



Planning Commission

Agenda Item

March 4, 2013

TO: Chair Steiner and
Members of the Planning Commission

THRU: Leslie Aranda Roseberry
Planning Manager

FROM: Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner

SUBJECT

PUBLIC HEARING: MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW NO. 0704-12, MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 1831-12, VARIANCE NO. 2222-12, ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT NO. 201-13, AND DESIGN REVIEW NO. 4652-12 FOR A NEW 334 MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND ASSOCIATED PARKING STRUCTURES AT 3537 THE CITY WAY

SUMMARY

The applicant proposes to redevelop an existing surface parking lot with a new 334-unit apartment development, leasing office, clubhouse (with fitness center, club room lounge, business center), two courtyards (with swimming pool, and outdoor lounge areas), and two abutting parking structures; one will serve the residential development (610 spaces), while the other will provide replacement parking for the Doubletree Hotel (494 spaces) that is presently provided in the surface parking lot. The residential units will be oriented to area streets and arranged around the two courtyards. The applicant is requesting an 80-space variance for the apartment complex parking as well as a 1-foot reduction in the parking structure drive aisle width.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 12-13 entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVING MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW NO. 0704-12, MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 1831-12, VARIANCE NO. 2222-12, ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT NO. 201-13, AND DESIGN REVIEW NO. 4652-12 FOR A NEW 334 MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND ASSOCIATED PARKING STRUCTURES AT 3537 THE CITY WAY

AUTHORIZATION/GUIDELINES

Orange Municipal Code (OMC) Table 17.08.020, Section 17.08.020.B.2a. and Section 17.10.060.E. authorize the Planning Commission to review and take action on applications for Major Site Plan Review, Variances, and Mitigated Negative Declarations. OMC Section 17.10.070 requires the approval of Design Review when a project requires Major Site Plan Review. OMC Section 17.10.050.D authorizes the Zoning Administrator to take action on adjustments of up to 10% of a development standard. OMC Section 17.08.020 establishes the reviewing bodies for various discretionary applications and final project determination rests with the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC NOTICE

On February 21, 2013, the City sent a Public Hearing Notice to a total of 203 property owners/tenants within a 300-foot radius of the project site, and persons specifically requesting notice. A notice was published in the Orange City News newspaper on February 21, 2013. The project site was also posted in four locations with the notification on that same date.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Mitigated Negative Declaration: Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 1831-12 was prepared to evaluate the physical environmental impacts of the project, in conformance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15070 and in conformance with the Local CEQA Guidelines (Exhibit B). The Mitigated Negative Declaration finds that the project will have less than significant impacts to the environment, with the implementation of standard conditions and mitigation measures. The 20-day public review period was initiated on January 23, 2013, ending on February 11, 2013. Copies of the document were available for public review at the Orange Public Library & Local History Center, the Taft Branch Library, the El Modena Branch Library and at City Hall.

Staff received three written comment letters from the City of Santa Ana, the University of California, Irvine, and Raines Feldman, LLP on behalf of City Tower property owner during the public review period, with only the third warranting responses. The other parties indicated they had no comments. The City prepared a Response to Comments to address environmental comments received during the public review period (Attachment 2).

PROJECT BACKGROUND

<i>Applicant:</i>	AMLI Residential
<i>Property Owner:</i>	AMLI Residential
<i>Property Location:</i>	3537 The City Way
<i>Existing General Plan</i>	Urban Mixed Use (UMIX)

<i>Land Use Element designation:</i>	1.5-3.0 FAR; 30-60 du/acre
<i>Existing Zoning Classification:</i>	Urban Mixed Use (UMU)
<i>Old Towne:</i>	Not Applicable
<i>Specific Plan/PC:</i>	Not Applicable
<i>Site Size:</i>	5.57 acres
<i>Circulation:</i>	The site is bounded by The City Drive to the east, The City Way to the south, Manchester Avenue to the west, and a hotel access road to the north. Access into the site is presently available off of The City Drive and Manchester Avenue via the hotel access road.
<i>Existing conditions:</i>	The site is presently developed with a 587-space surface parking lot of which 494 are allocated to the Doubletree Hotel through a formal property owner agreement.
<i>Surrounding land uses and Zoning:</i>	The site is surrounded by institutional, retail, office and hotel uses. North – Doubletree Hotel South – Outlets of Orange East – UC Irvine Medical Center West – Office tower
<i>Previous Applications/Entitlements:</i>	None.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to redevelop an existing surface parking lot with a new 4-story, 334-unit apartment complex (60 dwelling units/acre; 1.6 FAR) leasing office, clubhouse (with fitness center, club room lounge, business center), and two landscaped courtyards (with swimming pool, and outdoor lounge areas). The residential units will be oriented to area streets and arranged around the two courtyards. Units range in size from studios (801 sq. ft.) to 3-bedrooms (1,385 sq. ft.).

