

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

April 17, 2013

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

Committee Members Absent: Joe Woollett

Staff in Attendance: David Khorram, Chief Building Official
Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner
Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner
Robert Garcia, Associate Planner
Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Fox opened the Administrative Session at 5:05 p.m.

Chair Fox stated on item No. 2 the Yaghi In-Fill and on item No. 6 Massaro Façade Remodel, Committee Member Wheeler would be recused from those presentations. She verified all other Committee Members would be present for the Agenda items. All other Committee Members would be available to hear the Agenda items.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting of April 3, 2013. Changes and corrections were noted.

Chief Building Official, David Khorram, stated there were no changes to the Agenda. He passed out a flier to the upcoming awards presentation and stated the City had two projects that had been submitted.

Committee Member Imboden made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session of the Design Review Committee Meeting.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Member Woollett absent.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

There were no speakers.

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 3, 2013

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting of April 3, 2013, with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) 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
- Continued from DRC meeting: February 6, 2013
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would be recusing himself from the item's presentation due to his business relationship with the applicant.

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

Applicant, Jon Califf, address on file, stated the configuration of the back porch that Committee Member McCormack had brought up had been changed and on the existing house he had figured out that a casement could be as small as 24 x 40, which was closer to the measurement they were wanting. He changed that to a casement that would match closer in size. He pointed the changes out on the plans and reviewed them with the Committee Members. He pulled the porch stoop away from the parking stalls a bit to ensure adequate room for car doors to open. In regard to the tree he had gotten a revised landscape plan and some of the suggestions were for a Lavender Tabebuia tree, a nice patio tree that would get a bit bigger or a Pear tree, and his intent was to allow the owner to choose one of those trees. Those choices would replace the smaller originally proposed tree.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he realized the project had been scaled down a bit, but he still had the same concerns for the impacts of the site and the resource itself. The in-fill unit should be subordinate to the historic structure and those were the recommended Secretary of Interior standards and it should be compatible to the site. It was a pleasing design and if it was being built on an empty lot as an in-fill that would be o.k.; there were still bulk and mass issues. To compare the proposal to homes around it, the proposal was an inappropriate development. The area had already been compromised with inappropriate developments in the past and the home still had its original bungalow garage. The OTPA had gone with garage relocations for sympathetic developments, but the proposed project was not sympathetic. The project influenced the street scape and he could not see how the proposal met the Secretary of Interior standards and he would appreciate if the Committee could explain how the proposal met the standards in introducing a building of that size on the lot with a small 750 square foot bungalow with a single car garage. Thank you.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was the applicant's choice for a tree. There was a fine example of a tree at the library and it was a 25 year old tree impeccably maintained there and it was an anomaly that the tree looked that way. The Tabebuia tree would be fine. He had some questions on the legend, to change the name evergreen to lavender and he would probably advise the applicant not to keep that plant as it required a lot of water. For the ground cover, it was not a true grass and to identify it just as Lerio ground cover. Other than that he was fine and suggested to change the spacing of the 'Ballerina' raphiolepis plant to 24". Those were recommendations.

Committee Member Imboden stated on the trees shown in the elevation he could not tell what was proposed.

Mr. Califf stated the new trees were shown. The existing trees were along the property line along the fence. He pointed them out on the plans. There was one that was so close to the foundation that it would require removal.

Committee Member Imboden stated the proposal was not a final determination. He thought that Mr. Califf bringing forth detailed plans was nice and there were not a lot of questions. He felt the modifications that had been made were minimal and he anticipated seeing more; the changes made had gone a long way in making a difference. He was still somewhat concerned about the bulk and mass of the proposal and the applicant was definitely pushing the envelope on what was appropriate for the site and the historic resource on it. He was a bit disappointed with the report that came back, that Staff had not done an analysis, and there were enough properties on the block. The ordinance was clear that there should be a comparison of the proposed project to other historic resources on the block and that had not been done. He hoped that would be done before the project moved onto the Planning Commission and it was a point that had been brought up at the previous meeting. He was not concerned with the context on the block and there was a lot of bulk and mass on the block. There had been a comment made, during public comments, that the surrounding developments were not allowed to occur anymore and to judge those developments against the proposal before them and to state it was okay, he was not certain that it was the proper litmus test; he was looking at it as a historic resource and the impacts. That being stated, when he reviewed the long term viability of a property the project had very large buildings around it and the home probably would not be a 700 square foot home and the home would not share the value of other homes around it; he would be interested to hear the other Committee Member's thought and would have wanted the bulk and mass to have come down a bit more. It was being presented in a manner that he felt a little more comfortable with the proposed project and the placement of the trees on the side yard played a big role in mitigating what was being built. If the applicant was okay with it, he would want to include a condition of approval that trees of a certain size be maintained at the site in perpetuity. He was not concerned with the addition to the resource, he was not disturbed by the garage relocation, but he wished the bulk and mass had been lowered, but it was what had been submitted to them.

Chair Fox stated the changes, although slight, made a difference in pulling the form back into an "easier on the eyes" type of building. She was also concerned with a tiny building on a large lot, all alone and the value of it was so much lower that the motivation to maintain it could be

compromised. The economic viability, as Committee Member Imboden, had referred to would be greater with the changes and even the trees would be important in creating a privacy factor to the backyard and windows. The tree placement would be desirable and the changes were justified and being an R-4 lot and many of the other properties on that street would be facing the same problems and the proposal was an example of a solution. She felt the proposed changes had been very tastefully done and she had no problems with it. The only notation she had made was the side window and the attention to that had been appreciated. The other solution would be to maintain the existing historic window with a new casement window next to it, but if that made for bed layout impossible it was a good solution. The home would be elevated in a way that it was preservable and maintainable.

