

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

May 15, 2013

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

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: David Khorram, Chief Building Official
Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager
Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner
Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner
Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner
Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Fox opened the Administrative Session at 5:08p.m.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of May 1, 2013. Changes and corrections were noted.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would recuse himself from Item No. 6 as he was the architect on the project. Committee Member Imboden stated he would recuse himself from Item No. 6, due to his association with the church.

Chief Building Official, David Khorram, stated there were no changes to the agenda.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:21 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members present.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

There were no speakers.

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 1, 2013

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting of May 1, 2013, with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items: None

New Agenda Items:

(2) DRC No. 4612-12 – KONA CLEANERS

- A proposal to modify a façade remodel originally approved for the building by the Design Review Committee on April 4, 2012. Modifications have already been conducted.
- 821 W. Taft Avenue
- Staff Contact: Chad Ortlieb, 714-744-7237, cortlieb@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Committee Member Imboden stated that he had not received the updated new drawings in his packet.

Applicant, Bobby Patel, address on file, stated the intent was to add windows in the future. Currently, it was a cost situation and if there was something else that he could put there in the mean time, possibly a trellis or something, to cover the plain wall. In regards to the removal of the stone veneer he was proposing to place shrubs in that area and even if there was stone there the area would be covered with landscape. The landscaping had not been done as the fire sprinkler pipe was being installed. The Palm trees would be planted and those would help the building. There was an existing chain link fence and he wanted to keep it for the protection of his property and he had not wanted the extra burden of spending money on a new fence.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Chair Fox asked if there were landscape requirements for industrial properties?

Mr. Ortlieb stated the only areas that required landscaping would be the front set back on industrial properties. The amended landscape design specifications was not an exact science and subject to the DRC approval.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in addition to the items that were pointed out by Staff that were changed, there was also a change to the canopy from what had been proposed. The original canopy had a corrugated metal cover and was more of a shade structure. What had been installed was just a beam with supports. He pointed out the proposed canopy on the old drawings.

Mr. Patel stated he had taken the design from a building down the street and used it for the installed canopy.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the issue of the chain link fence, the original submittal clearly stated that the chain link fence was to be removed. Personally, he felt the fence should come out as originally stated and if a new fence was installed it would be a fence that was more compatible with the new standards.

Mr. Patel asked even if it was an existing fence?

Committee Member Wheeler stated the drawing that was approved was for a fence that was going to be gone, as chain link was not something that they had approved. The approval was for removal of the fence and if a fence was needed he would recommend a better fence.

Committee Member Woollett stated he concurred with the fence. Regarding the landscape vs. the stone, if there was adequate landscaping, stone would not be needed and it made a better front for the building. Regarding the fascia, he would not accept it as presented; he would suggest that the eave and fascia be painted one color and something not so dramatic. The horizontal siding color was already dramatic, in and of itself, and on the eave and stucco he would want that to be all the same color. The canopy at the front entrance had not contributed to the design of the building and he felt it was not too costly to place some other material to function as a canopy. The big issue was where the glass was proposed; he wondered if that area was painted if that would suffice until glass was installed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he suggested a horizontal louver treatment that would wrap clear around and provide for a treatment that would appear as louvered blinds.

Chair Fox stated it might compete with the corrugated metal that already existed. It had a very strong horizontal design.

Committee Member Wheeler stated a dark strip the same height of the window may work too.

The Committee Members reviewed the drawings and photos.

Committee Member Wheeler stated some Hardie board trim might work, installed all around it.

Chair Fox stated there could be a larger mass of Hardie panel.

Committee Member Imboden stated he agreed that there should be a better solution for that area. He was a bit concerned about designing the project at the table and sending the applicant away with an expectation of execution of what they suggested. The project had already gone through that situation and he was afraid of doing that again.

Chair Fox stated he agreed with Committee Member Woollett's suggestion of painting the one surface as a whole mass of dark gray, as she referred to the paint palette from the original submittal. The metallic element would pop more and fade the window into the mix and any additional details would not add to the building. She suggested the use of dark paint.

Committee Member Imboden stated he agreed with that suggestion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he agreed that the paint for the fascia should wrap all the way around.

Mr. Patel asked if he meant on the bottom too?

Committee Member Wheeler stated yes.

Chair Fox stated she had a problem with the use of the existing building color being applied anywhere else. The original approval colors were faded gray on that element and there may be some paint solutions to the situation. They could work through the colors and possibly that would help the applicant with some of the other problems.

Committee Member McCormack asked where had the choice for purple come from?

Mr. Patel stated he had wanted his building to stand out. The building was not in a retail location and he wanted customers to see it.

Chair Fox stated the applicant's business was in a very industrial neighborhood. The building was looking very upscale from the neighbors and having the glass was not critical based on the location of the building. She would not want to push for the installation of additional windows. The applicant wanted attention toward the building and she had liked the original color scheme and had not been fond of the stone that had been proposed. The faded gray from the original paint scheme could be used and the area where the window had been proposed could be painted the black jack color with no stone at the front of the building.

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed with the omission of the stone. He had an issue with the ramp looking like a construction ramp going up to a trailer and the only solution instead of ripping the ramp out and going with the originally proposed ramp that had appeared very designed. The current ramp appeared temporary. He suggested the use of landscaping in the front and up to the ramp should be required, and not just with turf. He suggested a layering of compatible shrubbery that could take a south exposure. On the new proposal there was the existing curb and the original submittal had a squared off area and he asked if the existing condition would remain? The original submittal was cleaned up and had some geometry to it.

Mr. Ortlieb reviewed the plans with the Committee. He stated the condition was existing.

Committee Member McCormack stated the east side of the building should have a layered landscape and if everything was painted black that side would appear to have a garage door.

Mr. Patel asked if that area could use a nice trellis?

Committee Member McCormack stated yes.

Mr. Patel stated he wanted the building to be as beautiful as possible; to take the suggestions from the DRC and get it all done. He had to open the business fast.

Committee Member McCormack suggested planting shrubs in front of the ramp to block the view. He had not been a big fan of the stone and he would want shrubbery there.

Chair Fox stated she agreed that a low landscape would be a good screen for the ramp and would appear better. She felt the applicant was willing to do the landscape and the need for some shrubs that would grow approximately 4' high in the zone in front of the ramp.

Committee Member McCormack stated they would need to specify an informal unclipped shrub mass up to 4' in height. There were many ways to handle the area. He asked if the project would come back to the DRC?

Chair Fox asked what the Committee's thoughts were on the chain link fence?

The Committee Members agreed that the chain link should be removed.

Chair Fox stated if the fence would be replaced she would recommend tubular steel.

Committee Member McCormack stated if the rail on the ramp was chain link it would be a design theme.

Mr. Patel asked if there was something he could put on the chain link to cover it up.

Committee Member Imboden stated no.

Committee Member McCormack stated chain link could be a theme in an industrial area, but since there were other elements, the chain link would need to be removed.

Mr. Ortlieb stated in an industrial area where there was chain link and if an applicant produced a permit, including the applicant before them. For example, produced a permit that showed approval for the fence in 1962 it would be the applicant's right to keep the chain link. It would not be a matter of legal non-conforming because technically someone could come before the DRC and request approval for chain link, but from a Staff policy chain link was not approvable as a street frontage element. In the back of a building or side yard, sure, but on the existing project he had not been provided with an original permit for the chain link. It brought up the situation that under current code for a fence under 6' a building permit was not required, but it had not excused the DRC review process.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he disagreed with that situation as from the original submittal the proposed project was conditioned to have the chain link fence removed and he would not want the applicant to be allowed to keep the chain link fence.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was surprised to see Staff's reinterpretation of the decisions that had been made by the DRC. He agreed that he would not want to have the stone application based on the other changes to the building and they were put in a bit of a quandary, particularly with the landscaping as one of the major elements of what was approved had been removed from the project. The landscape would not need to be different based on the elements that were approved that had not been installed. He disagreed with Staff's statement that Committee Member McCormack's comments were recommendations. It was out there and

already done and now they were being forced to review a project piece by piece instead of a very holistic design that had initially come before them.

