intent of the Plan was to provide guidance pertaining to the management of trees within the public right-of-way. There was a focus on planting, maintenance, and the integration of a balance between Public Works and development perspectives on the role street trees in the community played. It was the first time there had been a concerted effort in recognizing the

relationship of the tree palette, the spacing of trees, planting, maintenance, environmental, and aesthetic benefits the street trees had. In response to the Design Review Committee's (DRC) interest in the subject, Ms. Pehoushek was bringing forward the scope of work and draft outline that the consultant had prepared. The outline had been reviewed internally and feedback had been provided to the consultant at the end of last year. The input received from the DRC would be passed along to the consultant.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the statement "scope of purpose" he had not seen anything listed about the public or stakeholders that would have any role or input in the Plan. On some projects brought before the DRC there was some agreement on how trees should be maintained and special consideration on historic trees. He wanted to know how the Plan addressed input from stakeholders. He had brought some information in about management that he had been looking at for a while. There was a new product coming out that allowed maintenance of a tree's root structure below concrete without the need of removing the concrete because of breakage. Other things such as structural soil where addressed and it was not only a matter of management for the tree but also for the sidewalks. Many times in neighborhoods it was treated as a public park, the right to walk along the sidewalk. The other issue was removal and replacement of trees and he was anxious to understand what the intent would be for replacement of trees. In the past the replacement of a tree was always focused on a very miniature tree; he had not necessarily believed in that and reducing the form of the urban forest. He wanted to understand the thought process and would not want to see a replacement of very mature trees with very small trees that would not create an urban forest in the future.

Chair Woollett stated he had not found anything in the Plan about water consumption and with respect to that, there was a larger question about water consumption in public spaces and landscape. He asked the question as his path to City Hall took him by some publicly landscaped areas that used excessive amounts of water, to the point that the pavement had been destroyed.

Committee Member Fox stated she would think the Public Works Department would want to be made aware of those issues.

Ms. Pehoushek stated street tree watering was by a water truck.

Mr. Wolfe stated when trees are planted the initial watering is by a water truck and once the tree is established the watering stops. There are a couple of places where there is irrigation system for the trees.

Chair Woollett asked if there was any anticipation that there would be irrigation of trees?

Mr. Wolfe stated no. A tree that required irrigation would not be used, as it made no sense from a resource standpoint.

Committee Member McCormack stated there had been studies about deep watering and during a period of time of one growing season. If a tree was deep watered during a tree's growing season, and it was not necessarily an everyday task, with time for the soil to dry out and then repeated deep watering during a tree's first growing season, the roots would go so far down that there would not be any problem with the pavement. The tree would be sustainable without regular water after that time. He had believed the growing season was not three months but more like

two-thirds of a year. If the roots were established there would not be concrete issues and it would be something to research.

Mr. Wolfe stated there was a fine line between the cost of the tree and installation with initial maintenance. To introduce more resource requirements it would involve additional man-power to go out to water the tree for an extended period of time and those costs cut into the funds that were set aside for maintenance of already existing trees. When requirements were established Public Works looked at the requirements for maintenance of what existed and new resources. There was a balance between the resources for a new tree and the ongoing maintenance of planting another tree, trimming, and maintaining a tree. They needed to look at those items that might be more costly to the City.

Chair Woollett stated if it cost more to tear up a sidewalk later; there might actually be cost-saving to do something up front.

Mr. Wolfe stated there would need to be a cost analysis for that.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were studies that looked at a watering truck vs. a very inexpensive irrigation system.

Mr. Wolfe stated that would still require maintenance and repair; then it still required attention and things they had not done currently that would require additional costs. Picking the right tree in the right parkway was important for root issues.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not a tree expert, but what Committee Member McCormack was suggesting would keep tree roots off the ground, which was also causing the issue with the sidewalks to begin with. At some point that would need to be weighed out, which in the long term would be the best solution?

Mr. Wolfe stated also looking at the possibility that certain trees were not the best choice for a parkway.

Chair Woollett stated maybe the information for deep watering and sidewalk maintenance could be added as a part of the Plan.

Committee Member McCormack stated it could be any tree that had shallow watering, and 90% of trees that were given only surface water the roots of those trees would remain at the surface and the golden gem for the tree program would be deep watering. There would not be money wasted on the tree and concrete maintenance.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in an analysis it would be important to factor in the liability issues related to public sidewalks.

Committee Member McCormack stated Cornell University would probably have several studies on structural soil issues. It was a bitter pill to swallow to project for nine months of maintenance, but with the right watering there would be healthy trees for the future. In the scope of work in the Street Tree Plan draft it was stated that the consultant would be attending two DRC meetings, two hours each meeting.

Mr. Wolfe stated that had been included as an option.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the final Plan would come to the DRC, then Planning Commission, and ultimately to the City Council?

Ms. Pehoushek stated technically the Plan would not be brought back to the DRC.

Chair Woollett stated the DRC's request would be to have the Street Tree Master Plan come back to the DRC.

Committee Member Imboden stated with so many of the trees in Old Towne coming to the end of their life cycle, what was the intent to replace those and in some cases replacement of the same type of tree would not be the right thing to do. There needed to be an attitude and approach to how to manage those issues. Another place where it was of particular importance was at Hart Park and there was some serious decline in the Sycamore trees in that area. In a historic district trees were an important component of the area. It would be important that policies be provided for replacement of important species and the process for implementing such a plan.

Mr. Wolfe stated Hart Park was outside of the purview of street trees and anything in the park would be a different issue.

Committee Member McCormack stated the report listed 19,728 trees, 18 stumps, and 2,325 vacant sites.

Mr. Wolfe stated that was from the City's inventory and when it was noted as a stump it was a stump that needed to be removed.

Committee Member McCormack stated those were a lot of vacant sites.

Mr. Wolfe stated a vacant site was an established tree well and a vacant site in front of a residential property would not be considered vacant, unless there had been an original tree there or a tree that was initially inventoried. It would not be listed as a vacant site but just parkway area.

Committee Member McCormack stated many of the trees in parkways were planted incorrectly, or the wrong tree for the site; many planted over gas lines and sewer lines. Maybe part of the plan was to look at the infrastructure, where the sewer and gas lines were, when a new tree or replacement tree was needed. There were many cases where a tree might be removed and it would not be able to be planted in the same spot because of other things that were located in the ground.

Mr. Wolfe stated there were standards such as a certain distance from utilities; it was something that was looked at and included in the draft plan and would be updated as needed. There were certain distances that needed to be maintained from sewer and water lines and it would be included in the standards. There were many tree species lined out on the planting palette and the distances from utilities and trimming standards would all be updated.

Chair Woollett stated there had been an issue about pine cones dropping. How were hazards like that addressed?

Mr. Wolfe stated they tried to address hazards based on tree species and on established trees. Unfortunately, many of those were in established parks, including the Plaza Park, or on private property, and that was outside of what Public Works could do. If there was a tree that dropped large pine cones there were trimming standards developed to minimize hazards. The arborists understood the time frame that pine cones would drop and trimming schedules were based on that.

Committee Member Imboden asked about the trees on the Plaza Park perimeter, were those Public Works?

Mr. Wolfe stated those were part of the park and Community Services.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members were present.

COMMITTEE REORGANIZATIOIN WITH AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF FEBRUARY 20, 2013:

Election of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson.

Committee Member Wheeler nominated Committee Member Fox as Chairperson and Committee Member Imboden for Vice Chair.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

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.

Chair Woollett asked if there were any items on the Agenda that a motion could be presented without the need for discussion on the item?

Committee Member Fox stated item No. 7, Linx Restaurant, was an item that she would recommend approval on without discussion. All Committee Members agreed. Committee Member Wheeler stated he would abstain from the vote.

Chair Woollett asked if there was any Public Comment on the item? There was none.

Item No. 7 was moved without discussion (see page 41 of minutes for Motion).