Mr. Califf stated the window could go into the corner, if placing a window next to it would probably highlight the differences.

Chair Fox stated she also concurred with the comments made by Committee Member Imboden.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the trees, he would want those to be a viable situation, but often times the trees were removed and the City had not adopted language for replacement of trees of like kind and size, especially in a space noted on the plans. If that was direction they wanted to go in there should be some unifying element in the landscape plan to provide a visual quality to the lot. It should not only occur once. He was not certain from the photos and how long ago they were taken and he was attempting to identify the trees at the site.

Mr. Califf stated it was a mixed bag of trees and shrubs and he pointed out a photo that was taken about 8 months ago.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not wanted Committee Member McCormack to misunderstand his comments. He had not wanted the current property owner or any subsequent owner to be bound to maintaining a specific specie of tree of the same size; but if there was more abstract language that would include trees of a certain size to be maintained at that location to be screened. He would not want the property owner to be restricted if down the road the trees became problematic and he chose to remove a tree; he would want language that would recommend a suitable replacement tree, a tree that would do the same job in screening that the existing trees were doing currently.

Chair Fox asked if there was such a condition that they could recommend that could be enforced?

Mr. Ryan stated the landscape would require maintenance as provided for in the plans.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was done on commercial properties that the trees were required to be maintained.

Mr. Ryan stated there was not the same strong language that could be included for residential properties.

Chair Fox asked how could they make that a condition. It was one thing that she disagreed with, she felt the property owner would self maintain as the trees created a great privacy screen and

that anyone living at the site would want the screening from the neighboring property. She felt as though that was motivation and she was not certain they could condition enforcement of maintenance.

Mr. Ryan stated there was no mechanism for enforcement and it was difficult enough for the Committee Members to just have standards to review the landscaping themselves. In the new standards they were addressing that and it would hopefully be something in the future that could be utilized.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not understanding why they could not condition the tree maintenance?

Mr. Ryan stated there would be a resolution that would go to the Planning Commission and a condition could be added to the resolution for landscape maintenance to reflect privacy issues.

Chair Fox stated then they would need someone to police the situation and drive by the property.

Committee Member Imboden asked how was it any different then when a landscape plan was approved? The property owner was required to implement the plan that was presented and approved.

Chair Fox stated that in the future if a tree died they would want something to be done and she was not certain they could require that.

Mr. Ryan stated they could do that in the CUP, with maintenance of landscaping in a condition that the landscape be maintained for privacy purposes.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would be difficult to determine what type of tree should be recommended.

Mr. Califf stated he had done his best to depict the size and shape of the existing trees in his presentation.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would not want to create language that was too restrictive in regard to specie and so forth.

Committee Member McCormack stated language could be added for a tall, evergreen, vertical, conical tree. He was frustrated sometimes in reviewing a plan and there was such detail and articulation, but in reviewing the site photos with a car in the photo and he wanted to recommend a way to add some articulation or some interest at the building edge, where the concrete met the property. All the other areas were articulated at the edges and he would recommend that to make the project appear a bit nicer to add an element, such as gravel, between the concrete area and the edge of the property.

Committee Member Imboden stated for clarification, on the barge rafters extending out, he asked if they were planning on running gutters on those? He wondered if the rafter tails extended beyond the edge of the roof as it appeared that way in shadow.

Mr. Califf stated it was a barge overhang that stopped at the edge of the roof.

Committee Member Imboden made a motion to recommend approval of DRC No. 4658-12, Yaghi In-Fill 2nd Unit and Garage Relocation, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- The trees along the southern edge of the property shall be maintained as tall, vertical, pyramidal, evergreen trees as part of the approval and maintained in perpetuity as a visual mitigation.
- The double hung window on the historic structure to be maintained in the corner with a new casement window to be added to meet the egress requirements, to match in size with the existing double hung window and to include a mutton bar at mid point.

And recommend:

- The trees along the northern edge to be maintained.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would also want Staff to provide a basic FAR comparison of other historic properties on the street, simply because that was how the code read prior to submission to Planning Commission.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Joe Woollett

RECUSED: Craig Wheeler

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4666-13 – BALTA RESIDENCE

- A proposal to construct a 5,039.54 sq. ft. single-family residence on a vacant lot.
- 7021 E. Hidden Oaks Lane
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Marvin Ulrikson, address on file, stated in regard to the roof, he had designed the entry roof to be slightly higher for visual interest. The home would be at the end of the cul de sac and a 3 car garage as needed on a property of its size, he had split the garages to each side and change the entry pitch to have a higher appearance from the street. The rest of the roof would be 6 and 12 and the intent was to bring more interest to the entry of the project. If they felt it should all be the same he would be o.k. with that, he was open to their suggestions.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion

Committee Member Wheeler stated on sheet A1.03 of the roof plan, he felt there was an area drawn incorrectly. He pointed out on the plans the width of one element that might be incorrect. He reviewed the situation with the applicant. They reviewed the plans at the hip line and the overhang area.

Mr. Ulrikson stated he would note that.

Chair Fox pointed out another situation on another area of the plans. The applicant reviewed the plans with Chair Fox.