Chair Fox stated she agreed that the project needed to be looked at as a whole, however, they needed to break down all the issues to get through the item. She believed they were all in concurrence that the chain link needed to be removed and if replaced, to be replaced with a tubular steel fence or no fence at all.

Mr. Patel stated his original plan was to install a tubular fence.

Chair Fox stated they were in concurrence to deal with landscape with taller landscape elements to screen the foundation portion of the ramp. The Palm trees would be installed per original plan. The walls where the windows had been proposed would be painted the darker color and the fascias to be painted the faded gray color and the paint to wrap under the fascia and vertical face of the fascia. Now they were down to the canopy over the doors and the color choice for the center piece of the building.

Committee Member Imboden stated it appeared that the canopy-type structure was originally proposed to be the black jack color along with the railing and the central tower was to be the caribou herd. He suggested that they propose the applicant use the original color palette that had been approved.

Committee Member McCormack stated the railing was white.

Mr. Patel stated the railing was silver.

Committee Member Woollett stated he felt the landscaping was important and it may need to come back for review. He asked if Hibiscus plants could be planted and used as a screen as the type of plant went with the theme of the business.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were Hibiscus plants that grew 8' tall and some that grew 3' tall. He could design it but that was not what he was charged with doing. The suggestion would be for a tropical theme and in using the Hibiscus flower that was in their logo, it would fit in.

Chair Fox asked if the original plant legend would work?

Mr. Patel stated the railing was coated with a special treatment and if painted it would be very expensive or not appear nice if painted. It was coated in the factory, but if painted it would not appear very nice.

Chair Fox stated if it was yellow she would object to it, and there were some cost issues involved. She could live with the color that was there and she would rather ask for the chain link to be removed or replaced. The color of the rail could remain. She asked about the awning and what the Committee felt on that element.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he suggested corrugated metal.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not certain that there were supports for that.

Chair Fox stated when the project had initially come before them it was a substantial amount of investment in that industrial neighborhood. It was proposed with a higher standard of appearance than other buildings in the area; she would not press the applicant to do anything more to the awning and she was fine with it. She would want the original color palette to be used.

Committee Member McCormack stated the original plant palette could be used. He reviewed the plant palette. The Hibiscus would be against the ramp and suggested a plant that would grow to 4'; there would be flax at the base and to have the planting formal and more lined up. The space could accommodate two rows of Hibiscus.

Chair Fox asked if he would want the landscape to come back?

Committee Member McCormack stated there was 20' of planting area, enough to make a statement. He would want to see what was proposed.

Mr. Patel asked what was the time frame for getting it designed; he wanted to install the landscape as soon as possible?

Mr. Ortlieb stated the City was holding a substantial cash deposit and there was an incentive to get the project completed. He would work to get things through.

Chair Fox stated as soon as the landscape was designed, the review could be scheduled and the DRC met every two weeks.

Committee Member Imboden made a motion to approve modifications to DRC No. 4612-12, Kona Cleaners, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report, with the additional conditions:

- The chain link fence to be removed and if replaced, to be replaced with a steel tube fence.
- Landscape to be provided in the front set back area and the landscape plan to be brought back to the DRC for review. The landscape plan shall include a planting theme that screens the base of the ramp.
- The Palm trees to be installed as originally proposed.
- The walls where windows had been previously approved to be installed on, shall be painted the black jack color.
- The purple painted fascia areas to be painted faded gray.
- The canopy structure to return to the originally proposed color of black jack.

- The rail color of the ramp to remain in the current metallic silver.
- The central tower to be painted in the color caribou herd.

And with the following suggestion:

- On the right inset area a green screen may be installed and be included with the landscape plan.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

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

- A proposal to redevelop an existing surface parking lot with a new 334-unit apartment complex and two abutting 7-level parking structures. The applicant is requesting approval of the final landscape and lighting plans for Phase 1 of the project, which consists of construction of the two parking structures.
- 3537 The City Way
- Staff Contact: Anna Pehoushek, 714-744-7228, apehoushek@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Chair Fox stated that some of the materials had arrived to the Committee Members very late and she asked if any of the Committee Members required a continuance of the proposed project in order to allow adequate time for review of the additional materials submitted?

The Committee Members agreed to hear the item.

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

Applicant, Ken Ryan, address on file, stated they took to heart Condition No. 35 to come back with a final landscape plan for Phase 1 and Condition No. 37 to come back with a final lighting plan for Phase 1. He presented drawing boards of the various views of the project and spoke to these drawings with information on landscape and lighting. In addition to the final lighting plan that was provided there was information regarding the even distribution of lighting and that it was not too subtle, but also not too bright. There were exhibits that illustrated those aspects. He presented renderings that reflected the parking structure lighting along with an infrared perspective that reflected the lighting and how it was evenly distributed in the parking structure. Something that the DRC asked his design team to look at was the top level of the parking structure, and as a pedestrian would that be visible? An analysis of that situation was covered. The landscape concept had been modified with the corner being enhanced; he presented the previous proposal as well as the current modified proposal. The corner would be enhanced with landscape and due to the parking structure and the air flow requirements the landscape area next to The City Drive had been modified; the flax would begin at the residential and the second level of trees had been eliminated. He believed the response to landscape had been addressed. He reviewed the new landscape concept and noted what trees and landscape was being eliminated. AMLI had asked them to add a bit more richness and depth to the color scheme of the architectural feature of the parking structures and he presented the change. The branding remained the same and stated the colors had been changed. The chain link fence would be removed and replaced with wire or other material.

Chair Fox asked where was the location of the chain link?

Mr. Ryan pointed the area out on the plans and stated it was on the top of the retaining wall and with the modified landscape plan there would be cutouts in the sidewalk for vines to grow.

Applicant, Jason Armison, address on file, stated the wall was actually a City wall and they were not certain what they were able to do at the top of that wall.

Mr. Ryan stated his team was present to answer any questions.

Committee Member Imboden asked to see the landscape plans side by side and also a color rendering that depicted the original proposal.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Fox stated the Committee should first discuss lighting, then colors, and then landscaping, broken down with any issues. They would begin with lighting.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not received anything on interior lighting, except for the first level. He asked what would be different per level?

Applicant, Peter Maradudin, address on file, stated each level would be a mirror image of the first floor.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the Staff Report appeared to indicate that the lighting was indirect, but as he read the information it was only some of the lighting along the perimeter that was indirect.

Mr. Maradudin stated it was conventional direct illumination. A study had been done that took into consideration sight lines.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had done a sketch with scaling and it appeared that the indirect lighting was dropped about 18" from the ceiling, and were 12' from the perimeter and that the first row of non-indirect ceiling mounted fixtures were at 41'.

Mr. Maradudin stated yes, that was correct, they were deeply recessed.

Committee Member Woollett stated the indirect lighting was shining to the deck above and he asked if the ceilings would be painted a light color?

Mr. Maradudin stated no, the ceiling was light in material color.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the lighting levels depicted in the study included information of the lighting being reflected onto the gray surface?

Mr. Maradudin stated that was correct.

Committee Member Imboden asked if that was channel glass on the cut away corner of the building?

Applicant, Bryan Sevy, address on file, stated it was actually store front glass and had a glazing treatment with frosted glass.

Chair Fox stated it was quite a hot spot in the infrared diagram.

Committee Member Imboden stated in reviewing the top rendering there were no light fixtures visible and there was an even dull light there; but when reviewing the version in front of him he could see three to four rows of light fixtures. He asked if there would be an illuminated ceiling surface with a lot of hot spots?

Mr. Sevy stated looking through the glass what would be visible was what the glass allowed someone to see; unfortunately, he could not speak fully to what anyone would be able to view. The glass was frosted.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they had a sample of that glass?

Mr. Maradudin stated no.

Chair Fox stated in the analysis, it appeared that the frosted glass was not taken into consideration as it would appear differently and have more of a glow to it.

Mr. Maradudin stated the area would be hotter than anywhere else.

Mr. Sevy stated in the infrared depiction the red indicated brighter areas of light relative to the other areas of light. There were certain areas on the fins, such as the white lettering that reflected more light and those areas appeared more red and it had not meant that there was glare or glowing just a brighter area of light.

Chair Fox stated what it had depicted was that the other areas of the structure had an even distribution of light, but that the corner had a much brighter appearance.

