CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

June 5, 2013

Committee Members Present:	Carol Fox Tim McCormack Robert Imboden Joe Woollett Craig Wheeler
Committee Members Absent:	None
Staff in Attendance:	David Khorram, Chief Building Official Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Mark Schwartz, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Fox opened the Administrative Session at 5:05 p.m. Committee Members Woollett and McCormack were not present at this time.

Chair Fox stated that Item No. 4 regarding Rio Santiago would be removed from the current meeting's agenda and placed on the agenda for the July 17th meeting at the request of the applicant.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would recuse himself from Item No. 3 as he was the architect on the project. Committee Member Imboden stated he would recuse himself from Item No. 3, due to his association with the church.

Chair Fox suggested that the Committee schedule for a future administrative session to review what the purview of the Design Review Committee is. If everyone had a copy of the ordinance that talks about the DRC, the group could help clarify all the nuance of the group. Chair Fox noted that a lot of time in the past couple of months has been spent debating this issue, and clarifying it could help the Committee use its time more efficiently.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of May 15, 2013. Changes and corrections were noted.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recess the Administrative Session of the Design Review Committee meeting until the absent Committee Members arrived.

SECOND:	Robert Imboden
AYES:	Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Craig Wheeler
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session recessed at 5:15 p.m.

Committee Member Woollett arrived at 5:17 p.m.

Administrative Session resumed at 5:20 p.m.

Committee Member McCormack arrived at 5:25 p.m.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to close 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 5:32 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 15, 2013

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting of May 15, 2013, with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4667-13 – STARBUCK'S COFFEE DRIVE-THRU

- A request to approve the Starbuck's coffee shop landscape plan and site improvements.
- 1630 E. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- Continued from DRC meeting: April 17, 2013
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, presented the Staff Report. Starbucks is requesting review of the landscaping and sign improvements which were bifurcated from the previous DRC meeting on April 17th. The Committee requested that the applicant return with revised plans to address if possible certain site improvements the Committee felt needed further consideration. These included the possible removal of the walkway located adjacent to some of the parking spaces for additional landscaping, in addition to clarifying the proposed walk along the Chapman side and improving landscape palette. The applicant has attempted to provide additional information from the plans to address these concerns when possible. Both have been indicated in the staff report. The applicant brought additional materials to help the DRC in their final recommendation to the Planning Commission. The applicants are available to walk the Committee Members through the new materials and answer any questions.

The applicant personnel present included Terry Matz, Consultant; Gregg Denson, Landscape Architect; and Jeff Rabbitt, Project Architect; with all addresses on file.

Mr. Matz addressed the Committee, stating that he believes he has been responsive to the concerns of the Committee, including providing more detailed materials to help the Committee review the plans. These included a corner perspective, a real materials board, and a revised landscape palette. He believes each of these things should be sufficient to address the Committee's concerns.

Public Comment

None.

Mr. Rabbitt addressed the Committee, stating that most of the revisions had to do with landscaping. He wanted to describe some of those landscape revisions first, and use the materials to illustrate what those revisions would look like, then come back to the non-landscape revisions later. He then turned things over to the landscape architect, Gregg Denson.

Mr. Denson started by mentioning that the concerns over the small flowering shade tree were addressed by switching that to a Pink Trumpet tree which flowers nicely. There were some concerns with balancing the drive entry into the project with trees to both sides. The accessibility issue of the walk is going to have to remain. In response to that, the trees have been

shifted to the east as much as possible to help balance the entry. Specifically addressing the corner and the larger multi-branched specimen trees, the applicant has upsized those and also provided a multi-branch, low-branching Arbutus 'Marina' species, which is reflected also in the perspective. The plant palette itself has been revised to omit the plants that were of a concern, specifically plants like lavender, which was removed. There were some concerns regarding locations of certain plant material, and the car overhang is being taken into consideration, so some of the plant material is under a low groundcover, specifically in areas where car overhang is being anticipated. Also, there were concerns over how to attenuate the existing retaining wall to the west of the project, so that has been addressed and, the elevation view provided illustrates how that will be accomplished. The elevation view is from the Togo's side of the project. The applicant stated they were looking to provide a greenscreen panel of approximately 2 feet, set an additional foot above finish grade so the Rosemary can be trained to cascade and cover the wall. This should address the Committee's concerns and keep the desired character for the area. Mr. Denson then asked if there were any other questions on landscaping.