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 16, 2013

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of January 16, 2013, with the changes and correction noted during the Administrative Session.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items: None

New Agenda Items:

(2) DRC No. 4651-12 - AUTO ZONE

- A proposal for exterior improvements and signage for a new tenant at an existing commercial building.
- 655 N. Tustin Street
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, (714) 744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, David Bentley, address on file, stated he was available for questions and what Staff had described was accurate.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on sheet CE-1, the north, south, east, and west elevations were mislabeled. On the sheet labeled north, but was actually the west elevation, there was a call out for a new wall in-fill; however, the material type was not noted.

Mr. Bentley stated the intent was to match existing.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the existing walls were brick.

Mr. Bentley stated they could use block and paint to match the brick, or match the brick.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would be hard to match.

Mr. Bentley stated if the brick was painted it should not be too difficult to match.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested the use of stucco.

Committee Member Imboden stated the renderings of the elevation they were speaking to had a stucco hatch on it. He agreed that stucco would be appropriate.

Committee Member Wheeler stated stucco, in a smooth finish. On the south elevation there was a note to block in exterior doors and he suggested the use of stucco in that area as well, in order

to match what was being done in the front. He suggested that the stucco not be brought up all the way to the brick, but to set it back an inch or so.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were some site improvements happening with concrete and he asked if that would have triggered a landscape requirement?

Mr. Garcia stated no, the site improvements were just for the loading zone and had not triggered a requirement.

Committee Member McCormack stated there would be all the improvement at the site and he asked if the existing landscape would remain?

Mr. Garcia stated yes.

Chair Woollett asked what would have triggered a landscape requirement?

Mr. Garcia stated there had been a trash enclosure initially proposed, which was no longer a part of the proposal. And if there were any parking lot configuration changes, that would have required a landscape plan.

Chair Woollett asked what obligation would the applicant have to install the landscaping as proposed in an earlier proposal?

Mr. Garcia stated there was no obligation.

Chair Woollett asked if the site improvements had been reviewed to ensure that there had not needed to be any landscape improvements.

Mr. Bentley stated from his perspective the property was leased and they could approach the owners for any upgrades that were needed.

Committee Member McCormack stated if there was an effort being made to enhance and upgrade the site, the landscape should be addressed.

Committee Member Fox stated she had a concern about the secondary mansard roof and the feeling that with the paint striping it was being proposed to appear as if the roof was the same all the way around. Since the street was so residential, she was not certain that the red and orange stripe needed to go all the way around the building. She preferred that the painted stripes end with the front portion of the roof and then just use the white and gray scheme toward the back. The paint scheme appeared to be more signage.

Mr. Garcia stated if the area was illuminated or box-lit, that area might have been counted but it was just paint striping.

Committee Member Fox stated it was just a bit overbearing based on the location it was in.

Chair Woollett stated he had the same feeling. Where the vertical section of the banding of the fascia occurs, it was very logical to have the color scheme there. With the change in the roof form the colored banding had not needed to be painted there.

Committee Member Fox stated the paint stopping at the point she was suggesting would make for a much better situation.

Mr. Bentley stated he understood the rear of the building and the interior side of the building, but being a street side for traffic travel, he would want the two other sides to be painted. He reviewed the plans with the Committee Members.

Committee Member Fox stated the building was not visible until reaching the intersection.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the red stripe could be carried all the way around the building with no paint band on the mansard roof.

Committee Member Fox stated the red would go around the entire building and she was fine with that.

Committee Member Imboden, referencing an image on the plans, asked if that was just the Google image?

Mr. Garcia stated yes, it had been copied there in error.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4651-12, Auto Zone, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the additional conditions:

- DRC request that Planning Staff verify that the landscape plan at the site in its existing condition was compatible with what had been approved to date for the building.
- The orange striping shown on the canopy to stop at the re-entrant corner where the canopy dies into the mansard-like shape of the main roof and the red and white striping may be continued around the entire building. The mansard roof shall be all one color and in the gray color to match the building.
- The in-fill material shown for the front of the building shall be stucco.
- The in-fill for the doors that were being closed in, in the back to be stucco finish with a smooth texture, set in approximately 1" behind the face of the brick.
- The elevation names on the drawings to be corrected.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(3) DRC No. 4652-12 – AMLI RESIDENTIAL-UPTOWN ORANGE

- A proposal to redevelop an existing surface parking lot with a new 334-unit apartment development.
- 3537 The City Way (south of Doubletree Hotel)
- Staff Contact: Anna Pehoushek, (714) 744-7228
- Previous DRC Preliminary Review: December 5, 2012
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

The applicant's representative, Ken Ryan, KTGY Group, address on file, stated he was accompanied by members of his team. From the last time that they had been before the DRC they had taken the Committee Member's comments to heart. The additional comments they wanted to focus on would be those areas that they had spent time talking about previously on the project. He wanted to highlight their responses. There were adjustments made and he wanted the DRC's feedback on what they were referring to as the branding, way-finding, community identity parking structure graphics. He understood that there was a code issue, but since they would be going to the Planning Commission with two variances, they were hopeful that they could find a way to incorporate that feature without having to wait for two months or so for an overall zone code change. They were optimistic and any feedback that could be given by the DRC would be appreciated. Mr. Ryan went through an explanation of the various elements of the project from architecture, to landscaping and lighting, as he referred to the drawing boards of the project and its various elements.

Mr. Ryan stated there had been some discussion about shade and shadow, and therefore, an analysis had been done. During the summer solstice when residents would be around the pool there was great sun exposure and during the winter solstice the seating areas also received some sun. He brought samples of the aluminum louvers and presented those to the Committee Members. In terms of lighting, there was quite a bit of discussion about the lighting on the branding element. They had identified in the packet some different types of lighting and they had looked at sections to minimize glare. There were a few simulations that he presented for the Committee Members. The branding element was a more aggressive feature, but also had some elegance to it. Porch stoops were something that had also been brought up, and they were there. However, they had not been visible and there were porch stoop lights at those locations. Lastly, he wanted to focus on some key issues in the landscaping. First and foremost was the Palm canopy tree and ensuring that the trees would not compete too much with the branding element. They had changed all the Palm trees to 20'. Another concern had been the root ball of the Palms and they proposed half-tree grates and they had repositioned the trees on the street scape. The other big issue was the matching of street trees on Manchester. They corrected the trees that had been proposed for The City Drive and those had been removed as it was not part of their proposal. Their recommendation was to have a constant canopy and Palm tree element along the perimeter and to have a variety of trees. There was a variety of three different trees. Mr. Ryan reviewed the plans with the Committee Members and also reviewed the changes in the trees proposed. There was a commitment from AMLI to have the project be LEED Silver certified

and the project would exceed the Title 24 construction standards and comply with the energy star conservation standards. In addition, 65% of the construction waste would be diverted from land fills and as much as possible materials would be used from local businesses. Hopefully when the Committee Members were ready to make a recommendation there were three items that they wanted consideration on: Condition Nos. 30 and 32, both conditions as it related to lighting and landscape. Typically they would go to Planning Staff to ensure that everything was done in accordance with the direction of the DRC and not necessitate another review for irrigation details and things of that nature. They were asking for a change on Condition No. 35 that required the maintenance of the median on Manchester. They had some suggestive language that would require installation and initial changes, but not require on-going maintenance of the median.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion. He would want to go through each of the issues and request that they were presented in order to provide feedback from the DRC Members.

Mr. Ryan asked for feedback on the branding and the parking structure.

Chair Woollett stated they needed to discuss the branding element.

Ms. Pehoushek stated no action could be taken on signage and technically the branding element was a sign.

Mr. Ryan stated he respectfully disagreed and stated it was a branding element.