Mr. Sevy stated yes, that was correct.

Committee Member McCormack stated the plans before him, and understanding they were reviewing Phase 1, in each exhibit there was an element of the Palm trees that wrapped around and then the other trees were added to more of the residential area. He wanted to caution them that with the removal of the Palm trees there would be a much different view from the corner. In the “preferred perspective” the Palm trees had supported the corner parking structure and he was not certain if the removal of those trees would be a good idea, and his point being that with the removal of those trees the lighting would be affected. Before, the parking structure had a nice statement being book-ended and defused with a consistent band of green, and that was being lost. It was a landscape issue, but the landscape would defuse the lighting and there would be a difference without the landscape in those areas. He would speak to why the north elevation just fell off of making a statement. The trees that were currently proposed were small to medium trees and he would caution what that would look like in 10 years. He asked if the Palm trees would have up-lighting, and on Phase 2 would there be Palm tree up-lighting?

Mr. Ryan stated if the Palm trees made more sense instead of the Golden Medallion trees that were proposed they could consider that change.

Chair Fox stated on the color the letters appeared white, but on the color boards it was noted as black and the light reflection would be different through that color.

Mr. Sevy stated the proposal for one side of the parking structure lettering was black.

Committee Member Woollett stated to him the light shown on the colored rendering of louvers indicated color on front of the louvers and color coming from inside the building.

Mr. Sevy stated there was lighting from two sources on the louvers; from the inside parking structure and from exterior lighting. The colors varied; there were four related colors proposed for the louvers. There was a variety.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the colors were a change from the original proposal.

Committee Member Woollett asked if they had decided what color each louver would be and then put it into the software and then added the lighting information to get a depiction?

Mr. Ryan stated yes, and it was not completely predictable. AMLI had wanted a design with a bit more depth and interest.

Committee Member Woollett stated it would also be based on where someone was standing and what would be visible, and it really was a variable.

Mr. Sevy stated there was a change when driving by and the position of the colors was intentionally random.

Chair Fox stated the lights from detail 1, from LT0.1 were closer to the fins.

Mr. Maradudin stated from the face of the garage it was 9'.

Chair Fox stated there would be a different effect based on the location of the lighting and she was pleased with the change as the lights had initially been placed much lower.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the light source was on a datum line? In other words would the line of light be level and was that the intent and was there a notation for the contractor to ensure that design intent was carried out?

Mr. Ryan stated there would be a notation added.

Chair Fox asked what was the green area, noted as a low hedge at the base of the orange side?

Mr. Ryan stated that was the new fence, which would replace the chain link fence, with vine cutouts and the green depicted the vine on the wall.

Chair Fox asked if the fence was sitting on top of the wall?

Mr. Sevy stated yes.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a detail in the landscape plan that discussed that situation.

Chair Fox asked if there were any more lighting questions?

Committee Member McCormack asked if the Palm trees in Phase 2 would have up-lighting?

Applicant, Michael Knight, address on file, stated they had the option to replace the Golden Medallions with the Palm trees.

Mr. Ryan stated he was asking about Phase 2 for the residential.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would not want Phase 2 to have up-lighting and Phase 1 not to have up-lighting. It needed to be consistent. The most efficient way to up-light would be with a ground-mounted light at the tree well or to install a tree ring with lights that up-lit the foliage and would give light to the foliage and the trunk without the glare of ground lighting. The trees at the Outlets of Orange had tree lights at approximately 12' and it also stopped the rats from climbing the trees.

Committee Member Woollett asked where would the power supply come from for the tree rings?

Committee Member McCormack stated there would need to be conduit that ran up the trunk and a decision would need to be made on which side the lights would be directed.

Chair Fox asked if there had been a determination of whether the Palm trees would be lit?

Mr. Armison stated it was something they could consider for the second phase and had not been considered for the parking structure area as there was already so much lighting and additional lighting would detract from the other features.

Chair Fox stated if the parking structure Palm trees were not up lit, the residential should not have lighting on the trees.

Committee Member McCormack stated the Palm tree lighting was just ambient aesthetic lighting.

Chair Fox stated something they had not discussed was the roof top lighting and that was the materials that were just received and she asked if there were any concerns with that proposal? She believed the light placement was nice and there were only five fixtures on the roof deck that had been pulled back.

The Committee Members had no issues on the roof lighting.

Chair Fox asked where they were landing on the lighting issues; she had not heard any strong suggestions for changes with the exception on the Palm tree lighting.

Committee Member McCormack stated the proposal was a final determination.

Committee Member Woollett stated they had some conflicting suggestions. One, that the Palm trees should have up-lighting and there should be consistent treatment of the trees; however, the Palm trees in front of the parking structure should not have additional lights. He felt that the Palm trees in front of the parking structure would be silhouetted and that would be sufficient--to not add additional light.

Chair Fox stated she would be concerned with occupants on the higher floors with glare from the Palm tree lighting.

Committee Members Wheeler and Imboden stated they could accept either condition as long as there was consistency.

Committee Member Imboden stated there was something that had come from lighting, which was in the building design that had already been approved. He asked for more detail on the 2 x 2 corner cut.

Mr. Sevy stated it was a 2' wide mullion on the store front, but the height was the full height. The design intent that had been originally depicted was to have vertical glass and match the verticality of that area.

Ms. Pehoushek stated before they moved off of lighting was there anything else that the DRC wanted to provide direction on, such as the frosting level of glass at the corner or/and change to the ceiling fixtures?

Committee Member Imboden stated if the corner was truly frosted glazing, his concern was that in seeing directly into the building he would not want the fixtures to be visible and he felt that the design team had adequately addressed that.

Chair Fox stated the only thing that came from their discussion was that the exterior lighting be held at a constant level. They would now move onto color. She reviewed the color boards and asked where each of the colors would be applicable.

Mr. Sevy stated the colors for the residential units had not changed for Phase 2. He reviewed the colors with the Committee Members.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the change of the parking structure colors made him a little nervous; he preferred the original simpler color palette that was more of a constant.

Chair Fox stated she liked the idea of variant colors; however, she had a concern over the colors that were chosen as they appeared a bit "Vegas" for the City of Orange. She supported orange as a color, but she had not liked the addition of the pink color. She would support a varied palette of orange colors, but not the pink, and she was not in support of the purple that was combined with the blues and greens. She also had an issue with the black lettering on the darker green purple range; she much preferred the white letters. She asked why they chose the black lettering?

Mr. Sevy stated they just wanted a change from one side to the other.

Committee Member Imboden stated when he first reviewed the color changes he had asked himself what had happened; and it was so unlike anything he would ever do and he would want to hear an argument from the design team as to the reason for the change.

Mr. Sevy stated as a design team the original colors were very flat and they were looking for a way to provide more depth and variety. They were small slivers of color. They had studied many alternate colors and they had initially chosen colors that were more closely related, however, they just blended together to be one color again. Otherwise, with just the yellow and orange it appeared as a large Burger King sign. The overall effect was that in glancing at the structure the overall color on the one side would be orange. The finish was a Kanar baked on finish on the fins with a UV coating.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was not concerned with the longevity of the colors but he was concerned that five or 10 years from now those colors would not be relevant anymore and there would be a need for a change.

Mr. Sevy stated he hoped the colors would last for the life of the project.

Chair Fox stated the orange was so valid and would always work, but she was having a hard time with the other colors and those were colors of the 1980's that were horrific and that color range had her concerned. She would not hold up the project on it, but with the orange side she still had an issue with the pink and the "Vegas" look.

Committee Member McCormack stated the Orange stated orange, but the word orange was on the blue side.

Mr. Sevy stated one definition of a good design was that it made people think, there were subtle shifts in the colors.

Committee Member Imboden stated the design was very subjective and initially he had concerns, but in the end he was intrigued with the design and with the quantity and sheer size of the structure. The changes created undulation and softness, interest, and integration with lighting.

Mr. Sevy stated they wanted people to want to come to see what was going on there, to live and shop there.

Chair Fox stated if everyone was okay with it, she was just one person.

Mr. Ryan stated they had the same types of conversations in their office.

Chair Fox asked what about the black lettering?

