DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
AGENDA ITEM

AGENDA DATE:	JULY 17, 2013
TO:	Chair Fox and Members of the Design Review Committee
THRU:	Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager
FROM:	Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner
SUBJECT:	DRC No. 4650-12 – Cambridge Medical Plaza

SUMMARY

The applicant proposes to fill in an existing breezeway as well as complete exterior building and landscape improvements to an existing medical office.

RECOMMENDED ACTION – RECOMMENDATION TO THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

Staff is requesting that the DRC provide a recommendation to the Zoning Administrator.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Applicant/Owner:	Jeffrey Desantis for Cambridge Medical Plaza
Property Location:	1038-1042 E. Chapman Avenue
General Plan Designation:	Office Professional (OP)
Zoning Classification:	Neighborhood Office Professional (OP)
Existing Development:	1038-1042 E Chapman is 5,801 SF
Property Size:	36,459 SF acres
Associated Applications:	AA 200-13
Previous Reviews:	3-20-13

PUBLIC NOTICE

No Public Notice was required for this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Categorical Exemption: The proposed project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines 15302

(Replacement or Reconstruction) because the project includes a small addition and façade remodel for an existing building. There is no environmental public review required for a Categorical Exemption.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is requesting to enclose the existing 1,109 SF open breeze way between the buildings addressed as 1038-1042 E Chapman Avenue. The purpose of the breezeway enclosure is to create a larger waiting area for the existing medical facility. The subject building addressed as 1038-1042 E Chapman Avenue is not in the National Historic District, nor the Old Towne Historic District. There are no proposed changes to 1026 E Chapman Avenue, which is in the same center and is within the National Historic District, but not the Old Towne Historic District.

The project was reviewed by the DRC on March 20, 2013, where the DRC expressed concerns regarding the design. The concerns are listed below and described in further detail in the Analysis section. The issues included:

1. Trash enclosure location, whether an enclosure will be constructed, and if it takes a parking space
2. Radius glass
3. More sympathy for 1960's architecture
4. Move front entry door on the north elevation towards the east
5. Painting the base a dark color, add a bulkhead at the base
6. Square cut vs plumb cut fascia on the building.
7. Colored walkway and driveway paving
8. removal of palm trees

The revised proposal includes modifications that are more in line with the existing architecture. The major modifications include:

- removal of the previously proposed craftsman elements
- adding a hip roof over the enclosed breezeway instead of a gabled roof with exposed rafters on the north and south elevations
- adding two asymmetrically sized stone masses on the north and south elevations
- adding a darker painted bulkhead at the base of the building
- relocating the north ADA entrance from the center towards the east.
- Adding landscape and landscape planter to the north elevation
- Pushing out the south elevation walkway and parking stalls 10' to open up the entrance and provide landscaping
- Relocate the palm tree in the breezeway to the parking lot
- Constructing an enclosed trash enclosure to City standards

An Administrative Adjustment (AA) is required for the project because the existing 9,066 SF medical facility currently requires 45 parking spaces. Although the site is currently overparked with 46 parking stalls on-site, the 1,109 SF addition would require that the medical center

provide 51 parking spaces. Therefore, a 10%AA is required for the reduction of 5 parking spaces.

EXISTING SITE

The subject building, addressed as 1038-1042 E Chapman Ave, is a 5,801 SF single-story building that is connected through a breezeway. The building is in the ranch style of architecture with their emphasis on horizontal massing, hip roofs or side gables, low pitched roofs, and minimal detailing.

The building is predominantly covered with white stucco walls and boxed eaves. Brown painted stucco wraps up to the roof along what would typically be the fascia board. The building also has brown stucco trim framing the windows. The two sides of the subject building are connected by a breezeway with a solid sheathed roof cover. The original true divided light windows on portions of the building, particularly the north and south elevation, have been replaced with simulated divided lights.

EXISTING AREA CONTEXT

The subject property is just outside of the Old Towne Historic District; however, the neighborhood retains some of the minimal traditional and ranch features. As the architecture transitions along East Chapman Avenue toward Tustin Street, the architecture greatly changes with the addition of the Walgreens center, gas station and car dealership.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Orange Municipal Code (OMC) Section 17.10.070 establishes the general criteria the DRC should use when reviewing the project. This section states the following:

The project shall have an internally consistent, integrated design theme, which is reflected in the following elements:

1. **Architectural Features**.
    a. The architectural features shall reflect a similar design style or period.
    b. Creative building elements and identifying features should be used to create a high quality project with visual interest and an architectural style.
2. **Landscape**.
    a. The type, size and location of landscape materials shall support the project's overall design concept.
    b. Landscaping shall not obstruct visibility of required addressing, nor shall it obstruct the vision of motorists or pedestrians in proximity to the site.
    c. Landscape areas shall be provided in and around parking lots to break up the appearance of large expanses of hardscape.
3. **Signage**. All signage shall be compatible with the building(s) design, scale, colors, materials and lighting.

4. **Secondary Functional and Accessory Features**. Trash receptacles, storage and loading areas, transformers and mechanical equipment shall be screened in a manner, which is architecturally compatible with the principal building(s).