Parking for the development would be provided in two abutting parking structures (1,104 spaces combined); one 6-level structure provides parking for the residential units (610 spaces), while the other 7-level structure provides replacement parking for the Doubletree Hotel that will be lost as a result of project construction (494 spaces). One level of the parking structure will be subterranean. The parking structure will be wrapped on two sides by the residential units. The maximum proposed parking structure height is 56’8”.

As part of the project, the applicant is proposing streetscape enhancements that include landscaped parkways, the planting of canopy trees along the sidewalks that surround the site, and rehabilitation of the roadway medians along The City Drive and Manchester Avenue. The intention of the streetscape program is to respond to existing and anticipated future patterns of pedestrian activity in the area.

The applicant is requesting a Variance to allow an 80-space (11.5%) reduction in the Code required parking for the residential units (690 spaces), and a 4-space reduction in the amount of Code required parking for the project's leasing office. An Administrative Adjustment is also being requested to allow a 1' reduction in the width of certain drive aisles within the parking structures.

Development Standards

	Required	Proposed	Code Section
<i>Building Height</i>	<p>45' Building height may exceed the allowed maximum provided no part of the building exceeds ¼ of the horizontal distance between the ground point of the building and nearest single-family residential district boundary.</p> <p><i>(Note: building height in excess of 45' is allowed without a Variance or CUP provided that site is not in proximity to single family residential uses.)</i></p>	<p>50' Apartments 56'8" Max. Parking Structures</p>	<p>17.19.120 Table 17.19.120, Note (i)</p>
<i>Distance between structures</i>	<p>20' Window wall to window wall</p> <p>20' Window wall to non-window wall</p> <p>15' Non-window wall to non-window wall</p>	<p>Not Applicable. Project building components are integrated.</p> <p>There is no separation between structures. Residential units wrap parking structures. Parking structures abut each other.</p>	<p>Table 17.19.090</p>

<i>Fence height</i>	42" Required front yard or corner side yard 6'	Not Applicable.	17.19.140
<i>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</i>	1.5-3.0	1.55	Table 17.19.120
<i>Landscaping</i>	Setbacks and open areas of the site not occupied by buildings shall be landscaped.	70,802 sq. ft. Includes courtyard landscaped areas, Manchester entrance landscaping, and perimeter landscaping adjacent to building facades, and streetscape areas.	17.19.160
<i>Loading area (non-residential)</i>	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	
<i>Lot size (residential)</i>	40,000 sq. ft.	5.57 acres (242,629 sq. ft.)	Table 17.19.120
<i>Lot frontage</i>	100'	300'	Table 17.19.120
<i>Lot depth</i>	Not Applicable	576'	
<i>Open space, common (residential)</i>	Up to 1/3 of the required usable open space. (16,533 sq. ft.)	37,600 sq. ft.	17.14.110
<i>Open space, private (residential)</i>	40 sq. ft./unit (13,360 sq. ft.) A min. of 15% of the total floor area of the dwelling units shall be provided as private and/or common open space. Up to 25% of the total open space requirement may be met by counting any private exterior open space areas (patios and balconies) provided within the project.	32,276 sq. ft. (Avg. 97 sq. ft./unit)	17.19.090.D