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not too excited about the black lettering. The issue was that when the text was the same it united the two very different elements and the white lettering was much more successful.

Chair Fox stated she was concerned with the lack of contrast of the black lettering against the darker colors of the structure.

Committee Member Woollett stated with the different shades the volume of the building was diminished.

Chair Fox stated she felt the same way; however, the color choices concerned her and if intensity was the reason for those color choices possibly the color choices could come down a notch, it was the purple and the teal, it was just a lot. She asked for any other color issues and was she the only one having an issue with the color choices?

Committee Member Woollett stated the color board had colors; however, there was not a notation of how much of each color would be used.

Mr. Sevy stated the blue color was printing darker on the color boards.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was a design discussion of how much of each color would be used, or would the colors be evenly distributed?

Mr. Sevy stated they had taken a random amount of each color and mixed the fins until they arrived at a placement of the colors that appeared right. There was not an even amount of each color.

Committee Member Woollett stated they were dealing with a team that was dealing with the same concerns that they had and the Committee needed to be careful that they not get too fussy with the manner in which it was being presented and to trust it had been thought through.

Mr. Sevy stated the amount of the magenta fins was less than any other color.

Committee Member Imboden stated he encouraged the applicant's design team to not rethink the paint scheme, to leave it alone, referring to the color percentages.

Committee Member McCormack stated when he first reviewed the new color proposal he thought it was cool.

Chair Fox stated except for the black instead of the white on the lettering.

Committee Member Imboden stated it would depend on what the applicant wanted for those areas, and certainly the white was a more successful color. It could be a recommendation.

Mr. Ryan stated a recommendation would be a "think about it when implementing the project".

Chair Fox stated that was correct, and now they would move onto landscape.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was always an issue on a parking structure with roots vs. footings. It was a typical conflict and there needed to be dialogue between the structural engineer and the landscape architect. He asked, referring to page 5 of the Staff Report,

if the landscape area between the parking structure and sidewalk had been eliminated and he wanted to know the reason?

Mr. Knight stated it was due to the footings of the retaining wall, it was a City wall.

Committee Member McCormack asked how far had the footings reached from the vertical face of the wall?

Mr. Knight stated 5', and the depth varied. The soil area was from 0 to 12''.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had run into the situation before and the structural engineer had drilled into the footings to allow for soil.

Mr. Knight stated the City would not allow them to touch that area.

Committee Member McCormack stated if there was up to 12'' of soil there needed to be a way to drain that area for the plant material.

Chair Fox stated there was not plant material proposed for that area.

Committee Member McCormack stated his second question on detail L1.11, note L1.01 construction note No. 5, was that he did not understand how those related and why was the green screen being shortened. He had a concern about the 18'' x 24'' pocket vine planter in the sidewalk, which he assumed was up against the wall.

Mr. Knight stated the detail was for the modifications to the chain link fence. The chain link would be removed with another railing type fence and due to the footing issue they would cut out pockets in the sidewalk for vines to grow onto the wall.

Committee Member McCormack stated the fences total height, just by scale, and it would be the new fence that replaced the chain link at about 6'.

Mr. Knight stated it would be 4', the intent was for a 40'' railing. The new wall would be installed on top of the wall to replace the chain link.

Applicant, Vincent Do, address on file, stated to break up the linear footage it would be broken into two or three vertical sections, with the green screen growing on the wall. The details of that were in the plans.

Committee Member McCormack stated he wanted to ensure that all the plants lined up. The plan had a beautiful panel of green with back lighting and he wanted it to look like that but he was not able to line up the measurements that were noted on the plans.

Chair Fox stated the lighting detail showed four lights installed on the exterior of that wall.

Committee Member McCormack asked how far would the green screen go?

Mr. Knight stated it would run the entire wall.

Chair Fox stated her issue was that the planting just felt really totally different on the two separate elevations.

Committee Member McCormack stated one had Bamboo and the other had a Wood vine. He asked if the Wood vine was available in 15 gallon?

Mr. Knight stated they would have an alternative of an evergreen variety, the Trumpet vine.

Committee Member McCormack asked if any consideration had been given to heavy wire mesh, rectangular for the fence on the wall, it would hold a vine better. On sheet L1.11, for the structural soil detail, there was information about the tree planter and providing plants in a structural soil. The detail had not noted a new curb and he was concerned with the connection of the gravel to the actual planting material and it would deteriorate the street.

Mr. Knight stated that would not occur as it was an existing situation in that area.

Chair Fox stated on the corner treatment with the landscape treatment, she felt that was a nice enhancement and she asked how tall would the New Zealand flax grow?

Mr. Knight stated 30”.

Chair Fox stated the renderings showed the two layers of trees.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were two different types of Flaxes, there was purple.

Mr. Knight stated there was only one type of Flax and there was Fescue.

Committee Member Imboden stated the plans included purple and green.

Committee Member McCormack stated it made more sense to have just one type. He had a concern; the Mexican Fan palm was called out as 20’ and if those were field grown and typically they would trench 4 x 4 x 4 and the root ball may be too large for the opening they had planned for the trees. The root ball might need to be shaved and he wanted the applicant to think about that. When the trees were pushed over, the root ball could be 3’ to 4’. He agreed that the Palm trees should be planted on the hotel access road and he liked the Alfonse karr that would get 15’ to 35’ tall. He wanted to ensure that there was enough soil there. There was a note for Platanus mexicana and he asked why that plant was there?

Mr. Knight stated that was a plant that would receive linear root barriers.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was a great job, just some of the details needed to be cleaned up and at this point there would be no Palm tree up-lighting.

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

- The Palm trees shall be planted on the north, to replace the Golden Medallions, to match the Palm trees on the east side.
- The lighting fixtures for the exterior parking structure to be at a fixed height at both the east and north façade, as a datum.

And with the following suggestions:

- The black lettering for the word “Orange” to be changed to white lettering.
- For the vine pockets to provide a different evergreen vine for planting in those areas with no use of a red flowering vine.

Ms. Pehoushek asked if the Committee Members wanted to have the lighting plan for the residential units come back to the DRC?

Committee Member Imboden stated for a project of such magnitude he would want the lighting to return.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(4) DRC No. 4672-13 – ROXTROM RESIDENCE

- A proposal to convert a front loaded one-car garage into a porte-cochere (drive-thru) and construct a 227 sq. ft. addition to the existing residence, construct a 1,293 sq. ft. attached one-story second unit, and 437 sq. ft. of new enclosed parking for a non-contributing residence.
 - 215 N. Clark Street, Old Towne Historic District
 - Staff Contact: Leslie Roseberry, 714-744-7220, roseberry@cityoforange.org
 - DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission
-

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Farshad Azarnoush, address on file, stated he had nothing further to add.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was having trouble with the porte-cochere and how had it differed from a drive-thru garage?

Mr. Azarnoush stated they were one in the same.

Committee Member Imboden stated on the second unit with a landing on the door the main entry was in the parking area.

Mr. Azarnoush stated that was correct.

Committee Member Imboden stated the proposal was to have a 6' privacy fence along the front of the property line.

Mr. Azarnoush stated that was required by the ordinance.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the fence was not a requirement.

Applicant, Tony Roxtrom, address on file, stated they would not propose the fence.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if there was a requirement for private open space?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated there was a requirement to have a space identified, but it would not need a fence.

Chair Fox asked if private open space could be in the front of a structure?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could have a low fence. On the porte-cochere he thought it could not be done, due to the access requirement.

Mr. Azarnoush stated the Building Department stated it was okay.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the Fire Department had reviewed the proposal?

Mr. Azarnoush stated no.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the project went through a Staff review?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she believed it had not needed a review through the Staff Review Committee.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the notation was for a 7' access, but there was an 8' garage door and access to anyone with an oversized vehicle might not be available.

Chair Fox, referencing the open area at the back, and there was a private open area, asked what was going on with all the open areas?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated there was a square footage requirement for common open space and then a provision for private open space. The front yard setback area could not be counted.

Committee Member Imboden stated the definition of common open area was that the area would be open for use by the residents. There were two sliding glass doors opening to a common area that would be used by all.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the landscape legend there was a call out for an Italian Cypress and he could not find it.

Chair Fox pointed it out on the plans.