Chair Fox asked if this (*pointing to the real materials board*) was the material that was going to go in the greenscreen.

Mr. Denson mentioned that it was not the same material, although it is similar to what will be used, which is a proprietary double mesh material which allows the vine to climb up through easily. He also mentioned that the samples provided mostly pertained to the building rather than the landscaping. The way this part of the project is represented on the civil drawings makes it look like a retaining wall-type of item, but it isn't really intended to be that. It is a low, 30-inch, above-grade screen wall. It has been detailed out on page A6, and the smaller segmented pieces prevent it from needing to be broken out to accommodate grade changes. It is designed to keep car headlights from shining onto the property, and to keep pedestrians from crossing through the landscape to get to the building so that the pedestrian access route will be used instead. On the other side, the extension of the screen wall that originally curved around has been omitted, which opens up the corner a bit and improves visibility. This also addresses concerns voiced by the Police regarding accessibility. Mr. Denson then asked if that was sufficient, or if the Committee had questions regarding the building itself as well.

Chair Fox indicated that the Committee was primarily concerned with landscaping rather than building, and opened the floor up to Committee discussion.

Committee Member McCormack affirmed the changes made, but also had some concerns. The greenscreen appears to look good. In back of that, there are three options listed for accent shrubs. He asked about the thinking behind the choice of shrub, since some can flower and be quite tall.

Mr. Denson mentioned that the goal was to put in various groupings for the backside of the slatted panels, and while the normal height wouldn't reach the top of the panel, the bloom would come up above the screen. He stated that the plants were selected because they were fairly airy in appearance when they bloom.

Committee Member McCormack stated that if the grasses were not used in masses, and are intermixed with other grasses, it can look sort of weedy. He cautioned to use the grass as a very bold statement rather than trying to break it up.

Mr. Denson mentioned that the plan was to use the Berkeley Sedge as the dominant grass, and utilize the other grasses as accents that can help break up the ground plane.

Committee Member McCormack stated he liked the choice of trees, and while he did have to acquiesce to the building inspector, he disapproved of the end island removal, since those islands provide relief from the car and the drive aisle.

Mr. Denson asked if Committee Member McCormack was talking about the access point.

Committee Member McCormack stated yes, he was.

Mr. Denson stated that the end aisle removal was primarily for building access, and the pushback from Starbuck's was that they thought it would be too much of a congested area with the island. The width with the trees and the visibility made it necessary to remove the island so pedestrians wouldn't get lost from the view of drivers.

Committee Member McCormack stated that he understood the safety concerns, and couldn't really argue against those.

Mr. Denson stated that the revised plans did pull the trees down a little bit to help offset the loss of the end island.

Committee Member McCormack stated that the other problem was the northwest corner. He wished the drawings were in color, and stated it was the broken wall, pipe, and grade change that continued to provide a challenge. In his view, the revised drawings wouldn't allow for a finished look to the project, and continued to be what he called a "pimple" on the project. Solutions include fixing the grade and possibly extending the wall. The grading plan provided doesn't really give a good picture of this. There is a 30-inch grade change on the property, and the drawings don't clearly reflect how this will be dealt with.

Mr. Denson stated that part of the confusion was because he has also built a bio-swale in that area as well, which is on the Chapman Avenue side of the screen wall. That may be where some of the grade difference is being realized.

Chair Fox stated that the corner of the property line states that the grade change is 30 inches.

Mr. Denson clarified that the bio-swale actually goes through an under-grade culvert to the street, so at that corner the plan is to match up with existing grade. That leaves about a 5-1 or 6-1 slope, which is fairly minimal.