Ms. Pehoushek stated they had already spoken about it and there would be no action taken by the DRC or Planning Commission on the signage. The signs that were being proposed were not allowed per code and they would not be able to be approved through a variance. The only signage that the code allowed for a multi-family residential development was a 42" high, 35 square foot monument sign and there was nothing in the code for wall signs, blade signs, or any other building signage other than directional signage and a monument sign.

Mr. Ryan stated he was not asking for an approval, but just feedback.

Chair Woollett asked if that was the name of the project?

Mr. Ryan stated it was the name of the whole district, Uptown Orange; it was a branding element.

Ms. Pehoushek stated Staff had been talking about a branding element and how the City could control what the sign stated if it was in fact a name for the district. They were actively working on it.

Committee Member Fox stated they could provide feedback, but they were judging the color and size of the fins, the spacing, and those features.

Mr. Ryan stated he would respectfully ask as an applicant, unless the City wanted the project to die, to provide some feedback.

Chair Woollett stated they could argue that the fin and the shape itself could be a branding element.

Committee Member Fox stated she would maintain what she had stated before, that it was great and raising the words for hotel parking was very nice and it increased the plant material for that area. She was in the same place she had been last time and it was a sharp, smart solution for that part of town.

Chair Woollett stated they had made some comparisons of that element and the commercial center to the south, which had branding elements as part of that center. Some had lettering and some had none; there were monoliths and icons.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what happened to the term super graphics?

Committee Member McCormack stated he liked the signage and had no issues at all. The beauty was in the detail of how it was laid out with the landscape. It was cool, he liked it.

Committee Member Imboden stated in regard to the graphics he had commented enough on it last time. It was a really strong component of the project and he would hope that the City could find a solution to make it work. It appeared they were trying to do that.

Mr. Ryan stated the next issue was the openness to the street scape and what could be used from a privacy perspective without compromising the feel. He pointed to the area on the plans and referred them to a smaller packet.

Applicant, Nate Carlson, AMLI, address on file, stated the new renderings incorporated the changes in landscape; the sills were lifted at the corner and the extra glass was removed. There were planter walls also added for extra privacy.

Committee Member Imboden asked what the material would be for the privacy walls?

Mr. Carlson stated they could use fiber cement cladding or plaster.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was planting space in front of the walls?

Mr. Carlson reviewed the plans with the Committee Members. There was a landscape buffer and it varied from 2’ to 4’.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the Police Department had reviewed the plans with the new walls?

Chair Woollett stated those could provide a hiding place and clearance from the Police Department would be required. In winter conditions where the buildings were in the shade, for the shade and shadow analysis, had that section taken into account reflective light?

Mr. Carlson stated it just showed shadows cast by the building.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the pool deck all the trees were evergreen. Typically in the winter in adding light a deciduous tree would be planted and it ran against the grain of wanting a lush pool environment. With building shadow and the evergreen tree shadow it would be even colder, as opposed to a tree that would not have leaves in the winter. Unless the pool was heated to 89 degrees there would not be any one in the water and he could go either way. An evergreen tree dropped leaves all year and it was a maintenance issue; it was a designer's choice and something to think about.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the parking structure he wanted to understand how much of the parking structure would be visible through the fins.

The Committee Members looked at the samples and discussed what the view would be from various angles.

Chair Woollett stated if looking straight on, there would be visibility through the spaces between the fins. But as one would look to the north or south there would be less visibility. While driving, the parking structure would "go with you."

Committee Member Fox stated the lights from cars in the parking structure would also provide lighting. The spacing was critical for the lighting effects.

Chair Woollett stated presumably the spacing was related to ventilation requirements.

Applicant, Michael Schrock, address on file, stated the spacing and the length of the fins was related to that.

Chair Woollett asked if anyone had done a calculation to see how far away someone would need to be in order not to be able to see between the fins?

Mr. Ryan stated that had not been done.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was at 37 degrees. He had done his own analysis and had hoped it would be more dense. He felt more of the garage would be visible than what he had assumed, from the renderings.

Committee Member McCormack stated in the end it would be a parking structure.

Mr. Ryan stated it was a balance with the Police Department requirements.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the fins changed their angles?

Mr. Carlson stated no, they would not change and he reviewed the perspective elevation drawing with the Committee.

Committee Member Wheeler stated Committee Member Imboden had brought up lighting at the previous meeting. There were two issues with lighting: (1) the lighting that was being proposed externally that washed the fins, and (2) the internal lighting and whether or not there would just be blobs of light. It was a very important component. They would want lighting that had not just appeared as bright objects and he would suggest that lighting be installed around the perimeter.

Applicant, Randy Moss, address on file, stated the lighting along the bottom would be up lighting. The lighting would create an even amount of light and that would illuminate the brightness and in getting up further it would maintain the soft illumination.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the lighting inside the parking structure would be decreased so the lights would not be visible as just lights on the ceilings of the different levels?

Mr. Moss stated he had not felt that the up lighting would contribute to the illumination of the parking structure, but the lights inside the parking structure could be placed along the perimeter, as lights shining in and the lights along the drive aisle would be further away.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was in favor of keeping Condition No. 32 as he would want to see how the lighting was handled.

Mr. Schrock stated what they needed to be aware of was that the lighting in the garage was code dictated and they could not just place lights where they wanted to.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would want the bright spots eliminated as much as possible.

Committee Member Imboden stated the lighting was something that he had brought up at the previous meeting. He was not certain that lighting from the exterior would somehow balance out with what his concerns were, the hot spots inside the façade, and it could be a "make it or break it" for the building. The proposal was for something very special and he would hate to see it destroyed by hot spots inside. He understood the lighting levels were dictated by code, but how could the foot candles be met along with the design elements. If they were entertaining the idea of the very open façade and something very special in the graphics and so forth, he wanted to be assured that the structure was lit correctly. There were a couple of new buildings in town with a lot of attention spent on the outside of the buildings. In driving by them at night, with all of the fluorescent lights inside destroying the buildings, no thought had been given to that issue. He did not want that to occur with the proposed project.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were LED lights that could be used.

Committee Member Imboden stated there were solutions; it just required a lot of thought and attention.

Chair Woollett stated they had addressed the issue before as they discussed the parking structures that faced the 22 Freeway on the north side and it was blinding. The Committee was hyper-sensitive to the issue, and there were solutions.

Mr. Moss stated the single biggest thing that they could do was to move the lamp images and move them closer to the inside walls and keep the lighting away from the main aisles. There was the issue of security and it could be achieved.

Mr. Ryan stated he would suggest some very strong language that would state specifically what their requirements were. He understood the sensitivity of it and he would hope for a very strong "condition of approval."

Chair Woollett stated they could specify the lumens of light emanating from a specific point, a condition that could be met. Beyond that, it was someone's judgment and that made it difficult for staff.

Committee Member Fox asked if there was a lighting plan, as that was typically what they reviewed.

Mr. Moss stated that lighting was not a requirement for the application before them.

Committee Member Fox stated there had been much smaller projects where the lighting plan had been provided. The project before them was a substantial project.

Chair Woollett stated there were many Chapman University projects that lighting had been discussed.

Mr. Ryan stated again that he would suggest some very strong conditions of approval to be provided for the lighting.

Committee Member Fox stated that was after they had reviewed lighting plans.

Mr. Ryan stated not in all cases.

Committee Member Fox stated if it was on a case by case basis, the project before them was a fairly substantial project that had huge lighting impacts and she would want to review lighting.

Committee Member Imboden stated it had been his initial concern.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was concerned about the lighting, especially with his previous comment in lighting the architecture along the street scape and how that was incorporated in the landscape. He had walked many projects, and at The Block, collar lights had been installed on the trees that actually shined down and shined up and it was a better solution. When walking down the street, if people were blinded by 250 watt lights, that was not a quality pedestrian environment. That was why the DRC asked for lighting plans. He was concerned with the porch lights being controlled by the residents and he would want those controlled by the building.