Committee Member Imboden stated there was an adjacent structure and asked what it was?

Mr. Azarnoush stated he thought it was a garage, but it had no openings.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a note to keep the existing fence on the south side and it appeared to be in poor shape.

Mr. Roxtrom stated he believed it needed to go.

Mr. Azarnoush stated he could not commit to that as the neighbor might want to keep it.

Committee Member McCormack asked why were the trees being removed?

Mr. Azarnoush pointed to the plans and stated the trees would impede into the 25' back up and the other trees were in really poor shape.

Chair Fox stated there had not appeared to be any new landscaping being proposed and the area was just getting paved.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a lot of paving.

Chair Fox stated her response to the project was that it was almost completely paved and extremely dense. Even with the porte-cochere remaining it added to the density of the whole project. There was a 25' back up needed, but in attempting to max out the lot, clearly, she had some problems with that as it created a situation where the common open space would be highly unlikely to be used. There was bleakness at the back courtyard area and residents would not use the parking entries that would be blocked by cars and the entry doors being placed at the bedrooms implied that those could be separately leased with six total units and not two.

Committee Member Imboden stated he concurred with what had been stated. There was a lack of sensitivity to the way people would use the site, in terms of open space, private space, and sort of the insensitivity to the neighbors and the street in building the 6' fence. The porte-cochere presented a privacy issue but also a potential security issue to not be able to see cars coming and going until it was too late. The entry to unit B was at a parking area and not a good approach for that unit. It was a non-starter for him. There was so much with the project that just met the minimum requirements in order to maximize the development of the property. The property owner was entitled to do that, but not at the expense of public safety.

Committee Member McCormack asked if it was a gated porte-cochere?

Mr. Azarnoush stated no, it was not.

Committee Member McCormack stated if someone drove through the porte-cochere and then realized there was no parking it would create a circulation problem.

Committee Member Imboden stated there was so much paving and it was so tight. If the garage spaces were used for storage and if a guest pulled in, the entire circulation completely failed with just one extra car being pulled into the space.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was not so concerned with the turn-out as the applicant had met the 25' requirement. He wondered if the paved areas might be mitigated with some type of treatment such as pavers or textured treatment. The proposal had kept within the code allowances and it was coming in at .41 FAR which was established as the goal and architecturally it worked very well and fit in with the density on the street.

Committee Member Woollett stated he agreed with those comments, the code agreed with the proposal, and the ordinances allowed for the project as presented. He was unhappy with not having enough green space, but possibly the hardscape areas could be changed to some type of pavers. The ordinance currently allowed for the proposed project to be built and the DRC could not arbitrarily project what could happen in the future, because they could do that on any project.

Committee Member Imboden stated certainly there were ordinances that required minimum patterns of development and there were ordinances that required an approval by the DRC. If it was as simple as checking off boxes Staff would have approved the project long ago and it would have been permitted. The merit that was included in projects was that the DRC would review them and at the end of the day they would not need to agree on the issue, but he had not wanted his comments to be viewed as arbitrary.

Chair Fox stated she believed the area context had the range of the floor area ratio of the block that was .12 to .25 and the project before them was at .41. A FAR of .42 seemed to be a threshold. She felt that if the building went to a 2-story unit some of the massing could be moved up above.

Committee Member Wheeler stated with a 2-story they would be adding a 2-story home to a predominantly 1-story neighborhood.

Committee Member McCormack stated from his perspective, the proposal before them was certainly allowed, but coming from his point of view there was not an effort being made to mitigate the footprint of the building and he had seen many ways to take care of some of the situations, but the proposal had not presented any mitigating solutions. The paving would be hot and it would be such a stark site.

Chair Fox stated many projects that came before them had features and things that were allowed, but they came before the DRC for a review of their design; and if they had design concerns that the Committee should state their views and provide input for required changes as that was what the DRC was entrusted to do.

Committee Member McCormack stated the landscape plan was mostly a removal plan, and it was okay if the plants were dead or dying. He wanted to go on record that in his opinion there was not an attempt made to make the project better.

Mr. Azarnoush stated they could remove the fence and replace it with a low fence. The porte-cochere could be removed, or if the Police or Fire Departments wanted it removed that would be done. Some of the paved areas could have “grass-crete” to minimize the hard surface and the heat factors.

Mr. Azarnoush stated yes, he was at 31%, but the square footage of the house was small. It was a 1,300 square foot home and they had discussed with the Planning Department the plan over several different back and forth conversations and he had hoped that Mr. Ryan had been present to attest to that.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated if a second floor was something the applicant was interested in doing, they were free to apply for that.

Chair Fox stated if the applicant was wanting that much square footage there were other options. She was inclined to think that the lot was hard-pressed to hold the square footage.

Committee Member Wheeler reviewed the parking situation with the applicant and suggested more landscape for an area he pointed to on the plans.

Chair Fox stated in the usability of the spaces, from a design standpoint, the entrances were very sub-par. If the cars were pulled back a better sense of entry could be achieved and not have to be blocked by cars. It was not just the density or what the code allowed, it was the sensitivity of the design.

Mr. Azarnoush stated he had not objected to anything anyone was stating. He had not understood the DRC entering in a conversation about the entry to a back unit; he was not objecting, he was just curious as to why the DRC, a Committee that looked at the design for compatibility of the neighborhood of the area, was concerned over a back entrance that was not visible from any point on the property?

Chair Fox stated the purview of the DRC was not just to view projects from the street.

Committee Member Woollett stated he disagreed with Chair Fox's comment. The job of the DRC was to interpret the code and sometimes it was difficult to interpret. They needed to be very careful to not make arbitrary decisions because they believed their personal ideas were better than someone else. If they did that they could get carried away and decide what the City should look like and that was not their job. They were charged with interpreting the ordinances before them and consider the neighborhood. They needed to be very careful in going beyond that. The DRC was not responsible for the internal aspects of the building and they were very cautious, unless they were dealing with a historic building, when they got into the design of areas that were beyond the view of the street.

Chair Fox stated she believed that was contrary to what the DRC had been tasked to do. Staff reviewed projects for code compliance and the reason the DRC existed was to assess the design integrity of the projects and it was not limited to just one façade of a building. Even in single family residences they addressed the backyard views.

Committee Member Imboden stated the municipal codes also addressed other elevations and in enforcing them required the DRC to look at that. He was ready to make a motion to continue.

Chair Fox stated the Committee had varied opinions about the approvability of the project.

Mr. Azarnoush stated as far as landscape was concerned they could add landscape and asked if it was possible to approve the building and bring the landscape back to the DRC. The DRC had to look at the area, the proposal would make the site better than others in the area, and there was one or two other homes that currently appeared exactly like the proposal before them. In speaking about the FAR, they were not proposing a 10,000 square foot home.

Mr. Roxtrom stated he was not an architect and all the comments provided were very good and especially the comments about landscape. The perception was not to maximize the site and the intent was not what should be done, but being led by the City's code it was more of what could be done and they were guided by Mr. Ryan in what could and could not be done. To gain clearance they believed what they had proposed was acceptable. He liked the front of the house and would not want the fence in the front. He really had not liked the porte-cochere, but he had believed there had been some back and forth between Mr. Ryan and the architect that had required that element of the property to remain. His comment to the DRC was that the project

should have more thought to it to address some of the concerns and suggestions that were brought up and he wanted to meet all the codes but to have a nice property. The house was zoned R-3 and the house next door was zoned R-2 and was the same as the proposed project. He had not intended to do anything that was not correct for the habitants of the proposed units.

Committee Member Woollett stated if the property owner was willing to take another look at it that was fine as the project could be better.

Mr. Azarnoush stated the Committee was speaking of a continuation and not having it approved. He would want to have the proposal approved with conditions.

Chair Fox stated there needed to be three people to approve the project and judging from the comments made there was a mixed group of opinions on the Committee and he may not get an approval if the item went to a vote.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the project was a recommendation to the Planning Commission and they would not want to see a set of plans with a whole set of conditions that required a rework of the project. It was one thing to have a simple deletion or alternate change conditioned, but to move the buildings around that was something more.