Committee Member McCormack stated that he wanted to see the wood screen be on a level plane, so it didn't tilt when it hit the grade. The grading plan doesn't really flesh it out well enough to see how this will work. The problem gets amplified at the northwest corner of the site.

Mr. Denson explained that there is a 2.3 grade line, with variations only to 2.33 and 2.31, so it's relatively flat. The correction on the grade stops short of the corner.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was a drain there.

Mr. Denson explained that there was.

Committee Member Imboden stated that he had a concern that he doesn't feel has been addressed yet. At a minimum, we are looking at a 12-inch difference from one end of the fence to another, and possibly as much as 18 inches of difference. The drawings don't really explain how this will be addressed very well. For one thing, he didn't understand what the fence was going to be in terms of its materials, and secondly he didn't understand how the plan was to address the fence if there was a 1-1.5-foot grade change from one end to the other. The elevation that was drawn doesn't appear to reflect the grade changes.

Mr. Denson stated that that was correct.

Committee Member Imboden stated that the land was clearly not flat based on the topographical lines. The reason for asking was that a 30-inch fence on one end could become a 4.5-foot fence on the other side.

Mr. Rabbitt stated that the fence would always be 30 inches tall, and that there would be 2-inch breaks in the panels, which would allow the height to adjust to any grade changes.

Committee Member Imboden asked whether the fence was going to stagger or be consistent.

Mr. Rabbitt asked Committee Member McCormack about the datum.

Committee Member McCormack stated that the datum is really aligned with the building, so it looks really architectural as it comes down.

Committee Member Imboden stated that because this hasn't been addressed on the plans, he doesn't feel confident that it is understood by all parties involved. If it isn't understood, he doesn't feel comfortable agreeing to the plan.

Mr. Rabbitt stated that the proposed solution on the plan was to maintain a specific height, so it would step to vary with the grade.

Committee Member McCormack asked if these were prefabricated panels.

Mr. Rabbitt stated that they were, and that they were set and segmented so that they would allow for some variation, but that the variation was such a minimal amount that it doesn't necessarily show up in the drawings. He acknowledged that it should have been drawn differently.

Chair Fox stated that the height would vary, in order to maintain the top as being level.

Committee Member Imboden wondered what the maximum height there could be in the setback for this particular commercial district. The fence could potentially comply with Code when it starts, but be out of Code by the time it ends.

Chair Fox asked whether there was a height limit for screen walls in setback.

Mr. Garcia stated that there was, and looked up the Code to see what it was. He clarified that the Tustin Street side would have a 42-inch limit since it's a front yard, and the Chapman Avenue side would be a side-yard setback, so no more than 6 feet. He said he would have to look into it more closely though.

Chair Fox asked for a clarification on what specifically the Committee would like to ask of the project applicants.

Committee Member McCormack stated that the grading line should be on a level plane with the grade. This plan should also include a cleanup of the problem corner.

Chair Fox asked if cleanup of the corner should be made an official condition of approval.

Mr. Rabbitt stated that in the final plans, that corner would actually be cleaned up.

Mr. Garcia confirmed that the maximum height on Tustin Street was indeed 42 inches.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if it would be possible to shove the 232 line further out so that the fence could be on a level plane.

Chair Fox affirmed that was what it seemed to be diagrammed.

Mr. Rabbitt said that essentially it's building a bench.

Committee Member McCormack stated that when he looks at the grading plan and landscape plan, he can't seem to see how they agree with each other. He's not sure if the wall on the drawing is a new wall or an existing wall.

Mr. Denson stated that on the architectural plan, the existing apron goes well beyond the line. It used to be part of the gas station approach.

Committee Member McCormack stated that he thinks the landscape plan is correct, but the grading plan doesn't seem to be agreeing with it. His main concern is that the problem corner gets cleaned up and is able to be consistent with the rest of the project.

Chair Fox stated that the process wasn't supposed to be so interactive between the Committee and the applicants, but that the Committee was supposed to be discussing the plan as it is presented, with questions asked for clarification when needed. She asked the Committee Members if they had any other questions.