Committee Member Imboden stated he believed there was some confusion with Committee Member McCormack's concern as the applicant had spoke to lighting at the stoops and what the real issue was, was an internal consistency.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was concerned with consistency and security.

Chair Woollett stated the project, if approved, would move to the Planning Commission, and then to the Building Division. If the DRC wanted to see a lighting plan, could the applicant submit a lighting plan prior to Building Permit issuance?

Ms. Pehoushek stated that was an option.

Committee Member Fox stated if the graphics/signage was still in debate internally with the City that could change the lighting needs.

Mr. Moss stated it would be helpful to understand when lighting plans were required, as currently the application clearly stated that lighting was not required as part of the approval process.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had brought the lighting issue up at the previous presentation. He had made it clear that it was an important element and that some studies should be done.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was made clear that Committee Member Imboden was speaking to the interior garage lighting and the importance of the lighting elements.

Chair Woollett stated there might be a way that a recommendation of approval could be made with lighting provided afterwards.

Mr. Ryan stated the other issue was the Palm tree heights.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had wanted more information on the landscape section to have a scale in order to have a proportional feel to the landscape elements. What was not shown were the 3' grade changes of the finished floor and ground plane, and also the Palm tree relationship with the street tree. He would want to see a study done with a 36" box, which would be 15' to 16' tall and he felt that was too close. The privacy walls were not on there and he would want to see that. He felt the section with the street trees and the Palm trees needed to be re-worked to show the actual condition of the street scape edge. He had wanted to see sections D, E, and F.

Mr. Schrock stated it was to scale and when the Palm trees were noted as brown trunk they would take a scale to the site and ensure the trees were correct.

Committee Member McCormack stated if the brown trunk height was not tagged by them they would get a 20' that was shorter unless they were marked 25', which was probably 20' brown trunk, but it was a nuance and the site could end up with smaller Palm trees. Brown trunk was defined as the area where the fronds came out.

Mr. Schrock stated they would take a tape measure and they could ensure that they got what they proposed.

Mr. Ryan stated the intent was to put in what they proposed and whatever language could be added to ensure that there was an adequate height, they could do that.

Committee Member Imboden asked how long would it take before the Palm trees covered up the word "Uptown?"

Mr. Schrock stated the trees would get tall.

Committee Member McCormack stated they would for a portion grow up into the sign pattern, but they would grow past the signage.

Committee Member Imboden stated there would be a period of time that the words would be covered.

Committee Member Fox stated in the drawings the trees were covering up the words "Orange."

Committee Member McCormack stated he had not believed it was an issue. It was the reality that they both existed there and the plants would grow and that building was not going anywhere.

Mr. Schrock stated the Palm trees would grow fast.

Chair Woollett stated the drawings had not shown the heights of the various elements and he wanted to ensure that there would not be an issue later.

Committee Member McCormack stated he wanted to make sure the 3' grade change was taken care of.

Mr. Schrock stated generally it was an 18" grade change and it was flush at the top and mostly 12" all the way around.

Mr. Ryan stated there was also a concern with the root balls and tree grates, ensuring that there would not be an impact on the street scape.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was fine with the proposal for that.

Mr. Ryan stated the other issue was the matching of the trees on Manchester.

Committee Member McCormack stated the street was wide and he had visited the site again. They would want a big tree on that street and the connection between Chapman and the 22 Freeway he would want a tree that would link the streets together. What set the project apart were the Palm trees, but he would want a consistent tree on City Drive and recommended the Mexican Sycamore for that area.

Mr. Ryan stated the only other issues were the conditions that they had spoken about.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not found in the conditions anything that addressed the mitigation measures in the Environmental Impact Report and should that be added?

Ms. Pehoushek stated a recommendation could be made and she was not certain how that had been addressed in the past.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could make a condition that the EIR be incorporated.

Chair Woollett stated he had a question about the graphic, the super graphic. What if it had no letters?

Mr. Ryan stated there had been a concept that had oranges on it and they had gone through a lot of renditions. The thought was not just about the project, but about the area and the site was a gateway area with Uptown Orange as a cool moniker and they wanted to elevate that. The project had an elegant feel to it, but it was not too trendy.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had gone through the Staff Report and there were questions that Staff had wanted the DRC to address. Most of the questions had been addressed through their discussion.

Committee Member Fox stated on the spacing of the fins, Committee Member Wheeler had wanted the spacing to be a bit closer and she was not certain that concern had been addressed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the plans showed the spacing to be a bit more open than he had anticipated, but he had not felt it would be a problem. He felt better that the lighting would be studied.

Committee Member McCormack stated the concerns with the street trees and the Palm trees had been addressed and the tree palette was fine. There was a section he had circled noted as vines, but there were no vines on the plant palette.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they would need to come up with another solution if the Police Department would not approve the privacy walls? Would they need to see the proposal again if there were changes?

Chair Woollett stated what they were speaking of was the privacy of the people inside and that was a resident's issue and that could be resolved with window coverings.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was a design issue as well because of what people would do to get their privacy. Someone had made a suggestion to provide some area of transparency at the base.

Mr. Carlson stated the bottom was solid because of the stoop and the grade issues.

Chair Woollett stated they were submitting a plan and if the Police Department would not approve it they would need to see the changes.

Mr. Carlson asked if they could just go back to the original proposal if the Police Department had issues?

Chair Woollett stated no, as they would have approved the plans with the walls.

Committee Member McCormack stated in reviewing the connections near the leasing office on sheet A3.2, he was hoping to have street access quicker; and on item 20, which was short term bicycle parking, it would be nice to have a connection in that area to The Block. He had not seen any long term bicycle parking in that area.

Mr. Carlson stated the long term bicycle parking would occur on the upper levels of the garage and there were storage rooms for that.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was pedestrian access in an area he pointed to on the plans?

Mr. Carlson stated there was internal access.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the plant palette the plants shown were those that generally grew 30" to 36" high and it was a palette that had not required much maintenance. There was not a vertical plant listed that they might want to use, maybe a screening shrub and they might find the need for a vine. On the footings at the parking structure they tended to be big.

Mr. Schrock stated those were internal.

Committee Member McCormack suggested that the owner of the building have a one year maintenance package on the plants. The plants would be guaranteed for one year.

Mr. Carlson stated it was a 90 day maximum and that was what came with the standard contract. There was a one year contract for the trees, but everything else was 90 days.

Committee Member McCormack stated on projects of a larger size the maintenance was handled over after a year, instead of year after year maintenance.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not certain that was within their purview.

Ms. Pehoushek stated there was a meeting scheduled next week to discuss the median situation.

Committee Member Imboden stated the project was Planning Commission bound and they would deal with the issue at that level.

Mr. Schrock stated he would want the item as more of an issue to be discussed with the City Manager's office.

Committee Member Fox stated she had not felt comfortable excluding Condition No. 35 as that was a Public Works issue.

Ms. Pehoushek stated if between now and March 4 something was resolved, but if there was still discussion ongoing there would not be a resolution and they might be better off removing Condition No. 35 to allow more flexibility.

Chair Woollett made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4652-12, AMLI Residential-Uptown Orange, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- Visual screening fences along the first floor of the building to be reviewed by the Police Department and if changes were needed those revisions to be presented to the DRC prior to issuance of Building Permit.
- Condition No. 32 regarding the lighting inside the parking garage and external lighting to be submitted to the DRC prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
- Brown trunk height for the Palm trees to be defined as the distance from the ground to the base of the growth.
- All root barriers to be linear.
- Mexican Sycamore trees to be used along City Drive instead of Magnolia trees.
- Strike Condition No. 35.
- The mitigation measures in the Mitigated Negative Declaration be adhered to.
- The last sentence of Condition No. 31 to be added to Condition No. 28.

Mr. Ryan asked if it would be appropriate for the DRC to note that the branding way finding elements were appropriate for the project?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was not certain they were able to make that recommendation.