Chair Fox stated she might have feelings that other Committee Members had not shared and her conditions might be things that the other Committee Members might not want. She would not want the doors to the side yards to be put in and the secondary doors that went to bedrooms said to her “rental,” and she felt that there needed to be a change.

Mr. Azarnoush pointed to the plans and stated that was an existing unit.

Committee Member Imboden stated in removing the doors or windows there might need to be changes for egress.

Chair Fox stated they needed to hear a motion and see if the others agreed with the motion.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would want the applicant to understand that he could ask for a vote of yes or no, and if he wanted to move forward with the project, if the plan was denied that was another process.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the DRC could vote to continue to have the applicant make modifications based on the discussion and to come back to the DRC for another review. The DRC could vote for a recommendation with conditions or there could be a vote of denial to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Azarnoush stated that Chair Fox was telling him that he would get a denial, but he had not known how Committee Member McCormack would vote.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would move the item as a continuance.

Committee Member Imboden made a motion to continue DRC No.4672-13, Roxtrom Residence.

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

Chair Fox asked if there was an alternate motion? There was not.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he voted for a motion of continuance as he felt the applicant was willing to make some changes that would improve the proposed project.

MOTION CARRIED.

(5) DRC No. 4673-13 – LAZY DOG RESTAURANT & BAR

- A proposal to add 1,045 sq. ft. to the existing restaurant at the Stadium Promenade.
- 1623 W. Katella Avenue, Suite 212
- 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, Moni Dosanjh, address on file, thanked Ms. Nguyen for all her help on the project and they had read through the Conditions of Approval and had accepted all of them, except the stain issue that Ms. Nguyen had mentioned. They were on the fence as to whether they should paint the stained area in a red color to match the store front, but after speaking to their design team they would not be painting the wood and keeping it in its existing treatment. On the item regarding the stone treatment, the good thing about Lazy Dog was that all the stone was custom, but the bad thing was that all the stone was custom and the stone treatment that they used was no longer available from their supplier. They had not wanted to introduce another type of stone and they were proposing to paint the wainscot and heavily landscape that area to cover it up. He shared some photos with the Committee.

Ms. Nguyen stated the area was sloped.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he could not understand the drawings. He pointed to the drawings and stated there was a new wall, but it was shown as the old wainscoted wall. The applicant reviewed the plans with Committee Member Wheeler and explained the drawings. The new wall would flush into that corner and it was called out as the old wall. There were windows shown, but not on the plans, and the same situation appeared on the elevations for the other window. There were diagonal brackets, but the elevations had not shown that detail, where they were or what happened to them.

Ms. Nguyen stated there were brackets, but they were not shown on the west elevation or the east elevation.

Committee Member Wheeler stated those were some picky details, but someone needed to look at the drawings and clean them up. There was a lot of stone veneer that would be removed and he asked if it could be reused.

Mr. Dosanjh stated it would be damaged when it was being removed and they would not have enough of it.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was suggesting that just some of the stone veneer be saved and reused. What bothered him about the design of the new addition was that it was so alien from the existing. There was a whole new vocabulary of materials: metal-framed windows instead of wood-framed windows, a stucco base instead of a stone base, and the more that could be done to tie in the new addition to the existing and to use more similar materials to keep some consistency.

Mr. Dosanjh stated Lazy Dog had 11 stores currently and when they first opened it was a very rustic theme and they were now wanting to tie in some contemporary elements of steel and aluminum store fronts and that was where the new stores were headed. The company was going back to some of their original locations and attempting to incorporate more contemporary looks and materials.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had been present during the last discussion and one of the things that the DRC must consider was compatibility, it was one of the things they were charged to look at. With a small addition being added to a large structure that was not compatible it was a huge problem. If the philosophy of the restaurant chain was changing, he would hate to see a pimple attached to an existing building.

Mr. Dosanjh stated they carried the red from the aluminum storefront that matched throughout the restaurant and using the wood for the kicker and the cedar for the tongue and groove fascia and they were still incorporating the wood elements. They would use aluminum mullions instead of wood.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the direction should be to make it more compatible or to add some of the new vocabulary to other parts of the building, but to add just one little addition that was so very different looked out of place.

Mr. Dosanjh stated they wanted to freshen up the old building and the reason for the addition was to satisfy their customers and customer demands as they were turning away patrons nightly or having them wait over an hour to be seated.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was trying to understand, and maybe it was a difference in plane, he understood his interest in salvaging the material but there might not be enough to salvage for a common treatment along the entire base. Every vertical line that he reviewed on the plans was a change in plane; there were no areas that had a reveal.

Mr. Dosanjh stated they had discussed reusing the stone, but there was not enough.

Chair Fox stated the stone could be placed on just the pop-out areas.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there could be a mini pilaster at the bottom.

Mr. Dosanjh stated they were incorporating a stone sill throughout and he showed the Committee a photo of the Brea location. There would be heavy landscape and the area of stucco would not be very visible.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared that in some areas there would be mitered glass or glass corners and it struck him that it would be a very nice feature as it suggested the tower element. The plans showed a mullion. From his standpoint the design needed some more thought and to have the design be more compatible to the existing structure.

Chair Fox asked for further comments.

Committee Member Woollett stated the guidance that the DRC had from the ordinance was that they had to look at compatibility. What the applicant was stating that because of the new plan for their restaurants that was not what they wanted to do, but what was being dictated by the ordinance was that the applicant had to show more compatibility with the addition, whether it was in their plan or not. The proposal would need to go back to the drawing board and for the design to be more compatible.

Chair Fox stated it was not just the stone wainscot, but also the architecture, geometry, and vocabulary.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the new proposed vocabulary could work, but there needed to be some of the existing material incorporated in the new addition. He disliked the metal frames, as the existing site had wood frames; everything was not only stating different but in a sense also stating cheap, and the new proposal had not seemed to hold up to the quality of the original construction and that was how it would read. The drawings also needed to be cleaned up.

Committee Member Imboden stated for the applicant's clarification the only different new material that were being added were the window mullions; otherwise, the other materials had already been present on the other building. He had not disagreed with the comments made, but he wanted the applicant to understand what they were discussing. He looked at the proposal and there were design details that were derivatives of the main building, and certainly the new addition was more open, but it was a fine line between where something matched and where it was compatible. They needed to offer some clear direction to the applicant if they were headed to a continuance of the project and to what degree the project needed to be headed in terms of compatibility.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it had not had to completely match, but to have a reference of the existing building and if there could be the use of existing stone that would help a great deal and to use wood window frames that would be a huge improvement.

Mr. Dosanjh stated other tenants in the center had aluminum store fronts.

Committee Member Wheeler stated but not on the Lazy Dog building.

Ms. Nguyen stated the center was very eclectic.

Committee Member McCormack stated he concurred with the discussion and what he got architecturally from the discussion was that all the glazing that was being added to the south side of the building was not a good idea. If he was having dinner or lunch there, the blinds would need to be closed. The area would be a green house. He was confused on the plants, and he

would want to add a tree to the new area. The landscape plan was not doing the existing landscape justice. The plan that was out at the site was very well done, maintained well, and had a good design. The arrangement of the plants was formal but loose.

The applicant stated that the same landscape architect would be handling the addition.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were many plants listed, but the problem was that all the plant choices had cultivars, such as the flax-there were 48 different flaxes.

Mr. Dosanjh stated the plan was the original submittal that had been approved and planted.

Committee Member McCormack reviewed the plant palette. The planting design needed to be refined and honed to the same degree that the existing landscape was. The planting plan needed to be very specific and it was a very formal design.

Committee Member Imboden stated in the discussion of the south elevation, that might be an opportunity to incorporate some of the trellis treatment or canopies, considering that would tie the new addition into the existing building. He was looking at a rhythm that had already been set up outside of gridlines K.

Chair Fox stated there was a design vocabulary that existed at all the existing parapets of the structure and that could be pulled in.

Committee Member McCormack stated with addition of canopies that could change the landscape plan.