Mr. Ulrikson stated his drawing was different there was a 45 degree angle with a steeper angle.

Chair Fox stated there was a 90 degree there, pointing to an area on the plans and she went back to the question of why not make it all 6 and 12; she was having an issue with the one being at a slightly different angle.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt a case could be made for the steeper angle and to him it was not a problem. If it was 6 and 12 or 7 and 12 the difference would be so slight. On the arches on the front elevation there was a texture along the outer area and he asked what the gray area would be?

Mr. Ulrikson stated it would be more stone.

Chair Fox asked if the stone would be on the face and also return back?

Mr. Ulrikson stated yes.

Committee Member McCormack stated when he initially reviewed the layout it was odd to him to have a hip and a gable so close together and he normally viewed the situation with possibly a pop up of a square tower or some other element; it appeared odd. His sensibility would be to have a protrusion up and maybe that would be at the entry, something different.

Chair Fox asked if there was a volume ceiling?

Mr. Ulrikson stated no, most of the ceilings were 10'.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there were a number of hips and gables and he was fine with the layout.

Chair Fox stated she had parked down the street and walked the street and there were other homes that had the same features and there was quite a mix.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had the same feeling.

Mr. Ulrikson stated there were homes on the street with 4 garages that were lined up and he had wanted to have a different situation with the entry and raising the hip over the front door and attempting to break up the entry.

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed but felt it was not enough of a change.

Chair Fox stated she agreed with the unique roof form with a unique pitch at the entry.

Mr. Ulrikson stated the only reason he had not continued the hip there was that he needed to break that up to create the entry. He reviewed the roof plan with the Committee.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested raising the plate more at the entry to create more volume at the entry and it would provide for more separation and provide for a thicker structure above the arch, which would be more appropriate.

Chair Fox stated on the rendering there was a window but it had not shown on the plans.

Mr. Ulrikson stated it was a screen and not a window. There was also plant material identified there. It was Bougainvillea on a trellis to separate the garage massing.

Chair Fox asked for the material of the fence and gate?

Mr. Ulrikson stated they would use block wall and iron gates.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the block wall would be stucco as it was not noted on the plans?

Mr. Ulrikson stated yes it would be stucco and he would note that.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the plant legend there was a notation for Coffee fern and the only fern that would survive a southern exposure would be the Leather Leaf fern and even that would be a push. The landscape was more of a California Native theme and he suggested the use of a plant that could take the sun.

Committee Member Imboden stated on the landscape plan he would not want too large of a plant in front of the entry, he would not want to hide the entry.

Committee Member McCormack stated instead of 2 No. 2 plants, to put the No. 2 further away from the house as it could become a large tree and have it no closer than 8' away.

Chair Fox stated if he was referring to the California laurel tree she suggested moving it to the right of the driveway.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4666-13, Balta Residence, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff report and with the additional conditions:

- To relocate the California Laurel tree to the right side of the driveway and the other away from the front of the house, at least 8' away from the structure.
- The gate of the side yard to be wrought iron or tubular steel and the block side walls shall be covered with stucco to match the house.
- The pitch of the entry form to be changed to 6 and 12 to match the rest of the residence with the ridge over the entry to be raised to meet the ridge of the main house to provide for a higher plate for the entry form.
- Remove the Coffee fern from the plant palette and use a more tolerant California Native plant.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(4) DRC No. 4667-13 – STARBUCKS COFFEE DRIVE-THRU

- A proposal to construct a new single story 880 sq. ft. Starbucks coffee shop with drive-thru, walk-up service, and a 200 sq. ft. outdoor seating area.
- 1630 E. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Applicant, Terry Matz, address on file, stated he was a development consultant working with Starbucks to process the application. The Staff Report was accurate and Starbucks was in support of everything that was included in the report. The subject site was constrained and provided for some challenges. The most significant, was the acquisition of a full right of way on both Tustin and Chapman. The site was a former gas station and in making the changes it reduced the site layout from almost 1700 square feet to 1300 square feet and there was significant grade changes with retaining walls. The project met the City's guidelines with a design that worked and although they had not met the tree count, with additional trees that they proposed it would maximize the landscaping to the site with the allowance for visibility to the site. The parking was more than required and it was a unique setting and project.

Applicant, Jeff Rabbit, address on file, stated Starbucks was very excited with a new flagship prototype that was being used and represented in the photographs that were emailed to the City earlier in the week. The photos were from a store in Denver and the design had been adopted from a green theme using recycled storage containers. The proposal before them would not use the same situation due to the constraints of the site. They were still bringing the overall aesthetic to the site with an honest use of materials and Starbucks progressive look. The footprint was very familiar. Landscape was a concern; however, due to the constraints of the site they went with more quality than quantity and proposed a more robust landscape situation.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion

Committee Member McCormack stated site planning was a big key and how the objectives of the site worked with the issues that surrounded the site. He had some intimate knowledge of the corner and he drove past it at least six times a day and the corner had grown and changed. There were problems with traveling west bound on Chapman to south bound Tustin and he had driven it 3 times just today and in encountering a bus, the area was not easily traveled. The drive thru at Starbucks was generally crowded and he asked what the stacking number was and he would want to recommend appropriate signage for directions to enter the drive thru. For the site it appeared that it would work the best it could.