Chair Woollett stated he would add the following recommendations:

- Deciduous trees be added to the interior courtyard areas.
- Redesign the front entry to relocate bike and pedestrian circulation paths and to review pedestrian circulation from the inside northern quadrant to the main entry on Manchester.
- Serious consideration be given to finding an acceptable solution to meet the City's sign requirements with regard to the super graphics on the west and north sides of the buildings.

Committee Member Fox stated she would add that the City find a way to accommodate the graphics, even if it was on a location specific situation.

Chair Woollett stated he wanted it understood that the recommendation was being made acknowledging that it had not met code requirements.

Committee Member Imboden stated he congratulated and thanked the applicant's team that was before them. The packet was very thorough, accurate, and pleasing. He understood that a tremendous amount of work had gone into it. Ms. Pehoushek had also put together a very good Staff Report and in addressing the concerns from the previous submittal.

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

(4) DRC No. 4658-12 – YAGHI–IN-FILL 2ND UNIT & GARAGE RELOCATION

- A proposal to relocate an existing one-car garage, add 198 sq. ft. addition to a contributing 1920 Bungalow, and construct a new two-story 1,383 sq. ft. detached unit with enclosed garage.
- 437 S. Olive Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, (714) 744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would recuse himself from the item's presentation as he had provided input on the project.

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

The applicant's representative, Jon Califf, address on file, stated they had been present for a while already and he would want to hear their comments. He had gone with a design that was more compact and he was attempting to use a design that kept the building as low as possible.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated it appeared that Staff might have taken the wrong approach in evaluating the project. First and foremost, the impacts on the Historic Resource needed to be addressed; impacts to the site need to be considered before looking at impacts to the street scape. The rear addition of the bungalow seemed sympathetic enough but the in-fill unit overshadowed the small bungalow. The in-fill unit should be subordinate to the historic structure. The Old Towne Standards stated that the new construction shall be compatible with the old in massing, size, and scale to protect the historic integrity of the property. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards recommended adjacent new construction, which is compatible to the site, does not recommend introduction of new construction to a site that was incompatible in size, scale, design, and materials that destroyed relationships on the site. The proposal had not met the Standards. Although the design was more complicated than the simple bungalow, it was somewhat complimentary and a pleasing design. It was the bulk, mass, and complexity that created a compatibility issue. Instead of comparing impacts to the neighborhood, the OTPA had compared the proposal to inappropriate development on the block and development that had already compromised historic resources. The Standards stated additions should be confined to areas out of public view and common sense dictated that Standards should apply in the proposal before them. The development may not impact the surrounding street scape, but it had a huge negative impact on the historic site. As far as the view from the street there was quite a bit of influence on the street scape. The Standards would allow 1 ½ story developments; a 2nd story required a CUP and for over 20% floor area addition and the proposed addition was too much for the site. Another issue was relocation of the garage, especially to accommodate a project that had not met the Standards. The OTPA felt that the size, bulk, and mass of the in-fill structure needed to be scaled down so it would not diminish the presence of the small bungalow. The Land Use designation was medium density residential and

was based on those types of developments. The resources that had survived needed to be preserved. If the project had not met the Standards, how could an exemption from CEQA apply? CEQA stated if there may be impacts that CEQA would not apply and the impacts needed to be mitigated.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Imboden stated both the Staff Report and the presentation discussed the relationship of the proposed FAR with the project was that of the block. He asked if the FAR was broken down for the proposal and the Historic Resources on the block and how the proposal compared to existing FARs?

Mr. Ryan stated he had looked at the existing first story FAR for the block and the second story FAR for the block. What he discovered was that the second story FAR for surrounding buildings was substantially higher.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was referring to contributing structures on the block and that was something that the Design Review Committee was charged to do, was to evaluate the project within the Design Standards.

Mr. Ryan stated the proposal was .13, and the other resources on the block had some development on them that were historic contributors; there were not many on the block and those were at the .25 and .28 FAR range.

Committee Member Imboden asked if he was certain of that?

Mr. Ryan stated he would get that information.

Committee Member Imboden asked how the applicant had come to design the majority of the new structure being positioned to the front?

Mr. Califf stated the primary motivation was to maintain the relationship between the bungalow, the driveway, and the garage at the back. He also wanted to put an open parking place next to that and to move construction away from the existing garage. There was an existing fence, a wood fence, and they had not wanted to come up into the side yard but to keep the side yard open and to keep the relationship of the existing structure and the garage.

Committee Member Fox stated the requirements in the District stated that additions should be 1 ½ story units if there was an existing one story unit on site; and the CUP was needed for a two-story unit. She asked if a 1 ½ story concept had been explored?

Mr. Califf stated typically a 1 ½ story would be a Craftsman and the second story would be primarily covered by the roof. He felt that they were looking at something in the neighborhood of 25' for that type of solution. It would have required a fairly large front facing gable or it would be visible from the side. He had that thought, however, he chose the least mass and bulk to get to two stories.

Committee Member Fox stated the pitch of the existing roof was much steeper and might have been able to have been incorporated into 1 ½ stories. She understood the ridge would begin to climb and it seemed that the style chosen had a much lower pitch that reduced the overall height. The second story was large for that small of a structure and what was driving the massing, the amount of square footage that was up there.

Mr. Ryan stated he found six contributing buildings on the block out of the 10 and the remaining structures were non-contributing. The FAR for the contributing one-story was .30, .13, .17, .26 and then .12, there was a range. The proposal was .38 and the second story at .10 for massing.

Committee Member Imboden stated with what Committee Member Fox was asking and from the comments heard by Mr. Frankel, some could argue that introducing a two-story building of that size on the site with a 700 square foot structure and introducing a structure that was twice its size would not be compatible for the site. His concern was the placement and there was the two-story nature vs. the possibility of a 1 ½ story unit.

Mr. Califf commented that he would not agree with such conclusion stated by Committee Member Imboden. He attempted to respect the side yards and street scape and to remove the new structure to the furthest area of the property from the existing contributing structure. The street, the side yard and approach to the driveway would remain unchanged and that was the primary setting of the Historic Resource. They had taken a position with the new structure that was subordinate to the existing structure and placed the structure, although taller, that in and of itself had not degraded the setting of the Historic Resource.

Committee Member Fox stated philosophically there were two issues, the massing and the style. She respected the style as it had reduced massing and it was very different from the existing structure, but it was of the same era of the existing home. With the new development being so close to the house, the highest ridge, although higher, became a minor impact in the location of it. The portion that was dwarfing the resource was the closer roof ridge and if it was a 1 ½ story the roof line would have less of an impact, visually to the street. When she removed the forward section, visually she could be in support of the project. She was comfortable with the garage relocation and it maintained the relationship to the house. The roof peek was the biggest problem. The proposal was beautifully detailed and something that fit in the historic neighborhood. It was a complimentary contrast and not pretending that it was a match for the existing house and philosophically it was an interesting approach. She could support a reduction of the massing, a substantial reduction that would help the FAR and the looming position over the yard. It was very clever to move the back porch to the ample side yard.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would agree with those comments. It was a difficult property and project because of the bookends on both sides. At the end of the day the best use for the site was not a single family residence and they needed to be aware of the economic viability and the maintenance of the property. The place where he struggled was that there was so much bulk and mass and through the complexity of the design that it really upstaged the existing Historic Resource. It was twice the size, it was stylistically more house, and the question he asked was about the impacts. He was not concerned with the number on paper, the FAR. The block justified the FAR. The problem he had was a resource because it conveyed pre-war development in a frontier community and with the addition it no longer conveyed that. If that was done with every site in Old Towne, it would not be Old Towne anymore. Could a unit

the size that was being proposed be placed on the site, yes; it was a beautiful design and Mr. Califf understood the rhythms and needs of the site, but the way the design stood before him it presented an impact on the Historic Resource. In looking at the other FARs on the block they were far below the proposed project. He understood what existed on both sides. He would have a hard time coming to a conclusion of compatibility with the other Historic Resources on the block and the DRC was charged with that issue.