<i>Open space, useable (residential)</i>	150 sq. ft./unit (50,100 sq. ft.)	See open space info above. 69,876 sq. ft.	Table 17.14.070 17.19.090
<i>Parking (non-residential)</i>	12 spaces for leasing office (4 spaces/1,000 sq. ft.)	8 spaces (2.75 spaces/1,000 sq. ft.) <i>(Variance request)</i>	Table 17.34.060.A
<i>Parking (residential)</i>	690 spaces Studio: 1.2 spaces/unit 1 Bedroom: 1.7 spaces/unit 2 Bedroom: 2.0 spaces/unit 3 Bedroom: 2.4 spaces/unit <i>(Note: guest parking not included in 690 spaces)</i>	610 spaces Studio: 1.1 spaces/unit <i>(Variance request)</i> 1 Bedroom: 1.25 spaces/unit <i>(Variance request)</i> 2 Bedroom: 2.0 spaces/unit 3 Bedroom: 2.4 spaces/unit <i>(Note: guest parking not included in 610 spaces)</i>	Table 17.34.060.A
<i>Parking, guest (residential)</i>	67 spaces 0.2 spaces/unit	67 spaces 0.2 spaces/unit	Table 17.34.060.A
<i>Setback, Front</i>	10' Max. Up to 20' where sidewalk oriented pedestrian amenities are provided.	10'8" to 13'6" (varies) to building face. Patios project 6'6" into setback from building face.	Table 17.19.120
<i>Setback, Rear</i>	0'	68'6" including shared private street. (18'6"-26'4" excluding street)	Table 17.19.120
<i>Setback, Side</i>	0'	Not Applicable	Table 17.19.120
<i>Setback, Street Side</i>	10' Max. Up to 20' where sidewalk oriented pedestrian amenities are provided.	8' to 16.3' (varies) to building face. Patios project 6'6" into setback from building face.	Table 17.19.120

APPLICATION(S) REQUESTED/ REQUIRED FINDINGS
--

Major Site Plan: The applicant is proposing a Major Site Plan to construct a new 334-unit apartment complex, clubhouse/leasing office, and two abutting parking structures providing a total of 1,104 spaces.

Required Findings:

1. The project design is compatible with surrounding development and neighborhoods.
2. The project conforms to City development standards and any applicable special design guidelines or specific plan requirements.
3. The project provides for safe and adequate vehicular and pedestrian circulation, both on- and off-site.
4. City services are available and adequate to serve the project.
5. The project has been designed to fully mitigate or substantially minimize adverse environmental effects.

Design Review Committee: The applicant is requesting approval of a Design Review Committee application for the architectural design, landscaping, and streetscape improvements associated with the proposed apartment complex and parking structures.

Required Finding:

1. The project design upholds community aesthetics through the use of an internally consistent, integrated design theme and is consistent with all adopted specific plans, applicable design standards and their required findings.

Variance: The applicant is requesting a Variance from Section 17.34.060 to allow an 80-space reduction in the amount of parking required for the apartment complex.

Required Findings:

1. Because of special circumstances applicable to subject property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of the zoning ordinance is found to deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under identical zone classification.
2. The variance granted shall be subject to such conditions which will assure that the authorized adjustment shall not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which subject property is located.

Administrative Adjustment: The applicant is requesting an Administrative Adjustment from Section 17.34.110 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a 1-foot reduction in the width of certain parking structure drive aisles.

Required Findings:

1. The reduction in standards will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and general welfare of persons residing or working on the subject property or in the vicinity.
2. Issuance of the permit does not compromise the intent of this code.

ANALYSIS/STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

Issue 1: Parking Variance

The applicant is requesting an 80-space reduction in the parking required for the apartment complex and leasing office. This represents an 11.5% reduction in the Code required parking for the residential units, and a 4-space reduction in the parking required for the leasing office.

Apartment Parking

In the case of the apartment units, the reduction requested by the applicant is based on the application of a slightly lower parking requirement applied to studio and 1-bedroom units than typically required by the OMC as presented below:

Unit Type	City Standard	Proposed Ratio
Studio	1.2 spaces/unit	1.1 spaces/unit
1-Bedroom	1.7 spaces/unit	1.25 spaces/unit

No deviations are being requested to the parking requirement for 2- and 3-bedroom units, nor the guest parking requirement (0.2 spaces/unit) for all of the apartments.

The applicant performed a parking utilization survey of similar apartment complexes in Orange County, including the Renaissance Apartment development on West Chapman Avenue in Orange (Attachment 9). The survey supports the parking ratio reduction proposed by the applicant. Furthermore, the parking variance requested by the applicant represents a similar overall average per unit parking ratio to that of the Renaissance Apartments.

Leasing Office Parking

With respect to the leasing office, parking would be provided by 2 parking spaces in front of the leasing office and 6 spaces in an un-gated portion of the parking structure. In the unlikely event that there are additional visitors to the leasing office in need of parking beyond these 8 spaces, guest

parking spaces are available in the same un-gated portion of the parking structure as the leasing office spaces.