Committee Member Wheeler asked which sheet was correct when there were two sheets that didn't agree with each other.

Mr. Rabbitt said that A5 was correct between the two drawings in question.

Chair Fox asked if there were other landscape questions.

Committee Member Imboden suggested there should be a commitment made in writing on the materials for the fences.

Committee Member Wheeler noted that the site plan says the fences are to be made of wood.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the posts were to be wood as well.

Mr. Denson said they are metal posts with reclaimed wood slats.

Committee Member Imboden repeated that they were reclaimed wood slats, but painted metal posts. He noted that it was good to have a record of it.

Chair Fox asked whether the applicants would accept the conditions that have been noted so far.

Mr. Rabbitt said yes.

Chair Fox wondered if Committee Member McCormack would agree to the plan if the applicants agreed to clean up the problem corner.

Committee Member McCormack said he would, but that he had other concerns. He liked the Rosemary trailing over the wall, but suggested the Achillea 'Moonshine' was "cute as a baby" but "really ugly as an adult." He would suggest staying away from it, as it might not look good.

Committee Member Imboden said the only other suggestion he would offer is the location of the gaps in the fence. He would like to see plants placed more intentionally at the gaps so that these gaps don't become pathways.

Mr. Denson stated that the Flax would meet the concerns of that suggestion.

Committee Member McCormack stated that he was being really detailed at this point, but that it was appropriate for the Committee to make these comments as suggestions.

Mr. Denson stated that there would be at least three Flax plants for each gap, with the remainder being Kangaroo Paw.

Chair Fox asked whether there was concurrence on the Committee. She said she heard four conditions: (1) maintain the datum of the fence; (2) clean up the Northwest corner; (3) place a minimum of three Flax plants at each gap; and (4) state that the fence be reclaimed wood with painted metal posts.

Committee Member McCormack stated that when he mentions the datum being on top of the wood fence, that is to take up the adjusted grade at the bottom, where it would be shielded with the Kangaroo Paw so that people wouldn't even see it.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4667-13, Starbuck's Coffee Drive-Thru, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- The datum on top of the reclaimed wood screen along Chapman Ave. must be level at matching some datum on the building line, not to exceed 42 inches.
- On the wood fence, at the openings, to have a minimum of three Flax plants and fill the rest of the planting area in with Kangaroo Paw.
- To clean up and re-grade the Northwest corner of the project at the new sidewalk area that is being installed and to fix the existing broken wall at that location.
- The vertical posts shall be painted metal to match the metal canopy screens.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(3) DRC No. 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, lroseberry@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 Roseberry, presented the Staff Report. Most of the project has been approved, but the detail of the cap and finish of the top of the front pre-cast walls needed to come back for determination. The applicant came back with a detail showing a cap finish similar to the existing cap on the adjoining stairways. Staff believes that the detail is what the Committee was looking for, so the item is being returned to the Committee.

Applicant, Mark Bogh, address on file, stated that he was the secretary of St. John's Lutheran Church, and is also the contractor for the project. He stated that he was there to answer any questions.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, representing OTPA, address on file, apologized for not attending the previous meeting, and stated that some historic fabric was going to be removed from the building as part of this project, specifically on the West stair. The staff report was very vague as to what was going on, but the east staircase and landing was going to remain, while the west staircase was going to be removed. He said he understood that the rest of the project was approved and ready to move forward. He wanted to go on record as saying that he disapproved of how the staff report didn't mention how this project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards or Old Towne Design Standards. There was also no discussion of meeting these Standards in the minutes from when the project was initially brought to the Committee previously. This project involves removing a character-defining feature of the building. Such removal would be an irreversible action, and would violate some of the existing Standards, including standards 2, 5, 9, and 10 of The Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The staff report didn't mention the removal of this feature, and this change will be visible from Almond, which is a major street.

Ms. Roseberry stated that the appeal period for this project had expired, and no changes could be made at this point in time.