Mr. Rabbit stated the size of the site was the mechanism for their layout and they needed a 9 to 10 car queue. There were grade breaks and limited access issues that drove the aesthetics at the site. There had been access sites at Chapman and Tustin, they elected to negate those opportunities as it had not made sense to cut through the drive thru. The intent was to turn the situation inward and it was important to Starbucks to not allow any waiting cars to filter out onto Chapman. It worked itself out and made the most sense with the proposed design before them. Generally there were many options, but with the site before them there was basically one option.

Committee Member McCormack asked the applicant to speak to the grade issue and discuss the retaining walls. There was a wall that was almost 4' tall.

Mr. Rabbit stated the wall was a screen wall and not a retaining wall of any sort; it was a low visual break to help protect the headlights when in the drive thru shining out to Chapman. The Police Department had not wanted a higher wall and the grade was on the west side and at the south side.

Committee Member McCormack asked how the finished floor was arrived at with the grade changes. He reviewed the plans with the applicant. That corner had been problematic and he had seen accidents at that corner.

Mr. Rabbit stated the wall currently existed at the property line, their proposal was to bring the wall back 20' and there would not be that blind area on approach around that corner. The parking would be at the adjacent grade. The 4' wall would be the back of the trash enclosure with a landscape area.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the corner was being opened up a lot.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a 2' grade change that the wall would take care of.

Mr. Rabbit the site was relatively flat. The corner was being left alone.

Committee Member McCormack stated just to call it 231.5, the cars would be 2' higher than the relative grade on Chapman and another 3' wall was being added on the Chapman side and net a 5' wall, he needed some clarification on that.

Chair Fox reviewed the plans with him.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not understood the condition to be that way at the site.

Mr. Rabbit stated the site was relatively flat and if there were errors on the civil those would be corrected. The wall was a screen wall and not a retaining wall. He reviewed the plans with Committee Member McCormack and explained the wall details and the grade situation at the site.

Committee Member McCormack asked what material the wall would be?

Mr. Rabbit stated the proposal was for a green screen and would have a vine on it, he was not certain if it would be a block wall and they might use the same screen material that was used for the equipment screen.

Committee Member Imboden stated the material needed to be noted.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was concerned with the corner and had not understood the information provided in terms of the grade changes.

Committee Member Imboden asked Committee Member McCormack what he felt the elevation difference was from car 6 in the drive thru to the surface of the street at the North West corner.

Committee Member McCormack stated 232 and the finished floor was 234.

Committee Member Imboden stated he wanted to follow him and was he feeling that the situation had not been dealt with?

Chair Fox stated there were contour lines on the plans at the back of the walk way and at the exact corner he was reviewing and that was 3.2' below the finished floor; it appeared that the slope was just being maintained.

Mr. Rabbit stated it was an existing condition and there was no proposed change.

Chair Fox stated the drive aisle was exactly the same.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they were just digging a wall in there?

Mr. Rabbit stated yes, there was screening.

Chair Fox asked if there was a requirement for screening of the menu board?

Mr. Garcia stated yes and the wall was doing that.

Mr. Rabbit stated there was also a desire to protect the landscape and to get people to circulate to the appropriate entrances.

Committee Member Imboden stated on the plans there was a pre-menu board and a height restriction board and a menu board, he asked if those were the only items out there along with the screening elements; those items had not shown up all together anywhere on the plans.

Mr. Rabbit referred the Committee to sheet 6, he explained the screen and stated the only layered item would be the pre-menu board and the height restriction bar was very thin and the menu board would happen at the curve.

Chair Fox asked if signage was part of the submittal?

Mr. Garcia stated it was not part of the packet, as a free-standing site a sign program was not required. There was a blade sign depicted in the plans which was not allowed and the applicant was aware of that restriction.

Chair Fox stated the location was a gateway to the City and she was personally excited about the project, given that she was unclear of a few things. The height of the trash container needed to be clarified.

Mr. Rabbit stated the trash enclosure was just under 6' tall and the surrounding retaining wall varied and at that corner it was at its highest, they would add a green screen to the top of the wall to cover the back of the enclosure. The walls along the sides would be solid.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they could run the green screen along the back as a guard rail.

Mr. Rabbit stated they could run the screen to meet the height of the trash enclosure.

Chair Fox stated due to the use of the retaining wall at the trash enclosure the requirement for landscape along both sides of the trash enclosure could be less than what was required, because they were burying the back of the enclosure and that was a huge plus. On the corner of the building façade she was not certain how those were handled with the change from the reclaimed wood to the metal screening, she asked if the wood would wrap or would the metal wrap.

Mr. Rabbit stated there was a very thin end cap and it was wood and integrated to the frame of the mesh screen on the opposite side.

Chair Fox asked on letter C on the east elevation pointing to a canopy and she asked if that should be pointing to the screen below that?

Mr. Rabbit stated she was correct.

Chair Fox asked what was going on with the window break up and she asked if that was a fan?

Mr. Rabbit stated that was a Health Department requirement.

Chair Fox asked what occurred at the other window?

Mr. Rabbit stated on the modular units that would be the open end of the container with a metal frame and a similar store front.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they would be getting metal tree branches on the roof?

Chair Fox asked for the color board. The Committee reviewed the color board.

Mr. Rabbit stated the silhouette of a tree was something they tried at the Denver location and it was laser cut metal that was integrated into the screen.

Committee Member Imboden pointed to an area on the photos that was very dark and black and he asked what that would appear as on completion.

Mr. Rabbit stated that should be a tighter screen at the mechanical equipment.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they could look at a perforated metal?

Mr. Rabbit stated that was something they could look at.