Chair Woollett stated his sense was that the new construction made more of a positive impact to the site as it hid the building behind it, it was really helping the view from Olive Street. It made a strong statement that the street was a street with some very valuable resources on it. He had looked at the proposal as not overwhelming the existing property at all. In fact, it enhanced the existing Historic Resource. He had been faced with the same situation and the best way to deal with that situation was to leave the existing building and compliment the site with what was added. He felt that had been done in the situation before them. He appreciated Mr. Frankel's comments and there were Guidelines and Standards that they needed to follow, however, there were different ways to interpret them. The proposal was complimentary and it had not detracted from the existing resource. Mr. Ryan had mentioned the Grand Street study; that area was almost all Historic Resources and Mr. Ryan had compared FAR with that area and it was a favorable comparison.

Mr. Ryan stated the FAR study from Grand Street looked at the FAR of a .42 threshold and that was from a large stacked two-story building at the alley on South Grand, and in a study of the block what had caused the massing, and it was the FAR on the second floor that caused that. There was a project on Palmyra that had a FAR of .68 between the historic one-car garage and it moved the .42 threshold out and everyone agreed there was not an impact on the street. On the proposal he had suggested that Mr. Califf get the second floor FAR down and it would help a lot and that was why he went with a low pitch design. He was trying to a quick calculation and on a ½ story definition in Old Towne they looked at floor area 5' and above and they took 60% of the first floor area and in just going to a ½ story he was not sure that it would help. Maybe it was a matter of simplifying the front.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not certain 1 ½ story was the only solution.

Committee Member Fox stated the two stories moved the eave line up and raised the massing all the way up as opposed to having the eaves lower and that would lower the massing. The Committee Members reviewed the plans and Committee Member Fox suggested changes on the plans. She stated with a dormer coming out of that it would still be effective and to compliment the structure to run a gable the other way it would bring the eave down and push the high gable point back and keep the same square footage. It was not just about FAR. She loved the structure and it would be a nice addition to Old Towne.

Mr. Califf stated on a 1 ½ story home it ran the risk of looking like a design from the 1970s and if he went with a Craftsman it would be a 6 and 12 to 8 and 12 and that would make it 5' higher. There might be more or less the same amount.

Committee Member Fox stated she could tolerate taller if it was moved back.

Applicant, Chuck Yaghi, address on file, stated then it would be just a big mass of roof going up.

Committee Member Fox stated there would be the dormer and there were ways to mitigate the mass.

Committee Member Imboden stated what he was viewing was a little house with a big house in back of it and that was not typical Old Towne development and that was where he had an issue with compatibility. He would not mind seeing more roof back there.

Mr. Ryan stated there was the same situation at Lemon and Almond. There was an original two-story bungalow to the back and it looked like a separate lot with another house at the front.

Mr. Califf stated absent R-1 Zoning, the site for the proposed project was R-4, but over the years it had become more of a typical situation. In 1916 or 1920 it was one little house per lot and over time there was much more of the same situation and the City zoned the site R-4 to allow such developments. What it came down to was collective opinion and whether that fact affected the setting of the Historic Resource and his opinion was that it had not. It was a progression in development and he had not felt the setting was altered to a negative degree.

Committee Member Imboden asked if there were other examples of the same situation, as proposed, in Old Towne with a rear structure twice the size at the front of the property?

Mr. Yaghi stated it was not twice the size.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was almost twice the size.

Mr. Califf stated Culver Street had a couple of examples that were much larger, with new construction in the back and next to that where they had moved larger historic structures to the back.

Committee Member Imboden stated but the historic structures were much larger.

Mr. Califf stated Committee Member Imboden had asked for some examples and those were examples; he had not analyzed the properties for the numbers.

Committee Member Imboden stated the existing house was so small.

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed with Chair Woollett in that the structure was shielding the building in the back and he was in agreement with Committee Member Fox's recommendations and the comments from Committee Member Imboden and what the DRC was charged with. From his point of view there was just so much on the lot, but it made the neighborhood better.

Mr. Califf stated there could be some things that could be changed to solve it.

Committee Member Fox stated even more mass to the back would be okay, to move the bathroom and change the hall, there could be some changes made to maybe just pull it all back. She would feel much more comfortable with some changes and she had not objected to the idea of it.

Chair Woollett stated he had the feeling that they all liked the project and he asked the applicant if he was willing to take another pass at it. The project was nicely done.

Committee Member Imboden stated although the number was high, that was not the main issue. It was more of how it was executed on the site.

Mr. Califf stated he felt he could work with the suggestions and he had been moving the upstairs a bit and going to a true 1 ½ story would be problematic. He could scale it back.

Committee Member Fox stated the ridge coming out was the issue.

Committee Member Imboden stated having the roof simplification could help.

Mr. Califf stated it was a fine line in simplifying it so much that it looked like a tract home that was being made into a Craftsman.

Committee Member Fox stated she would entertain a higher ridge to accommodate a much simpler roof.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was okay with that, but there needed to be some balance.

Committee Member McCormack stated regarding the landscape, aside from the Italian Cypress tree and the Magnolia tree, the other plants were shrubs and he would suggest a larger tree, something that could get up higher and that may help with the massing, something that was more vertical. He liked the comment about the back porch leading to the yard, but if someone parked in the extra parking space it was so close to the gate and he was not sure if there was a solution to that situation.

Committee Member Fox stated on the existing house with the addition it appeared there had been a window that needed to be enlarged, possibly for egress.

Mr. Califf stated the Building Division had made them do that.

Committee Member Fox suggested a pair of windows, as it would match all the other windows on site. She would be more inclined to add another window there.

The Committee discussed the window situation and window types with the applicant.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to continue DRC No. 4658-12, Yaghi Residence.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(5) DRC No. 4661-12 – INLINE PARTNERS

- A proposal for a façade remodel to modernize an existing office building.
- 293 S. Main Street
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, (714) 744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Michael Shaffer, 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 he had not seen anything on the new drawing that addressed the scuppers and he asked if the scuppers would remain?

Mr. Shaffer stated no, there were internal drains. The scuppers were just architectural in nature and they would be cleaning up the parapet line. Originally when the building was built it had wood siding and then it was stucco. The plan was to take the building down to the structure, clean out the interior, and re-do it.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a drawing for the stair tower and he asked if the wall would be furred out for the tower?

Mr. Shaffer stated the wall would return at the roof line and he pointed out the area on the plans. It would tie into the face of the side wall.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the glazed door area was on the same wall plane as the stone tower.

Mr. Shaffer stated yes, and he referred to the elevations.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested furring the wall out 6” out so the stone would read more as a tower and there would be a transition from stone to glass.

Mr. Shaffer stated the predominant entry was on the east and the reason for the modification of the stairs was that it encroached on the landing. They also created ADA access as there was currently no access from the sidewalk.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was suggesting popping the wall out.

Mr. Shaffer stated the issue with doing that was there would be encroachment on the 4' ADA access path and they had cut down on the parking space to have it all fit. He reviewed the plans with the Committee Members and how the area worked in regard to the ADA access.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what the garage doors would look like?

Mr. Shaffer stated they were metal panes painted the same color as the stucco and they were sectional doors. There was a head clearance situation and the sectional doors would work with that situation.

Committee Member Fox stated the main portion of the building faced Main Street and on that facing wall there was a recessed area.

Mr. Shaffer stated it was a secondary entry with a ramp due to the grade change and the sidewalk.

Committee Member Fox stated the recessed area appeared to have not been acknowledged and it was the main area that would be visible to passing traffic. She asked if there was a way to enhance that.

Mr. Shaffer stated they looked at the saw tooth and they wanted to simplify the building.

Committee Member Fox stated there was a door in the right-hand corner of the recess.