Committee Member Wheeler pointed out that the post bases had a difference in how they lined up on the site plan and the elevation plan, and those details needed to be cleaned up.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to continue DRC No. 4673-13, Lazy Dog Restaurant & Bar.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(6) DRC No. 4688-13 – ST. JOHN’S LUTHERAN CHURCH

- A proposal to install a new handicapped ramp on the south side of the church to provide access to Walker Hall.
- 184 S. Shaffer Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Leslie Roseberry, 714-744-7220, roseberry@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would recuse himself from the item’s presentation as he was the architect for the project. Committee Member Imboden stated he would recuse himself from the item’s presentation due to his affiliation with the church.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Bill Cathcart, address on file, stated they had worked on the project for a long time and they were attempting to find a way for handicapped parishioners to enter the facility. The building was completed in 1927 and what they wanted to do was to get people who were using walkers and wheel chairs into the building without making modern modifications. They had studied chair lifts and had gone around the entire Walker Hall to find a better way and what was being presented was the best solution. One of the issues was that the building had no address and they had a hard time figuring things out.

Applicant, Mr. Henley, address on file, stated in researching where the property line was they were unable to find anything through the City; on paper the building had not existed. They had done every possible iteration to attempt to solve the problem to assist those individuals who were maturing at the church. The building was built in the 1920’s and it was a unique jewel in the City. They had looked at many options, and the proposal before them was the least obtrusive.

Mr. Cathcart stated the building had a theater with a stage, a basketball court, kitchen, dining room, and parlor. One of the original entries was at the north side; which put people at the ground level of the theater and meant someone entering the building there would need to hike up the aisle-way to get to the front door and make their way around to the other rooms.

Mr. Henley stated the incline of the floor was not at the proper slope.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated the ramp wall was right up against the sidewalk.

Mr. Cathcart stated yes.

Mr. Henley agreed, indicating with his hands about how far away it was.

Chair Fox stated it looked as if the ramp was being held off slightly to keep it away from the windows.

Mr. Henley stated the windows were not used. They were closed up and there would be a gap along that wall.

Chair Fox stated they were holding that off and there were the minimum widths on the ramps. There had been a ramp at the back, but now that was explained.

Mr. Henley stated at the curb line there would be some pervious paving to allow handicap parking and there was a driveway that would allow for loading and unloading with a couple of bollards there. He explained the situation on the drawings.

Mr. Cathcart stated there was an “up” at the east end and a “down” at the other side, and the one that they were attaching to was closer to the west.

Chair Fox stated there was a large part of the landing that appeared to be tying into an existing stair tread. She thought the ramp could be longer along (an area she pointed to on the plans) and get lower and shorten the length, if they pulled that to a minimum landing.

Mr. Henley stated it would not work; they wanted to keep the entry level to the ramp somewhere in the neighborhood of where the step went down. The ramp came up to a flat place, up again with another incline to a large flat landing, then up again to the building entry.

Chair Fox stated if there were 7” risers and, pointing to the plans, it came out another 7’ they could have gone down another riser with a shorter landing. They needed a tie-in and she understood why.

Mr. Cathcart stated there were ways to tighten it all up, but they had already researched the various ways to construct the ramp and the option before them was the best solution.

Chair Fox stated there was a lot of wrought iron.

Committee Member Woollett stated his concern was that the DRC’s primary job was to consider the project as an addition to a historic building, which was the primary thing.

Mr. Cathcart stated that was the reason for not using any brick. The columns out in front that were added in the courtyard with the Bougainvillea, those used new brick that they had made to match.

Committee Member Woollett wondered what the ramp would look like if it had been built in 1927.

Mr. Henley stated it would be hand laid brick on built-up footings, what would it look like?

Mr. Cathcart stated there would have been brick on the top and concrete at the bottom.

Committee Member Woollett stated the idea was to in a sense echo the exposed foundation.

Mr. Cathcart stated to not copy it exactly but use similar materials.

Committee Member Woollett stated the stair cases had a molding along the top and he wondered if the ramp should have a molding along the top, in order to relate to the historic content that might be needed.

Mr. Henley stated it would be a molding along the top of the concrete ramp. That was all concrete so they would not need a cap.

Chair Fox stated that was what Committee Member Woollett was suggesting they needed to do, put a cap on it.

Committee Member Woollett stated with the concrete or stone base around the building there was a transition in the brick. He reviewed the drawings. The ramp looked contemporary.

Chair Fox stated her only issue with the project was that the concrete panels at the bottom appeared as tilt up, industrial concrete panels.

Committee Member Woollett stated if the panels were pre-cast why couldn't they be pre-cast with an element at the top.

Mr. Henley stated what they were looking at was a brick structure that had a concrete cap on it.

Committee Member Woollett stated if there was brick, there would be a base with the brick and then a cap. He could see the concrete going all the way up with a cap or at least a reveal at the top and that would be sufficient. If they were pre-cast, cast a reveal along the top.

Chair Fox stated "or place a cap along the top."

Mr. Henley stated they could not do that. That would not work and the only place that would apply would be on the landing that went into the door. Along the other areas it would be inappropriate, if a cap was needed it would be around a specific area (he pointed to on the plans). It would be a contrivance to try to build it that way.

Chair Fox stated she understood why pre-cast concrete needed to be used against the wall, on the one side. What would stop pre-cast panels along the other areas?

Committee Member Woollett stated whether it was pre-cast or not it could still have a reveal along the top, on one side.

Chair Fox stated along the top of the wall there could be a piece of pre-cast concrete molding along the top.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the ramp side, the ramp would be lowered to get that reveal. He questioned why the ramps were being pre-cast. It could be done with block and filled in or pre-cast.

Mr. Henley stated they looked at a steel structure.

Chair Fox stated she understood the efficiency of using pre-cast with the two elements, but the one area facing the sidewalk had a very different design and was a pretty long façade.

Mr. Henley stated he felt it was not appropriate, the way they were manufactured was unique and had never been done before. Adding something like that just for a visual affect was not appropriate for him to try to get his guys to do it.

Committee Member Woollett stated the element could go right on top.

Mr. Henley stated on top of it, and where would it go? If someone was standing in the street you would not see it, all the rest of the ramps go down hill.

Committee Member Woollett stated that would be okay.

Chair Fox stated the cap went down hill on the stairs.

Committee Member Woollett stated there was one right there (pointing to an area on the plans).

Mr. Henley stated that was an existing condition.

Committee Member Woollett stated he knew that, and that was his point.

Chair Fox stated she was fine with the back wall being pre-cast against the windows and the way it was designed. On the other plane it was visible and primarily the long plane in the front was the concern.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was not a matter of personal opinion, what he was attempting to do was that the DRC was constrained, and the ramp was being added to a historic building and it must be consistent with a historic building and it was not just a matter of whether it looked nice; it was a matter of what was necessary in order to have the new construction tie in to the historic existing structure.

Mr. Henley stated he was attempting to get it built and not make it more complicated. There was not an attempt to echo a historic feature.

Committee Member McCormack stated when he first looked at it he noted that the material was different and the first thing he would have done was to play with the panels, but it would be very difficult because of the flat landing; that being stated it was a difficult situation. He was involved in building ramps; he would have done what the applicant had done and minimize the wall surface. It was a difficult situation and then there were the railings to add. Aside from

adding a cap, if it was just a reveal that would be too modern looking; it would be very difficult to do and unfortunately it was just a ramp to allow handicap people into the building. The finish that had been proposed was the only thing that could be done; it could not be made from brick.

Chair Fox stated the new construction definitely stood out as not a part of the original construction. The modern feeling of it was not compatible in the current state. The iron work was trying to echo what was on Shaffer.

Mr. Henley stated the iron work was the same iron work that existed on the side ramp.

Chair Fox stated she agreed with Committee Member Woollett, that if the panels were pre-cast and after installation a concrete cap was added, it would only be a couple of inches, and it only needed to be an inch.

Committee Member Woollett stated it would echo what was already there. In looking at the Historic Standards, and he had been on the Committee nearing 20 years, in adding something new to an old building it should appear new, except in the City of Orange and they had argued the point before. If there was something being attached to a historic building it better have the same style and should not stand out as new. It should be identifiable as new, but not a modern piece of work on a historic building.

Mr. Cathcart stated where it was attached to the building it needed to be clear what was old and what was new.

Chair Fox stated that had been accomplished and the only thing they were speaking to was the addition of a cap on the pre-cast wall that would help to tie it all in.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the concrete had a stucco finish to it?