Committee Member McCormack stated at the retaining wall, he suggested that the contour be at another area with a clear plinth line behind the wall and basically behind the wall it would be flat and have a finished sloped feeling. He asked why the end island was being paved and he would want to suggest a tree be planted there, he had not seen the need for the additional paved area. In reviewing the whole center it would not appear out of place and would make for a better entry.

Chief Building Official, David Khorram, stated at a shopping center there needed to be a continuous path of travel for disabled patrons; it was a requirement in the Building Code to allow for patrons to get from one business to another. If there was a means of using the path to get from Starbucks to adjacent buildings that paved area would be required.

Chair Fox asked if that was for Staff to use?

Mr. Rabbit stated that was for Staff and for deliveries.

Mr. Matz stated it was a path of travel

Committee Member McCormack stated he felt it was unnecessary.

Committee Member Imboden stated the path of travel could not be through a drive aisle.

Chair Fox stated once the proposal went to the Building Department it would be determined as to what the requirement was and changes could be made.

Committee Member McCormack stated that was not ADA.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was.

Chair Fox stated it was a path of travel to the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Khorram stated when there were several buildings in one shopping center, people could not be treated differently, and disabled patrons would need a path of travel from one building to another and that was the only way for them to travel to an adjacent business.

Committee Member McCormack stated if it was just moved over it would be the same situation.

Chair Fox stated they could not go through the driveway.

Committee Member McCormack stated he wanted to push the issue, as he had not agreed with it.

Chair Fox stated if it was a Building Department requirement they would not be able to override that for an aesthetic feature, Committee Member McCormack could make it a condition that if it was not a requirement that the area could be changed to a planting area.

Committee Member McCormack stated if that was a Building requirement then all end aisles would be sidewalk access, normally the end islands were planting. He felt there were two requirements conflicting.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in the situation before them it was a path of travel.

Mr. Khorram stated it was a path of travel and it was a Building Department requirement to travel from one business to the next.

Committee Member Imboden stated Chair Fox had presented a solution.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was just his point of view.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was already a good size tree in that area and to move one over just a bit had not made sense.

Committee Member Imboden stated on the grading, as he saw that needed to be understood and thought out. That they had gone from a wall planted in the ground to a steel wall that sat above the ground with more than a foot of elevation change from one end to the other and how was the grade change being handled?

Mr. Rabbit stated it would be stepped incrementally so it would not be an obvious change.

Committee Member Imboden stated it would have been nice if it had been shown how that area was handled as it was such a prominent corner. He had expressed his concern previously and particularly with a new building it was not out of line to require a true materials board and it seemed so often that the DRC had not had that. It was standard industry practice. He would have thought that as the site was such a prominent “gate way” to the City that a corner perspective would have been provided, to show how the end result would appear. Sometimes the applicant might need to be asked to provide those. The site was a potential win or lose and if the fence that was being proposed at the front of the project headed south it could be a big lose.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a big opportunity with the proposal before them, but if it was not right it could be a huge failure.

Chair Fox stated the landscape could be bifurcated and to have the applicant return with a revised landscape plan prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

Committee Members Imboden and McCormack agreed to bifurcate the landscape.

Committee Member Imboden stated the rest of the package was beautiful.

Chair Fox stated the remainder of the project could go forward to the Planning Commission.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that bifurcation would allow for a study of the parking situation and the end aisle.

Committee Member McCormack stated one of the things as a gate way to the City the site was looked at from both sides. There was a hedge that would block the head lights and contain the area and he suggested something to drape over the wall.

Mr. Rabbit stated they had proposed a vine or planting that would soften the area and it was their intent for that area.

Committee Member McCormack stated their tree choice was a tree that would grow very slow and would be very small. It was not a significant tree. It was a very good tree, but very small. He was not a fan of the Pyrus tree and he suggested the use of a Tababuia tree. He was becoming a big fan of that tree and it grew well in the City of Orange and a tree of choice for him. He reviewed the plant choices with the applicants and he suggested multi-trunk trees. He had not thought the Phlomis would work very well and would not have a defined appearance. The grass line bio swale was good. The flowering shrub was fine and he suggested the rose flower carpet be removed as it was more of an English Garden type plant. The Lavender he would only put in at dry areas, all the rest of the plants for that area was perfect. The Thymus was very hard to grow and the Dymondia was very short, he would make another choice for those and he suggested a taller grass. The vines were perfect. It was such an important corner of the City. He would want all the site issues worked out with the landscape plan to return.

Mr. Matz asked for an explanation of bifurcating the project and the time frames they would be looking at?

Mr. Garcia stated it would not slow them down. The project would be moving forward. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit the final landscape plan would need to return to the DRC for their review. Another choice would be for a continuance.

Mr. Matz stated he would want to continue to move forward and return to the DRC with the landscape plan.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would also want to review the lighting and for the path of travel situation to be resolved.

Mr. Matz asked for clarification of what Committee Member McCormack was referring to?

Committee Member McCormack stated there could be striping on the paving without the ramped area and the corner could be used as another planting opportunity for another tree. He pointed out the area on the plans.

Committee Member Imboden stated the trees were part of a variance that required Planning Commission approval and would they want a response on the quantity of trees in order for the Planning Commission to make a recommendation.

Chair Fox stated she was okay with the number of trees as proposed as the situation was mitigated by the tree size and they were larger than what was required and if they added a tree that would be just an added bonus.

Committee Member Imboden stated he too was okay with the number of trees as proposed.