Mr. Shaffer stated the door swung out at that location.

The Committee reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Fox stated she understood it could not go away.

Mr. Shaffer stated it was a secondary entrance.

Committee Member Fox suggested a canopy over the recessed area.

Mr. Shaffer stated he would not want anyone thinking that was a main entry point and there was not even a door handle on that door. He wanted everyone to go to the main entry that had been enhanced with stone.

Committee Member Fox stated maybe there could be some landscape treatment to shield that area.

Mr. Shaffer stated the landscape at the site was toast, and they were going to re-landscape the entire site, plus re-slurry and reseal the parking lot.

Committee Member Fox stated the DRC could propose a condition that the landscape could screen that secondary entrance.

Committee Member Imboden stated the Police Department might oppose.

Committee Member McCormack suggested a hedge in front of it.

Mr. Shaffer stated in the elevations everything would be below the slab.

Committee Member McCormack stated he understood from the drawings that a small wall would go there.

Mr. Shaffer stated it was already an existing wall and they would keep the wall and lower the grade.

Committee Member McCormack suggested just turning the wall.

Mr. Shaffer stated someone could hide behind that and he would prefer putting a couple of trees there for screen.

Committee Member McCormack stated the area was sloped and he asked if the condition would change?

Mr. Shaffer stated they would take the slope out and bring the door down to below finished floor line. Right now it was sloped up above finished floor line. There was a concrete stem wall and the stucco would be extended to that.

Committee Member McCormack stated if that condition was left, there would still be a slope and a stronger landscape would be needed for that.

Mr. Shaffer stated he understood a landscape plan was not needed, but the intent was to landscape.

Committee Member Fox stated it was a beautiful building except for that one recessed area.

Committee Member McCormack asked if another recess could be punched in.

Mr. Shaffer stated the other side was the parking garage and they were not able to give up any parking spaces.

Committee Member Fox suggested adding a detail to keep the rhythm.

Mr. Shaffer stated the problem was that the stairs were located there and the door could not be moved.

Committee Member Wheeler stated personally he had not felt that the recess on the back of the building was a big issue.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was just the problem of putting the back door to the street.

Committee Member Fox stated it was on a main street. The window openings that were there were now lined up and the proposed windows were not.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the windows were placed to match the building grid and the only place there was an issue was the back door and it was not an issue for him.

Committee Member Fox stated there was quite a bit of a landscaping buffer. Something could be done with landscape and it could be conditioned.

Mr. Shaffer stated they would be placing two Crape Myrtle trees there.

Committee Member McCormack asked what would trigger a landscape plan?

Mr. Garcia stated that was not a requirement and not part of the plan.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve DRC No. 4661-12, In-Line Partners, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following suggestions:

- Landscape appropriately placed to screen the recess niche facing Main Street.
- Ground plane landscape to be consistent and calm enough to hide the jitteriness of the grade.

Chair Woollett stated if there were already landscape drawings that had been submitted and approved, the suggestions made through the motion would not go anywhere.

Mr. Garcia stated the plan was submitted at risk.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the landscape plan would be returning to the DRC?

Mr. Garcia stated no, but he would work with the applicant and ensure the landscape was appropriate.

Mr. Shaffer stated it would be done correctly.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(6) DRC No. 4663-12 – SANTANA RESIDENCE

- A proposal to make exterior changes to a contributing 1913 Craftsman Bungalow, including front & rear porch modifications, deck railing, enlarge roof dormer, and replacement of exterior features.
- 343 S. Cambridge Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, (714) 744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review and Comments

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

Applicant, Michael Williams, address on file, stated the reason he wanted to come before the DRC for a preliminary review was that there was a lot to the project.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he had some difficulty determining what was existing and what was proposed on the plans; with the plans and the Staff Report he had figured it out. It was nice to see the property getting some attention as it had been neglected for some time now. The OTPA would support the Standards and keeping the original doors and windows, preserving the service porch, and keeping the windows and doors in their original orientation, to keep the porch columns to reflect the original design and the door placement. The plans reflected a foundation with a stone veneer but he noticed the base was just on piers and the stones were just thrown under there and the stone veneer was not necessary.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Chair Woollett stated the areas for review were the front porch, the dormer, and service porch.

Mr. Ryan stated the original elevations had three windows on the back but there were only two and there would be a change in the plan for the bathroom.

Committee Member Fox stated she conceptually wanted to get her hands around the falling down sun porch and had they felt it was important to preserve a 1976 structure.

Applicant, Kim Santana, stated the previous owner had bought the home in 1962 and the sun room was already there.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had a hard time believing it was built in 1976.

Ms. Santana stated they wanted to keep it.

Committee Member Fox asked if it was not historic, could it be removed with a new addition? The thing she was having issue with about the site was that there were all these "stuck-on things" and then they wanted another "stuck-on thing" with the porch.

Mr. Ryan stated the sun room was added in 1947. He had transposed something.

Mr. Williams stated the best way to look at it was as if it was a historic porch and the applicant wanted to save it.

Mr. Ryan stated his suggestion was to ensure that the sun room would not fall down.

Committee Member Fox stated there were a lot of things that were stuck on the house and she thanked the applicant for buying the house. There was such a medley of columns on the porch and the flat roof structure on the front was strange. She agreed that the columns on the porch should match the column on the left hand side. She agreed that the upstairs porch, going all the way across because if it was too narrow it would not be appropriate. Horizontal bands from the deck up could be added to create shorter balusters and it would be more charming, more symmetrical. Looking at the geometry of the whole thing there was still a lot going on.

Ms. Santana stated the flat balcony went almost all the way to the side of the house and it was a good depth. She was trying to understand how that would be gated off so no one would fall off the roof.

Committee Member Fox stated the railing would return and if there was a small parapet added then it would prohibit someone from walking in that space. It would help mitigate the oddness.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would take it a bit further and bring it in further from the front. He was troubled that there was a proposal for such a significant change to the front elevation when there was no documentation that the condition ever existed in the first place. They were going all the way out to the front of the porch and it had not needed to be so far out. It could be pulled in to minimize the impact of it. He was afraid that getting it out there to the edge would add an enormous second story deck that was probably never there.

Committee Member Fox stated there were doors there.

Committee Member Imboden stated it wasn't unusual to have that condition. There were a lot of second story balconies in Old Towne that were not the entire size of the doors and he could be okay with introducing a rail up there whether it never existed or not as long as there was some restraint with it.

Mr. Williams stated on his house, on his balcony, there was a box on each side on the second story deck and wrapped with siding. There was a 12' x 3' block on top of that where the pickets started and they could bring it in a foot or 14" to make the deck smaller and bring it back a bit to have it be shorter.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested instead of a railing to have a solid wall with siding on it.

Mr. Williams stated that was what was on his initial proposal, but Mr. Ryan had kicked that out.

Committee Member Fox stated even if the extra feature added a parapet about a foot high it would create a 2' x 6" rail on top of that and if it came in a foot from the front, she would not do a big box and use a heavier board.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the structure would support a deck?

Mr. Williams stated there were 2 x 8 members running from the house and he had to focus on the connections to the house. The deck would be strong enough to support a family. The ceiling was bead board fastened to the 2 x 8 joist.

Committee Member Imboden asked if he would do it from the top and then sheathe?

Mr. Williams stated the deck was on top of the 2 x 8. The joist on most porches protruded into the house and then they cantilevered over the bearing wall. He needed to investigate the condition on the structure.

Committee Member Imboden stated his concern was that what is being proposed might require the complete blowing apart of the porch to structurally build a roof deck that may have never existed. They needed to be very careful.

Committee Member Fox stated sometimes there were porch additions that were just an aesthetic. The house was so full of anomalies that the porch justified the doors that were there.

Committee Member Imboden stated he could see it turning into a situation where the porch could not support the load and then there would be other issues.