Mr. Frankel wanted to get it on the record that he is disappointed in the Committee's decision, and wishes he could have been at the previous meeting to express his disapproval prior to the decision being made.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated that the western stair is being removed, and a portion of the eastern stair is being removed because there's an intermediate landing at the end of the east ramp. What used to be one stair is now two stairs. When he was reviewing this last week, he didn't see the stairs as character-defining, and thought that the term "character-defining" was a difficult term to fully grasp. He did feel that the moulding was important, and that it hadn't been put on the new ramp cap. He asked what happens on the top of the cap, since it isn't really a cap, but fastens on the side.

Mr. Bogh stated that it was integral so it wouldn't come off, since in the past other caps have had to be replaced.

Committee Member McCormack asked where the cap detail drawing was.

Committee Member Woollett stated that it wasn't clear from the drawing what the design was exactly.

Chair Fox stated that one of the things that had been discussed previously was doing a separate pre-cast cap that would be placed on the wall.

Committee Member McCormack stated that a wall with a cap interval would seem kind of "lego-ish." He asked if the intent was to match the existing structure.

Mr. Bogh said that was the intent.

Committee Member McCormack stated that the detail drawing to achieve the intent to match seemed to show them as being so different, especially when the cap was going to be different on one side than the other. He thought that would look "funny."

Chair Fox stated that there had been discussion previously of having the cap just on the outside walls.

Committee Member Woollett stated that what was discussed previously was that it was going to be fastened or attached to the walls. He further stated that his understanding was that the panels were already in fabrication at the time of the last meeting.

Mr. Bogh stated that they had stopped the fabrication of those panels based on the feedback they had received. The idea is that the whole thing will be poured monolithic, but the "curb" will be a separate pour from the main walls. The sandblasting between the two features will be matched with existing. He conceded that it is hard to see from the pictures, but that there is some black color to it, and it will look "really cool." The end result will look really different than the wall itself. They are trying to make that similar to the sanctuary look.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the wall was going to be poured in place.

Mr. Bogh stated that the wall is pre-cast, but will be built on the ground and will be finished with the sandblasted look.

Committee Member McCormack asked if both sides of the wall would be different finishes

Mr. Bogh stated that was correct, since the backside of the walls will not be seen. The sandblasted look will cover everything except for the top curb.

Committee Member McCormack asked if he was referring to the backside of the wall against the building.

Chair Fox stated that it was hard to see everything on the drawings, but this much was seen above the ramp surface or above the stair surface.

Mr. Bogh stated that that part will look like a smooth finish curb.

Chair Fox asked if that would be the same finish as the rest of the curb.

Mr. Bogh stated that it would all look the same.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the intent was to have them all look the same.

Mr. Bogh said that it was.

Committee Member McCormack then stated that he thought there were some parts that didn't look like they were done correctly.

Mr. Bogh stated that the part under discussion only occurs at the landing.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the cap was 5 inches tall.

Mr. Bogh stated that it was.

Committee Member McCormack stated that he didn't think it was going to look like a cap, unless it was notched in a cap.

Mr. Bogh stated that it was notched in, and then the sidewalk was right below it, so there was 5 inches on the inside.

Committee Member McCormack stated that the way this was drawn, the 5 inches seemed to be missing on the other side.

Mr. Bogh stated that that was correct, because there wasn't another inch and a half to spare without going out into the street. He then pointed out a specific elevation drawing that showed more clearly what was going on: there is a cap look from the front, and then on the inside people won't be able to see the cap look, since there isn't sufficient space to do so. There was a survey of the whole project, and there just isn't sufficient room to keep the 5-inch cap in place on the inside.

Committee Member McCormack stated he could see it a little more clearly now.

Committee Member Woollett asked whether the cap would be pre-cast on site.

Mr. Bogh stated that it would be pre-cast at the yard, so as to minimize the construction time required, since it's a high-use area. He stated he was hoping the construction could be completed within 10 days.

Committee Member Woollett stated that it looked like on the ramp section, the wall was going to be put in position, and then the footing was going to be poured around it.