Chair Fox suggested that they return with a site elevation from the corner of Chapman.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was a tough site, but an important site to the City and he applauded the applicant with what they were bringing forward and he hoped the Planning Commission reviewed it in the same manner.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission, DRC No. 4667-13, Starbucks Coffee Drive-Thru, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff report and with the additional conditions:

- The screen surrounding the mechanical equipment be of a tighter mesh to better screen the equipment.
- The landscape plan, including the low wall on the Chapman side of the site be resubmitted to the DRC prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
- The DRC felt the number of trees as proposed was appropriate, and if one additional tree was added for a total of 14 trees at the site, that would be appropriate as well.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(5) DRC No. 4677-13 – BRUXIE RESTAURANT

- A proposal for replacement and expansion of new awnings on a fast food restaurant.
- 292 N. Glassell Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Dean Simon, address on file, stated there was a small strip on Glassell that was on the property line and they were proposing to extend the awning to cover the area where patrons dined and to remove the balusters and it would create a better effect. When it was windy it was not very fun.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion

Committee Member McCormack stated the awnings would come out and would it end similar to the awning that was currently on the building?

Mr. Simon stated yes.

Committee Member McCormack stated on sheet 5.1 there was a post and he suggested that the post be moved.

Mr. Simon stated that was an existing column post and they would only be adding one footing, everything else was existing.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested a 2” tube of high strength to have all the columns the same size. All the others were called out as 2” and the new one was called out as 3”.

Mr. Simon stated if it was structurally sound he would have that changed.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they intended to lower the sign?

Mr. Simon stated if the awning affected the sign they would lower it.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if there was a rule that the signage on the awning valance could only cover 2/3rds of the height of the valance?

Mr. Ryan stated it could be 30% of the valance and they liked it to flow within the field.

Committee Member McCormack stated on sheet A1 there was the existing sign, but it was not on the proposed sheet 1; when it turned the corner what would occur there?

Mr. Simon stated the new awning would wrap the pole. He reviewed the plans with the Committee Member McCormack and explained how the awning would work in that area.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there would be down lighting in the awning?

Mr. Simon stated yes. For a weather challenged facility, wind was the worst situation for them.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was fine with the submittal.

Committee Member McCormack reviewed the detail at the bottom of the new column and suggested that the area be finished with concrete or asphalt to match what was currently on the ground.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4677-13 - Bruxie Restaurant, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff report and with the additional:

- Detail 1 on sheet 8.0 shall note a new concrete or asphalt finish to match adjacent surface.

And with the following recommendations:

- The new column to be a 2” column, instead of 3”.
- The sign to be lowered if necessary.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(6) DRC No. 4680-13 – MASSARO–FAÇADE REMODEL

- A proposal to remodel the front and rear facades of a contributing one-story 1922 Western False front industrial building.
 - 145 N. Lemon Street, Old Towne Historic District
 - Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
 - DRC Action: Final Determination
-

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would recuse himself from the project's presentation due to the proximity of his work place.

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

Applicant, Anthony Massaro, address on file, stated looking historically the façade on the property seemed to have changed over the years for whatever the specific use was. If it was a garage or a bakery changes were made for that use. The owner of the current business was a high end graphics company and he wanted to have his employees in a nice atmosphere. The gable and the windows and doors were a function of how he wanted to run the business.

Mr. Ryan stated a curb cut was proposed for the second door.

Mr. Massaro stated one side would be used for storage and the other door, with the curb cut, would be for shipping, receiving and for deliveries.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion

Committee Member Imboden asked Mr. Ryan if the 1982 DPR was available?

Mr. Ryan stated no, the form was not available.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the property had been surveyed in 1982?

Mr. Ryan stated he was not certain if it was surveyed as a non-contributor, but it was not there, he was not certain if it was just missed. He had gone back to look for it. There was no record of the property being surveyed in 1982.

Committee Member Imboden stated the current DPR showed that it was.

Mr. Ryan stated there was no record in the 1982 DPR that he had. It was listed as an address but no survey.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the National Register District occurred from the 1982 survey?

Mr. Ryan stated no the Plaza had, but the local district was done outside of the 1982 survey. There was an address listing, but no DPR form for the property. He had gone back to the earliest photos, but there was not one for 1982. The older photos were mostly residential.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was listed in 1997 in the registry and the 1991 photo was what they had. There had to be a DPR for if it was a National Register property. Was there anything that told them what the materials were for the rear façade and the profile of it? The doors were not called out, nor were the dimensions. A new window was also proposed, but it had not appeared to be called out as such. He asked the applicant what the purposes of the windows were?

Mr. Massaro stated there were exposed trusses inside and the owner was seeking additional light coming from the gable end. He was not able to find any Western False Front historical data in Orange, it was not typical, but he found precedence for windows. It was generally just a two story façade and he felt a window was not an unreasonable request.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not disagreed that Western False Fronts had upper story windows; however, the subject property had not had one. He asked if sky lights were considered?

Mr. Massaro stated yes there are existing sky lights and no new ones were being added, they would unblock some of the sky lights that had been blocked up. The owner wanted more light, the design would not live or die with the addition of a window. In reviewing the existing situation there was a side pole that was rather odd, it came right through the vent and he would want to at least add something there. The pole cantilevered back and was just coming right out of the vent and appeared very awkward.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not known that he would agree to change the vent.

Chair Fox stated there was no evidence of how old the pole was.