Based on its operational experience, the applicant believes that the Code-required parking for the leasing office is excessive based on the typical level of office staffing and leasing office visitors. The applicant contends that the nature of employee and visitor activity at an apartment complex leasing office is different from a typical business office. Therefore, application of a “business office” parking requirement is not entirely appropriate.

Resolution:

Staff believes that the parking variance requested by the applicant is appropriate for the apartment units given the similarity in the overall average parking spaces per unit to other similar apartment complexes in Uptown Orange. It should be noted that the City amended its parking standards for residential uses following approval of the Renaissance, Allure, and Archstone apartment projects in Uptown Orange, increasing the guest parking required per unit by 0.2 spaces/unit. This change was not prompted by any parking problems associated with these developments; rather, they were based on observed parking problems at older apartment developments in other areas of the City.

With respect to the leasing office parking spaces, staff also believes that the variance is supportable given the relationship between the leasing office and the apartments. The leasing office is largely an ancillary component of the overall development

Issue 2: Drive Aisle Width Reduction—Administrative Adjustment Request

A 1-foot reduction in the width of the parking structure drive aisles that run in an east-west direction (perpendicular to The City Drive). This reduction is being requested to allow for a slight reduction in the footprint of the parking structures in order to provide additional space around the site perimeter to accommodate wider sidewalks and a higher quality streetscape.

Resolution:

Staff believes that the Administrative Adjustment being requested for the drive aisle width reduction is acceptable. It does not diminish the functionality of the parking structure circulation, and enables the applicant to provide a higher quality pedestrian environment that is consistent with the City’s objectives for the Urban Mixed Use district. The additional space gained by this minimal reduction in width enables the sidewalks to be widened along The City Way and hotel/parking structure access road to provide an enhanced pedestrian environment.

Issue 3: Relationship to Housing Element

As indicated in the City’s 2010 General Plan Housing Element, the City of Orange has a Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) of 5,079 units for the 2006-2014 Housing Element planning period. With the housing construction that has occurred in Orange from 2006-2011, the City’s

remaining RHNA need is 3,649 units. The income affordability breakdown for those units is as follows:

Income Level	Remaining RHNA Need
Very Low	1,041
Low	772
Moderate	406
Above-Moderate	1,430
Total	3,649

Source: City of Orange Housing Element Report to the State of California submitted February 22, 2012

The Housing Element includes Policy Action 11, which directs the City to pursue infill development as a strategy for the development of owner- or renter-occupied housing units. The Housing Element also includes Policy Action 17 to establish zoning classifications to provide adequate sites for housing development. (Policy Actions 11 and 17 are provided in Attachment 10 to this report.) As a follow up action to establishment of the Urban Mixed Use land use designations in the 2010 General Plan update, the City established Urban Mixed Use zoning in Uptown Orange, including the proposed project site. There is a residential density range of 30-60 units/acre associated with the Urban Mixed Use land use designation.

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) recognizes residential densities of greater than 30 units/acre as densities under which even market-rate units may be available to lower-income households. Due to the development characteristics (e.g., underutilized commercial property, large surface parking lots) of many properties in the City’s Urban Mixed Use districts, the majority of “Housing Opportunity Sites” (sites that have the greatest potential for infill residential development) are concentrated in these districts. Furthermore, based on the density range allowed in these districts, the City is looking to these areas of the City as the key locations where new residential development eligible to be counted toward satisfying the lower-income housing need of the community.

City of Orange New Housing Construction Policy

Section 17.14.015 of the OMC requires developers with projects of 11 or more units to participate in discussion with the City to evaluate the feasibility of providing affordable units within the development project, and references various incentives available to assist in making the integration of affordable units economically feasible for developers. The OMC section also references the New Housing Construction Policy contained in the City’s 1994 Affordable Housing Plan, which also cites various incentives and funding assistance offered by the City.

While staff did engage in discussions with the applicant to explore the potential integration of restricted affordable units in the project, with the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency, the funding mechanisms referenced in the Affordable Housing Plan are no longer available. Additionally, the development incentives referenced in the Affordable Housing Plan have been addressed through Code changes that have taken place since the adoption of that Plan including

more accommodating density, building height, and open space standards for residential projects associated with the Urban Mixed Use development standards. Therefore, while the applicant is not providing dedicated affordable units due to financial feasibility, the very nature of its characteristics responds to the spirit of the New Construction Policy.