Mr. Bogh confirmed that that was the case. There would be little legs on each end of the panel set on the grade, and then the rebar just sticks out. It's exactly like a retaining wall only it is poured in reverse. It is similar to tilt-up screen walls that are done on buildings. The primary reason for this in our opinion is the quality of the finish, which is so superior to any other poured-in-place wall that could be built. He stated he really was committed to making it look like the existing structures of the building.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the cap piece was going to be poured integral with the wall.

Mr. Bogh stated that it was, and that it should last forever. He conceded it was a little different, and thought finishing them different would really make it pop.

Committee Member McCormack stated that this seems to work for the interim sections, but wasn't sure about how it would work for the sections that step down.

Mr. Bogh said that it would be the same material and look, but it would just be another panel.

Committee Member McCormack wondered how this would work for the inside of these step panels.

Mr. Bogh stated that those would stay existing as much as possible.

Committee Member McCormack wondered how the detail showed what was going to happen, especially since there was a sloping situation on one drawing, instead of the stepping that appears in other sections. He recommended using a traditional cap all the way around.

Mr. Bogh stated that they could do that.

Chair Fox stated that the stair went down, and wasn't fully visible on the pictures that were taken on the project.

Mr. Bogh stated that the where the stair went down, there was no cap.

Chair Fox stated that the backside from the landing over should have a cap on it.

Mr. Bogh stated that he could do that.

Chair Fox stated that when the project gets past the wall, there should be an extra cap on it.

Mr. Bogh stated that that was "cool."

Committee Member McCormack asked why the project couldn't provide the same things on both sides if brick has to be removed.

Mr. Bogh stated that one of the sides doesn't have enough space to do the same thing as the other side.

Committee Member McCormack asked why they didn't just keep that as it is.

Chair Fox clarified that if he kept the brick, and then put a new ramp in, it would stick out too far, and so the ramp needs to be pushed into where the existing brick is.

Mr. Bogh stated that he has to struggle with both issues of the turn at the top and the right of way, and by the time he adds them up he starts running out of space.

Committee Member McCormack asked if that was why he had to demolish the West landing.

Mr. Bogh said yes.

Chair Fox stated that it is important to address the issue that Jeff Frankel brought up regarding the Secretary of the Interior standards, but there are also building code and the ADA (*Americans with Disabilities Act*), which says that builders are discriminating against people with disabilities if they can't get into the building. This access in a public building such as this does need to be there, and the applicants have looked at all the possibilities for the best place to put this, and this is a better location than that façade on Shaffer St., which would be even worse. There are lots of character-defining features to this building that are being maintained, including the basement windows. All things considered, the applicant has devised a good solution to the problem.

Mr. Bogh stated that he could bring in years of study on the matter that shows that this is the best solution they can come up with.

Chair Fox stated that in spite of the fact that it is regrettable to lose any part of a resource, but in this case, there's no better option.

Committee Member McCormack stated that he agreed with the Chair, comparing it to a rock, paper, scissors situation where the building code and ADA are in direct opposition to each other, and one has to supersede the other.

Chair Fox stated that putting bricks back wouldn't work either, because this is a new feature being proposed, and it would create a false sense of history to try to pretend it is historic.

Committee Member McCormack stated that aesthetically it would look better to see brick consistently all the way across, but he knows why it's not possible.

Chair Fox asked if he was talking just about the landing part.

Committee Member McCormack stated that he was.

Mr. Bogh asked about removing the brick from the other side, so the symmetry would be maintained.

Committee Member McCormack stated that he didn't think that would help either.

Committee Member Woollett stated that the very fact that it's a ramp and not a stair is not historic. It's better to not be brick, since it is being built in 2013. It's respectful of the original design, but it's clearly not original.

Committee Member McCormack asked how people would think about it just from looking at the finished product.

Committee Member Woollett stated that it is an addition, and that it would be fine for an addition to look like an addition.

Committee Member McCormack asked Joe if he thought it would look better with brick.

Committee Member Woollett stated that "better" wasn't the right term.