Committee Member Imboden stated that was never noted as a character-defining feature or a contributing element. There was no existing sign. He would not be able to approve a new window opening as the Standards were pretty clear about that and he had not felt there was a necessity for it. If it was for light, it appeared that the additional light needs were being met with skylights. The front was pressed tin and that type of change would not be reversible and the Standards required that changes be reversible. There were a number of things in the Standards that pointed to not having a new opening being permitted. He found the lower portion of the building to be a challenge as it was not historic, but there was nothing that would take them in the direction of what the applicant proposed. Would that mean that it was okay or not okay? He would state that the doors were not appropriate, as proposed; the panel doors for the style of the building as well as the entry doors.

Mr. Massaro stated what he was attempting to do with the doors was to create fenestration locations that met the needs of the building, but keeping consistency. The new doors were just a

pair of doors similar to the doors that currently existed on the building. Mr. Ryan's recommendation was to not have the window or gable end or changing the design of the two large doors and he was fine with modifying his submittal.

Committee Member Imboden asked what the material of the lower façade was?

Mr. Massaro stated if the fenestration would be retooled, it was T1-11, he proposed using a tongue and groove, something of a higher quality unless the Committee wanted board and batten. He was open to suggestions on the vertical siding.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not certain the application as submitted was complete. If a material was being proposed, especially for the front of a Nationally Registered property it was important to know what the material would be.

Mr. Massaro stated he proposed 4" reversed board and batten siding to match existing, that was what was proposed. If the Committee wanted to remove the T1-11, they would do that, but the proposal was to repair the T1-11. He was open to suggestions.

Mr. Ryan stated applicants are allowed to repair their buildings and that could be done, or if they felt the material was historically inappropriate and they chose to remove non-historic material and replace with more historic material, both those options worked.

Chair Fox stated she felt the top half of the building needed to be thought about differently than the bottom half of the building. She felt strongly that the top of the building should have minimal changes. The bottom non-historic portion of the building lent itself to more flexibility. She could not agree of the top portion window change and would want the vent to remain. She was concerned with light fixtures and such that would be mounted to the historic front that would cause penetration of the historic materials. She would want to see the address plates being brought down to the new piece of wood, or belly band, which was being introduced. She had some concerns on lighting that was being used to light the sign and might they be able to incorporate some lighting element into the awning – to have fewer penetrations. There were two additional poles existing at the site with lights and if there were ways to use those elements to re-use the holes in the tin to mount lighting. There were poles being removed and those would leave a hole and maybe those areas could be used. She was concerned with adding more holes to the very uniqueness of the building. The window fenestrations at the back made for a more appealing use and she was okay with that, they looked very distinctly non-historic and had not created a false sense of history and they appeared to role across the façade.

Mr. Massaro stated they were barn doors, but glass barn doors, the rear of the property would be the employee lounge area and the owner wanted to create a space for them.

Chair Fox stated it would make the yard more functional. On the back façade she was not concerned with what occurred on the bottom.

Committee Member Imboden stated there needed to be call outs on the material for those back doors.

Chair Fox stated she bought into nothing being changed at the top and no glass being put in the vehicular looking doors and even not doing panels, but maybe a more vertical situation.

Committee Member McCormack stated maybe something more industrial, some roll up doors. He mirrored everything that was discussed. The old roll up doors with hinges that made a sound would be better.

Mr. Massaro asked if they were suggesting literally a roll up door that had all the roll up functions?

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not certain that an industrial roll up with the horizontal lines might not be the best choice.

Mr. Ryan stated there were industrial doors that were made from wood and might be simple and read better.

Mr. Massaro stated the panel doors were installed with the Creative Cakes Company. They appeared to be inexpensive fiber glass doors. He would be concerned if using pure roll up doors that were more of an industrial horizontal door, that those might not look as nice. The owner wanted a hip printing vibe and wanted the doors that swung open, none of the suggestions that he was hearing were problematic. He had no issue with leaving the top half of the building as it existed. He had no issue with changing the door styles and he wanted to be able to have the functionality that the owner was wanting to achieve.

Committee Member Imboden stated it sounded that they were all in consensus that the upper portion of the building would have no changes and there was not a reason for any changes. Signage could either occur on the existing Creative Cakes signage area or lower.

Chair Fox stated nothing should penetrate the tin.

Mr. Massaro stated he would use the same location to place their signage with no new penetrations and he was okay with not having lighting there. They were not retail or a restaurant.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not too concerned with the rear façade as that was not original anyway and what was proposed worked for the new use. He assumed that the doors would be single light, glazed wood doors?

Mr. Massaro stated yes. They were to appear as a glazed barn door.

Committee Member Imboden stated he wanted to be clear on the materials. He agreed that the other doors were not appropriate for the style of the building as proposed and he was uncomfortable just stating to choose an industrial door. Historically the doors would have been a vertical opening and although the façade was being changed, a horizontal door would not be appropriate, and it would be two doors. He suggested a vertical board tilt up door in wood or swinging doors.

Chair Fox stated there were swinging doors proposed on the plans.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would move away from the raised panel doors and to choose a vertical door.

Mr. Ryan asked if there was an issue with whether the doors were swing out doors. The doors would swing in.

Mr. Massaro stated he was in agreement that the windows in making it too carriage house and the comments that were made, however, the Creative Cakes business had set a cottage feeling to the building and he would come up with as many examples as they wanted for the doors, he was not certain if the vertical or horizontal use would work, but it felt that it moved away from the canvass and the color scheme and the divided light. It was very hybrid and eclectic, the manner in which the Creative Cakes business had changed the building.