Workforce Housing Study

The applicant prepared a Workforce Housing Study (Attachment 12) that provides a review of 2013 Orange County median monthly income levels in relation to qualifying incomes for the rental rates anticipated for the proposed apartments. The study also considers average monthly salaries associated with representative jobs that are typical examples of types of employees that qualify for workforce housing. Rental rates for the proposed project are anticipated to range from \$1,350/month for a studio unit to \$2,312/month for a 3-bedroom unit.

When applying the standard Orange County median monthly incomes to the income levels needed to qualify for tenancy in the proposed project, “Low Income” households would not meet the qualifying income criteria for any of the units. However, it should be noted that the monthly income of 1- and 2-person households falls only slightly below the qualifying incomes for studio and 1-bedroom units. In the case of the larger household sizes, there is a greater gap between “Low Income” household earnings and qualifying income for 2- and 3-bedroom units.

The Workforce Housing Study also provides information about actual monthly salaries of “typical” jobs in the area (medical field, teacher, fire fighter, police officer). The salaries associated with these jobs all exceed the County median income. The study finds that these salaries meet the qualifying monthly salary criteria for tenancy in the proposed project.

Household Income and Affordability

As a point of reference, the 2012 median household income for Orange County as determined by the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development is \$85,300 based on a household size of 4 persons. (At the writing of this report 2013 income data was not available.) This median household income serves as the basis for determining housing need and affordability associated with different income levels as follows:

Extremely Low:	< 30% of median household income
Very-Low:	31%-50% of median household income
Lower:	51%-80 % of median household income
Moderate:	100% of median household income
Above-Moderate:	80%-120% median household income

For Orange County, 2012 annual income levels associated with housing affordability are as follows:

Income Category/ Household Size	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons
Extremely Low Income	\$20,250 (\$1,688/mo.)	\$23,150 (\$1,929/mo.)	\$26,050 (\$2,171/mo.)	\$28,900 (\$2,408/mo.)
Very Low Income	\$33,750 (\$2,813/mo.)	\$38,550 (\$3,213/mo.)	\$43,350 (\$3,613/mo.)	\$48,150 (\$4,013/mo.)
Lower Income	\$53,950 (\$4,496/mo.)	\$61,650 (\$5,138/mo.)	\$69,350 (\$5,779/mo.)	\$77,050 (\$6,421/mo.)
Median Income	\$59,700 (\$4,975/mo.)	\$68,250 (\$5,688/mo.)	\$76,750 (\$6,396/mo.)	\$85,300 (\$7,108/mo.)
Moderate Income	\$71,650 (\$5,971/mo.)	\$81,900 (\$6,825/mo.)	\$92,100 (\$7,675/mo.)	\$102,350 (\$8,529/mo.)

Source: State of California Department of Housing and Community Development Memorandum from Glen A. Campora regarding State Income Limits for 2012, dated and effective February 1, 2012.

In comparison, the Workforce Housing Study prepared for the proposed project identifies the projected qualifying rental rates and incomes as follows:

	Average Monthly Rental	Qualifying Monthly Income
Studio	\$1,350	\$4,500
1-Bedroom	\$1,496	\$4,987
2-Bedroom	\$1,905	\$6,350
3-Bedroom	\$2,312	\$7,707

Resolution:

The Housing Element includes the proposed project site among the larger housing opportunity sites in Uptown Orange (Attachment 11), and assumed a potential development capacity for the site of 231 units. The fact that the proposed project provides 103 more units than the assumed capacity is beneficial with respect to Housing Element implementation and satisfying the City’s RHNA.

With respect to the Workforce Housing Study, while the qualifying income levels for the proposed project are higher than the County “Lower Income” household affordability levels, the qualifying income levels would be in alignment with individuals earning the median County income. Additionally, the density of the project, in conjunction with the “typical” monthly income of jobs in the area, demonstrate that the project increases the supply of workforce housing in the City of Orange.

Issue 4: Manchester Medians

The applicant is proposing to improve the existing medians on Manchester Avenue. These medians are presently unimproved and detract from the appearance of Manchester Avenue. The applicant proposes to reconfigure the medians and install landscaping.

During Staff Review Committee review, there was extensive discussion about the need to ensure safe turning movements for vehicles related to the office tower to the west as well as residents and visitors to the proposed project. Additionally, the Fire Department expressed its need for emergency vehicle access through the median area, noting that special attention is warranted in the final design of the median improvements.