Committee Member McCormack asked about it being "more aesthetic."

Committee Member Woollett stated that the Committee was administering an ordinance, and didn't feel aesthetics were the chief concern.

Committee Member McCormack said he felt like they were setting a precedent for future projects as well.

Chair Fox stated that by putting brick back on, it would pretend to be historic when it isn't historic. The new materials show that the project is new.

Committee Member Woollett stated that he believed the Committee often violates the national code regarding construction on historic properties, in that additions to historic buildings are supposed to be encouraged to look different. We in Orange don't do that—we encourage designs that look like they were added, but that they were added back when the building was built rather than more recently. The way we have discussed this project seems like a really good way to do it.

Mr. Bogh stated that while he was taking pictures of the building, there happened to be two older ladies standing outside the building, and one of them wondered why there wasn't a ramp on the building in the first place: the other answered that in the 1920's no one cared about older ladies not being able to make it up the steps. This makes me think that we are doing the right thing by adding these ramps.

Committee Member Woollett stated that he saw someone coming out of the building and bounding down the stairs and back up again several times, and that man likely wouldn't be in favor of the ramps, since they would make his job much more difficult.

Committee Member McCormack playfully stated that they could always add in a ladder.

Mr. Bogh stated that there was a church meeting about the project, and there were lots of people excited about the prospect of having a ramp there to help people be able to get in and out of the room.

Chair Fox stated that she would like to hear a motion.

Committee Member Woollett initially 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 conditions:

- That the cap be extended to both sides of the wall at the new stair at the east end and at the beginning of the ramp at the west side on the north side of the ramp.

Chair Fox stated that the condition should be restated.

Committee Member Woollett stated that the conditions are:

- That the 1.5 inch cantilever of the cap shall extend on the north as well as the south side of the south wall of the ramp at the east end.
- At the west end of the ramp the 1.5 inch cantilevered cap shall be installed on the south side of the north side of the ramp.

Chair Fox stated that the Committee needed to make the condition very clear. The two conditions as she stated them were:

- The cantilevered cap needs to wrap to the north side of the walls at the east stair and at the west ramp up to the landing between the west landing and end of the ramp.

Committee Member McCormack proposed the wording be: at the beginning of the ramp on the west side the cap on the center wall to be equal 1.5 inches on both sides.

Chair Fox stated that it wasn't on both sides of the wall.

Mr. Bogh stated that it was just a curb.

Chair Fox stated that it was just on the north side of the wall.

Ms. Roseberry stated that not everyone sounded like they were having the same idea, so the wording needs to be clearer.

Chair Fox stated the conditions again and Committee Member Woollett agreed to them:

- This cantilevered cap needs to wrap to the north side of the stair wall at the east stair to the extent of the top riser to the bottom of the wall.
- The cantilevered cap needs to be added to the north side of the ramp wall that is visible from the basement stair and dies into the new highest landing.

Committee Member Woollett stated that it was a good thing Mr. Bogh was here.

Mr. Bogh stated he was sorry he wasn't here last time to explain everything. The rake of the wall will be the same as the rake of the staircase.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(4) DRC No. 4413-09 & ENV No. 1818-09 – RIO SANTIAGO SPECIFIC PLAN

- A proposal to change the General Plan and Zoning Designations for the 110 acre site and create a Specific Plan that would allow: a maximum of 130 single family homes; a maximum of 265 senior (age-restricted) housing units that could include up to a three-story building; pay-for-use private recreational facilities that could include up to an 81,000 square foot building; and, open space areas north of and including Santiago Creek. Publicly available trails, publicly available open space, and private streets are also proposed as part of the project.
- 6118 E. Santiago Canyon Road
- Staff Contact: Chad Ortlieb, 714-744-7237, cortlieb@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the City Council

Chair Fox stated the applicant requested that this item be continued, and will be put back on the agenda for the July 17th meeting.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to move this item to the Design Review Committee meeting on July 17th, 2013.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on June 19, 2013.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 6:59 p.m.