Committee Member Woollett stated it was only concrete. There were caps added to masonry walls, a brick wall was not just stopped, it was capped off.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was not a way around it when pre-cast panels were used; in a very contemporary modern design there would not be a cap.

Committee Member Woollett stated if the panels were pre-cast that was fine, but to get all the pre-cast panels to line up exactly would be really tough.

Mr. Cathcart stated they had a great engineer.

Committee Member Woollett stated he stood behind an instrument for too many years and he knew how hard it was to accomplish. It was one reason a cap was placed on top of brick because it never came out precisely level and there was a mortar bed with a cap to ensure it was level.

Mr. Cathcart stated in looking at the front of the building there were steps that went up and down and there was relief there. They were using the same materials but not replicating it exactly, it was concrete without a cap. Everything else looked as if it would have been built in the 1920's.

Chair Fox stated there were joints and a pre-cast system.

Mr. Cathcart stated it was concrete. If you drove by what would be visible was concrete and it would blend with the existing, there would be black wrought iron and it would blend.

Committee Member Woollett stated there were pre-cast elements historically with brick on top of them.

Mr. Cathcart stated they were not wanting to copy it.

Chair Fox stated it was not copied because it was not brick, it was obviously not copied.

Mr. Cathcart stated the stairway and the front of the building had no brick, it was concrete.

Chair Fox stated there was not a photo; she had not known what was there.

Mr. Cathcart stated there was concrete with a relief. The new construction was concrete without a relief and he had not felt there was a problem. The panels would be butted up to each other.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had a problem when a chamfer was placed on the top. He suggested that a chamfer be placed on the vertical surface and to just let it ride all the way to the top and it would appear much better. What Committee Member Woollett was suggesting was a pre-cast top and then drilling through that to add the railing.

Chair Fox stated the form with a cap would make it more compatible. They were limited as it was a big form being added and it was not a lot to ask that a small detail be added and it was doable. If the panels were not dialed in exactly the cap would allow for some forgiveness.

Mr. Henley stated they would be exactly right.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was at Chapman University and there was a metal ramp without a cap or a rail. It was a building that looked historical. Putting a cap on the ramp wall would not make it look modern. Modernist would not put a cap on it.

Mr. Henley stated he had already had some of the panels made. There would not be a cap on them; he could not put a cap on them. He had people who were willing to do things that were really dramatic in getting the panels built in the manner and precision that was necessary and a cap could not be added. They could not put a cap on them.

Committee Member Woollett asked why nothing could be added?

Mr. Henley stated it was in conception and he could paint something on it, but he could not add to it.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the railings were all made?

Mr. Henley stated they were being made.

Committee Member Woollett stated if the wall was a little higher the railings could be a little shorter. He stated he was not going to approve it.

Chair Fox stated the applicant needed three votes in favor of the project to be approved. The applicant could take a vote for approval or denial or the project could be continued.

Committee Member Woollett stated just the idea that the applicant brought a design to them and then stated that they were sorry they could not make changes because it was already built; well, he was sorry but they could not approve whatever was brought in.

Mr. Henley stated that was a risk he was willing to take and there was a narrow window to complete the construction.

Chair Fox asked the applicants if they wanted to have the Committee take a vote that would have a condition for a concrete cap being added to the wall, or to take a vote as submitted.

Mr. Cathcart asked Ms. Aranda Roseberry if there was a date before the end of the month to take their project to the Planning Commission on appeal?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the next PC meeting was on Monday, May 20, so there would not be enough time.

Chair Fox stated there were three options; they could vote on the design as submitted.

Mr. Henley stated they would deny it.

Chair Fox stated they could approve the design with a condition for a cap.

Mr. Henley stated that would mean they would need to return with a design to show how a cap would be added.

Chair Fox stated they could condition a specific type of cap and allow Staff to look at it.

Committee Member Woollett stated the applicant was stating they could not do that and the design of the cap was important. Craig Wheeler, the architect on this project, was designing the structure and he knew how to add a cap.

Mr. Henley stated they had been working on the project for 10 years. It was something that they worked on to get the most effective solution that they could.

Committee Member Woollett stated that on a historic building that they would allow a modern entrance and he had not wanted to do that. It was not just being picky with the design. He would not want to set a precedent.

Mr. Henley asked if putting a cap on the ramp would solve the issue?

Committee Member Woollett stated yes, it was one of the most prominent historic elevations in the City.

Chair Fox stated it was a large element being added.

Mr. Henley stated the cap would not be visible. If a cap was added between the concrete and the rail, if that was what they were suggesting, it would not be visible.

The Committee reviewed the plans and pointed out where the cap should be added.

Mr. Henley stated they would just be adding one more line to the view from the street.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they would want a cantilever on it?

Committee Member Woollett stated it may be half round on the side; he needed to go back out to the site and look at it. Mr. Wheeler would know the solution and he was surprised he had not designed it in that manner.

Chair Fox stated the applicant could ask for a vote, and they would most likely get a denial. The denial could be taken to the Planning Commission; or they could condition the project for the installation of a cap.

Mr. Henley stated there was the top of the wall, there was a hole in there for the vertical rods to set, and there was the bottom line at the railing. Now they were asking for another layer to fill in the gap.

Committee Member Woollett stated no, the railing would be raised.

Mr. Henley stated it made no sense; he was not certain how he could add another line there.

Chair Fox stated it was a pre-cast cap.

Mr. Henley stated he knew what they were talking about but he was not certain how he could do it with the design before them to make it any better than what it was. He had been sitting at the meeting for four hours and maybe he was just tired, but he would think about it and if they wanted to vote for an approval with the possibility of adding a cap to it he would agree.

Chair Fox stated it would be a condition to add the cap, a requirement.

Mr. Henley stated a demand for a cap. He could not understand the reason for it and he had a lot of people look at the design.

Chair Fox asked for a motion.

Mr. Cathcart asked if it was a reveal they wanted or was it a cap?

Chair Fox stated a “cap.”

Mr. Cathcart stated if they could stretch that, they wanted to see another line and they could research how they would add something.

Committee Member McCormack stated a reveal would need to be stopped at the vertical line.

Mr. Cathcart stated they knew what was being asked of them.

Committee Member McCormack stated a reveal would look more modern.

Committee Member Woollett stated there needed to be a historic reference at the top of the wall.

Mr. Cathcart stated they would take an approval with a condition with the request for a historic reference to be added to the top of the wall.

Committee Member Woollett stated he could not leave it wide open and who would decide whether it was successful.

Mr. Cathcart stated they had discussed what they wanted and in the motion they could state what they wanted without telling them how to do it.

Committee Member Woollett asked if they wanted to continue the item?

Mr. Cathcart stated no, not a continuance.

Committee Member Woollett stated it had to be a continuance; otherwise, how would they know what it would look like.

Mr. Cathcart stated they could come look at it.

Committee Member Woollett asked Mr. Cathcart if they would take it out if it didn't work?

Chair Fox stated they needed to take a vote, as is, and that would mean a denial. The other options would be to condition the project with a specific cap, or to continue the project.

Mr. Cathcart stated they had done it when he was on the DRC and to have two of the Committee Members look at the design and to approve it on the spot.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated that was a very uncomfortable position to put the DRC and Staff in. The Committee would need to take a vote.

Mr. Cathcart stated many times they would approve a project and the irrigation plans would be brought to Staff for their approval without the need to return to the DRC. Instead of the Staff looking at it, two of the DRC Members could look at it.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated they could not do that; they needed to have a meeting.

Mr. Cathcart stated there were only three members that could vote.

Mr. Henley stated they were on a strict four week construction time line without a complete disruption of the school and other activities.

Committee Member McCormack stated they could approve the footings and have the railing and cap come back to the DRC. That would not stop the schedule.

Committee Member Woollett stated he could agree to that, knowing there would need to be a cap on it.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4688-13, St. John's Lutheran Church, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional condition:

- The top of the exposed walls of the ramp shall have a concrete cap that provides a historic reference to the historic building and the cap not to be installed until approved by the DRC.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry asked if they wanted the railing and the cap to come back?

Committee Member Woollett amended the motion for the cap and railing to come back to the DRC for approval.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on June 5, 2013.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.