Mr. Ryan stated it had not occurred to him that there would be support issues.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the door was original, could it have been a window that was turned into a door?

Mr. Ryan stated the casings inside were really old.

Mr. Williams asked if there would be a condition that required investigation that the porch would be supported or to have the Building Division stop by to verify it was strong enough.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was not their area to get into.

Committee Member Imboden stated there were posts in place that would probably not support the load for a deck. There was a whole structure required for a deck that had not existed currently and it was something that was being proposed. He would not want to drive by one day and see the entire porch ripped off.

Chair Woollett asked if they even wanted a deck out there?

Applicant, Alfred Santana, address on file, stated the only reason a deck was proposed in the first place was because when they had spoken with Mr. Ryan before they purchased the home, it was in one of the pictures that was in color and there had been a railing.

Ms. Santana stated they had researched all of the owners and all the photos in the library as they were trying to get an old picture of the house. There was a deck and a railing, but the photos were from the 1970s or early 1980s. They tried to get in touch with former property owners. It looked weird currently and they wanted to change that and cared less if there was a deck there. She had not wanted to spend a gazillion dollars tearing down stuff to make it look how it should look and they wanted to find the easiest way to do that. They would probably not even sit out there; they just wanted it to look normal.

Committee Member Wheeler stated a walkable deck was a maintenance issue and if they had not wanted a deck then the property owners should not add a deck.

Mr. Ryan stated he had found a photo from 1982.

Chair Woollett asked if it could have been a porch cover?

Committee Members Imboden and Wheeler agreed.

Committee Member McCormack suggested just having a window in that area.

Ms. Santana stated as it appeared now it needed a rail, even if it was not a door.

Mr. Williams asked if Ms. Santana wanted a deck?

Ms. Santana stated she would rather there be a deck there.

Mr. Williams stated they would investigate what the condition had been and ensure that there would be the proper support.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had a problem with the boxed out column.

Mr. Williams stated there was a boxed out column, there was an imprint of that on the porch. They had not known what had happened with the house. Symmetrically a ½ pillar against the house was proposed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a 6’ x 6’ and he suggested the use of that form.

Mr. Williams stated the center member which was a 4’ x 6’ was installed to support the sagging of the porch and it was done within the last 20 years.

Committee Member Fox stated the pilasters were there and then there was a boxed out column with another column that had a tapered Greek revival and that was added, then there was one in the corner.

Mr. Williams stated he would want a ½ pillar.

Committee Member Imboden stated they were not certain of any of that.

Committee Member Fox stated the boxed out shape was what had existed as there was an imprint of that form on the porch.

Mr. Williams stated with the impression of the boxed out pillar he imagined that was what had been original and that was what he was proposing. He could not imagine anyone having a solid turn post pillar inside of a box. The ones he had dismantled were always hollow.

Committee Member Imboden stated that was assuming it was original. He found it really odd that someone would find the right size column and place it there.

Mr. Williams asked how had he known? It could be possible that someone found it at a yard sale and cut it down to make it fit.

Mr. Ryan stated it was a cigar shape and someone had cut it down to make it fit; it was missing the plinth that was on the top and bottom.

Committee Member Imboden stated the DRC was being asked to make a lot of decisions about original elements, keeping original, and adding things in. There had been added support in that front area.

Mr. Williams stated the 1' x 8' would need to be removed and then a header added, in order to support the deck. There would need to be a beam of some sort for support.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was trying to define what the scope of the project was. The roof was now being taken apart for a header, the columns would be removed, and in keeping the porch rail a support would need to be added. He asked if the porch was being ripped off and rebuilt. He was trying to understand the scope.

Chair Woollett stated the applicant wanted a porch with a rail.

Mr. Williams stated there would not need to be dismantling, as trim boards could be added. There would not be a demolition and it could all be done within itself. The house was trying to find a home and it needed help.

Committee Member Imboden stated he understood that and admired the property owners. The scope of the project was not clearly defined.

Mr. Williams stated there was no approval being sought.

Chair Woollett stated it was not the DRC's job to design the project.

Committee Member Fox stated they should land on something; should they encourage a porch or would a porch not be approvable, an upstairs porch.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the applicant wanted a porch. A curb could be added to minimize the railing height and he liked the idea of having it be symmetrical above the door.

Chair Woollett stated the discussion should move to other issues.

Mr. Ryan stated there were the remaining porch elements and the door and the window issues.

Committee Member Fox stated another added box thing onto the back of the elevation would be too much for the house to bear and to either recess the door into the mud room or to attach a very shallow door with brackets would be more appropriate instead of columns and a shed roof, as there were so many of those already. She also agreed with lowering the mass of the dormer on top.

Mr. Williams stated on the front porch there was evidence that there was another door.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans.

Mr. Williams stated they wanted to eliminate the doors and windows that had existed in the sun room and just use horizontal siding top to bottom. It was hard to tell what existed. Typical lumber would be 2 ¼" or 4".

Committee Member Imboden stated historically they knew it was not a solid wall.

Mr. Williams stated he was not certain.

Committee Member Fox stated there was evidence of a sill and it was a nice feature. If it was her house she would put the door and window back. That was her recommendation.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he agreed with lowering the dormer.

Mr. Williams stated if he was at 6' -3" currently, could they go to 6' -8"?

Mr. Ryan stated that would work.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was in agreement to keep the windows and doors on the service porch.

Mr. Williams stated that was one reason he brought the project in for a preliminary review. The applicants purchased the house with a door on the back and assumed that it was livable and useable space. Then they were told the door could not remain in the space and it had to be pushed back 3' into the recess of the home which created an interior covered porch.

Committee Member Fox stated she wanted to stop Mr. Williams as she was not advocating to push the door back. She would be okay with brackets on either side of the old service porch portion with a little eyebrow roof across that but leave the door.

Mr. Williams asked if she was okay with the door?

Committee Member Fox stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he could not remember a situation where they required a recessed door.

Mr. Ryan stated the main door was generally inside and the idea was to emulate that.

Committee Members Wheeler and Imboden stated they were fine with the door not being recessed.

Mr. Williams asked if the windows could be removed and replaced with horizontal siding due to the bathroom work that was being completed inside. It could be a faux window with tinted glass and a wall. If he was requesting an addition of 260 square feet, the DRC would approve that. Since it was not visible from the front why would the DRC not be able to approve eliminating three windows and keeping two to gain a bathroom.

Committee Member Imboden stated there were standards to follow and he would agree to just leaving the windows there.

Committee Member Fox asked if the toilet was there? She could layout a bathroom that would place something under the window and still keep the window.

Committee Member Imboden asked if there was a reason the wall could not be moved?

Mr. Williams stated the tub would rest against the wall and the new wall terminated dead center of the windows.

Committee Member Imboden stated there would need to be a circular curtain with a claw tub, and couldn't the wall be moved out a bit.

The Committee Members gave their input on the bathroom layout and felt it was an issue that could be solved.

Mr. Williams asked if everyone was against removing the windows?

Committee Member Imboden stated yes, as a first choice.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if the wall ran back and came into the mullein and he put a shelf below the window it would provide an excuse for the wall to move over.

Mr. Williams stated he would take a look at that, or could the windows become faux windows.

Committee Member Fox stated the solution that Committee Member Wheeler gave would provide for a way to keep the windows and add a nice detail.

Chair Woollett asked Mr. Williams if the DRC had provided him with some good information?

Mr. Williams stated yes and thanked the Committee Members.

The item was submitted for preliminary review and no motion was needed.

(7) DRC No. 4668-13 – LINX RESTAURANT

- A proposal to construct a new projecting blade sign for a new restaurant.
- 238 W. Chapman Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, (714) 744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Fox suggested that the item be approved as proposed. There were no objections.

Public Comment

None.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve DRC No. 4668-12, Linx Restaurant, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on February 20, 2013.

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

MOTION CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 9:56 p.m.