Resolution:

To ensure that motorist safety and emergency vehicle access is addressed with project implementation, staff has included Condition # 40, which requires monitoring of vehicle collisions for a 1-year period and further safety enhancements to the medians if warranted by the monitoring. Condition #39 has also been included requiring the design of the medians to be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department prior to the issuance of an encroachment permit for the medians to ensure that adequate emergency vehicle access is accommodated in the final design.

Issue 5: Signage

Signage for the proposed development consists of free standing monument signs, building mounted blade signs, and building mounted lettering. The text incorporated into the parking structure louvers also constitutes signage.

The sign provisions for residential development in the Zoning Ordinance do not accommodate the variety of sign types proposed by the applicant. Staff is presently exploring options for the appropriate treatment of signage for large-scale infill residential development not only on the project site, but in the context of the City's Urban Mixed Use districts. Consequently, the proposed project signage will ultimately be brought forward independently to the DRC for approval.

ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDATION

Staff Review Committee:

The Staff Review Committee reviewed the project on September 19, 2012 and then again on December 19, 2012. The Committee determined that the content of the Mitigated Negative Declaration was satisfactory and recommended Planning Commission approval of the project on January 16, 2013 subject to the mitigation measures included in the Mitigated Negative Declaration and staff recommended conditions.

Design Review Committee:

The Design Review Committee provided preliminary feedback on the proposed project on December 5, 2012. The Committee formally reviewed the subject proposal at the February 6, 2013 meeting, and unanimously (5-0) recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration and project subject to staff recommended conditions and conditions pertaining to the following (refer to Attachment 7 for original condition number references):

- Visual screening surrounding first floor patio areas of the building to be reviewed by the Police Department and if changes were needed those revisions to be presented to the Design Review Committee prior to issuance of a Building Permit. (See re-numbered Condition #22.)
- Modification to Condition # 32 requiring both the lighting inside and outside of the parking garage and external project lighting to be submitted to the Design Review Committee prior to issuance of a Building Permit. (See re-numbered Condition #36.)
- The landscape plan shall specify that brown trunk height for the Palm trees be defined as the distance from the ground to the base of the growth. (See re-numbered Condition #34.)
- All tree root barriers utilized in site landscaping shall be linear root barriers. (See re-numbered Condition #34.)
- The Magnolia trees proposed as street trees on The City Drive shall be replaced with Mexican Sycamore trees. (See re-numbered Condition #34.)
- Strike Condition # 35.
- The last sentence of Condition No. 31 shall be added to the end of Condition No. 28. (See re-numbered Condition # 32.)
- The mitigation measures in the Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be adhered to.

The DRC also made the following recommendations:

- Deciduous trees should be added to the interior courtyard areas.
- The front entry should be redesigned the front entry to relocate bike and pedestrian circulation paths and to consider pedestrian circulation from the inside northern quadrant to the main entry on Manchester.
- Consideration should 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.

Staff has modified the conditions of approval as directed by the Design Review Committee with the exception of striking Condition #35. This condition has been retained, but the wording modified to allow for an alternative arrangement agreed upon by the City Manager's Office (see re-numbered Condition #41).

ATTACHMENTS/EXHIBITS

Attachments to Report:

1. Planning Commission Resolution (including Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
2. Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 1831-12 Response to Comments
3. Vicinity Map
4. Site Photos
5. Design Review Committee Staff Report, December 5, 2012
6. Design Review Committee Minutes, December 5, 2012
7. Design Review Committee Staff Report, February 6, 2013
8. Design Review Committee Minutes, February 6, 2013
9. Parking Study for AMLI Orange Apartment Project, IBI Group, November 19, 2012
10. City of Orange 2010 Housing Element Policy Actions 11 and 17
11. City of Orange 2010 Housing Element, Appendix B, Uptown Orange Housing Opportunity Sites
12. AMLI Uptown Orange Workforce Housing Study, Springbrook Realty Advisors, Inc., December 11, 2012

Exhibits provided to the Planning Commission:

- A. Submitted Plans and Exhibits labeled March 4, 2013
- B. Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 1831-12
- C. Project Informational Booklet

cc: Nate Carlson
AMLI Residential
3195 Red Hill Avenue, Loft F
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Mark Hickner
KTTY Group
17922 Fitch
Irvine, CA 92614