Committee Member Imboden stated his response was that something entirely different was being proposed and the applicant was in a position to respond to the historic building, rather than a business that had no longer existed. Another surveyor could have looked at the building and made the statement that with all the changes it was marginal whether it was a contributing building any longer. He was not certain that they should use that as a benchmark to move forward. He had not had a problem with the windows as proposed and he was okay with the re-alignment of the door. The details of the project were important and to move away from the raised panels as there was not a historic precedence for that.

Mr. Massaro asked if a single panel with a diagonal or something, as an old door would have been done would work for the Committee?

Chair Fox stated “and they could be swinging doors.”

Committee Member Imboden stated the diagonal could be on the inside. It was just a vertical element. He was not seeking a door that would fool anyone to thinking it was a historic door, but he had not wanted to go so far away from that to be so new and contemporary. He could move forward, however, he had some issues with the garage door and what that would be.

Chair Fox asked if they would be more comfortable asking for a continuance in order to have the revisions of the garage door return and also the other changes that they had discussed. They were asking for a lot.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would agree with that.

Chair Fox asked how had they felt about the windows in the back?

Mr. Ryan asked about the vent?

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not concerned with the ability to have the area cleaned up and restored, but to add a window would be too far out of character and would appear altered.

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed and was not certain why someone would have placed a brow and circle at the vent, but there it was.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the site was in the Plaza District?

Mr. Ryan stated it was in the Sante Fe Depot.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not certain if they had any control over paint or colors, but he would recommend that with a Western False Front it should be one color, and as presented it was very severe. They could go with two colors, but something more complementary and not 2 such severe colors.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they were proposing to leave the vent and pole situation at the rear alone?

Mr. Massaro stated it would be usable space from the inside so he would need to add something there, maybe glass to keep the air from coming in. That was such an odd ball shape he would need to do something there.

Chair Fox stated they could remove that (referring to the recently installed exhaust fan.)

Committee Member Imboden asked where would the A/C unit be installed?

Mr. Massaro stated they would be doing a seismic retrofit and there would be new plywood and the roof would be a corrugated roof with insulation at the underside of the ceiling. The condensers would sit on the ground in the backyard with the coil units on a platform above the restroom. It was only 6,000 square feet. There would be sheathing, roofing, and insulation from the underside.

Chair Fox stated she would agree with blocking off the back of the vent and to just replace it with new metal and the brow could be removed, just not placing the window. There would be replacement of some of the damaged and rusted corrugated material.

Mr. Massaro stated it would be the same profile, just new material.

Chair Fox stated with a continuance the project would need to be brought back to the DRC before going to the Building Department.

Mr. Ryan stated as a matter of clarification on the T1-11 siding and his approach to that, he was not clear on what way they were recommending the applicant to go with.

Committee Member Imboden stated on a rear façade if that was what existed the owner had the privilege to replace with T1-11. If that material had not existed on the front of the building currently, T1-11 should not be added, only where it already existed.

Mr. Ryan stated the replacement would be with a vertical board.

Chair Fox stated the tongue and groove would be something higher end and as long as they were upgrading she would suggest tongue and groove. She asked if everyone was okay with the awning and with the rear situation?

Committee Members Imboden and McCormack stated they had no issues with those elements.

Committee Member Imboden stated there needed to be simplified front doors.

Chair Fox stated a flat panel door with a tongue and groove in-fill at the bottom instead of the raised elements.

Committee Member McCormack suggested Dutch doors might be nice at the front to split the doors.

Committee Member Imboden stated that might be a matter of security and it was the choice of the applicant.

Mr. Massaro stated he was open to the idea of the door changes, he would want to change to a swinging door, but he wanted to clarify that they were seeking one rail and a style with one piece, just a panel window.

Committee Member Imboden stated the applicant could look at authentic doors, something simple, more industrial.

Mr. Ryan stated he could come back with a few choices to gain feedback on.

Chair Fox stated she would want a color palette; typically they would want to see a color board. The mass was the defining feature of the building and to not break it up with color.

Mr. Massaro stated to proceed he would finish with the TI package and the fenestration would not hold them up. He would work everything out and come back with door choices. He wanted to clarify, there was an unprotected opening at the property line and he wanted some low shelves from the inside and he wanted to remove that side window from a life/safety standpoint.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was probably not original, but considering the property he would not have an issue closing off that window.

Chair Fox stated she was o.k. with that.

Mr. Massaro stated in the event he over spoke and the owner wanted to use T1-11, could he proposed the replacement as T1-11 with tongue and groove as an alternate.

Committee Member Imboden stated for the repairs of like materials to like materials on 3 sides the T1-11 was fine. The building front was not T1-11.

Chair Fox stated yes it was.

Committee Member Imboden stated the front façade was being redone and if the applicant was to propose T1-11 for the front, he would not agree, because the front façade was being completely redone he would not approve T1-11 on the front façade.

Chair Fox stated as it was already existing elsewhere on the building she would be okay with T1-11 as an option.

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed.

Mr. Massaro stated he was reading keynote No. 5 “new 4’ wide reverse board and batten siding to match existing.” Could he leave that note on there when he was correcting his documents?

Chair Fox stated yes.

Committee Member Imboden made a motion to continue DRC No.4680-13, Massaro Façade Remodel.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on May 1, 2013.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.