ANALYSIS/STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

Issue 1 DRC Comments:

1. *Trash enclosure location, whether an enclosure will be constructed, and if it takes a parking space.*
   The applicant is proposing to construct a trash enclosure to meet City standards on the south property line between the two buildings addressed as 1026 E Chapman Avenue and 1038-1042 E Chapman Ave. This is the same location where the unenclosed dumpster currently sits on-site. Since the trash enclosure would reduce the required 25' back up area for one parking space, that one parking space cannot be counted legally. Therefore, the on-site number of parking spaces has been reduced from 47 to 46.

2. *Radius glass*
   Although, the applicant is still proposing to construct the glass block wall on the north elevation, the wall would no longer be a curved radius glass block wall. The wall will be parallel to Chapman Avenue.

3. *More sympathy for 1960's architecture*
   The architect researched design from this era and found that minimal detailing and ornamentation was more typical of the time period. Therefore, the applicant has removed the previously proposed open gable craftsman elements from the design and added a hip roof form with two asymmetrical stone columns on either side of the glass block wall. The design now includes a landscaped planter that is offset from the building and the existing window trim will be removed to it is uniform around the building.

4. *Move front entry door on the north elevation towards the east.*
   The entry door on the north elevation was previously proposed adjacent to the glass block wall in the center of the building. It is now proposed to remain on the north elevation, but shifted closer to the northeast corner of the building.

5. *Painting the base a dark color, add a bulkhead at the base*
   A 2' tall, offset, stucco, bulkhead would be added to the base of the majority of the building and will be painted a darker color.

6. *Square cut vs plumb cut fascia on the building.*
   The elevations have been corrected to show square cut fascia on the building instead of plumb cut. The existing clipped fascia on the east elevation was also added to the plans.

7. *Colored walkway and driveway paving*
   The DRC suggested calling out the walkway and driveway paving by adding colored paving or striping details. An accessible door and path of travel from the public right-of-way were part of the original design, but have been shifted farther east along the north elevation. That door will have the signage necessary per accessibility requirements. Patrons driving to the site would park in the back parking lot and uses the ADA entrance on the south side of the building. Although there are narrow concrete walkways along the east and west sides of the building they do not meet ADA requirements. The applicant feels that the design has met the Code requirements without the need to stripe the concrete or asphalt.

8. *Removal of palm trees*
   The landscape plan shows that the palm tree that is currently in the center of the breezeway will be relocated to a new finger island on the south side of the building, within the parking lot.

ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDATION

None

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND REQUIRED FINDINGS

The courts define a "Finding" as a conclusion which describes the method of analysis decision makers utilize to make the final decision. A decision making body "makes a Finding," or draws a conclusion, through identifying evidence in the record (i.e., testimony, reports, environmental documents, etc.) and should not contain unsupported statements. The statements which support the Findings bridge the gap between the raw data and the ultimate decision, thereby showing the rational decision making process that took place. The "Findings" are, in essence, the ultimate conclusions which must be reached in order to approve (or recommend approval of) a project. The same holds true if denying a project; the decision making body must detail why it cannot make the Findings.

The Findings are applied as appropriate to each project. Based on the following Findings and statements in support of such Findings, staff recommends the DRC approve the project with recommended conditions.

1. *In the Old Towne Historic District, the proposed work conforms to the prescriptive standards and design criteria referenced and/or recommended by the DRC or other reviewing body for the project (OMC 17.10.070.F.1).*

   This project site is not within the Old Towne Historic District; therefore, this finding does not apply.

2. *In any National Register Historic District, the proposed work complies with the Secretary of the Interior's standards and guidelines (OMC 17.10.07.F.2).*

This project site is not within the National Register Historic District; therefore, this finding does not apply.

3. *The project design upholds community aesthetics through the use of an internally consistent, integrated design theme and is consistent with all adopted specific plans, applicable design standards, and their required findings (OMC 17.10.07.F.3).*

   The subject building is within the Office Professional zone; but outside of the Old Towne Historic District and National Historic District. There are no adopted specific plans or applicable design standards in this area. The proposed design would not change the architectural style of the existing building. The proposed renovation would match the minimal style of the period by removing the window treatments, adding a darker colored bulkhead, front landscaping, and glass block.

   The design adds a gabled roof end, wood fascia boards, exposed tongue and groove boards, more ornate columns, and a new type of window, which is not consistent with the current architecture.

4. *For infill residential development, as specified in the City of Orange Infill Residential Design Guidelines, the new structure(s) or addition are compatible with the scale, massing, orientation, and articulation of the surrounding development and will preserve or enhance existing neighborhood character (OMC 17.10.07.F.4).*

   This project is not an infill residential development; therefore, this finding does not apply.

CONDITIONS

The approval of this project is subject to the following conditions:

1. All landscaping shall be automatically irrigated and in operable condition. All landscaping shall be maintained on-site.
2. The property owner shall apply for a Temporary Use Permit for the storage containers onsite 30-days prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
3. All construction shall conform in substance and be maintained in general conformance with plans and exhibits labeled Attachment 5 in the staff report (date stamped received July 8, 2013), including modifications required by the conditions of approval, and as recommended for approval by the Design Review Committee. Further, exterior building color and materials shall conform to the plans and color and materials board approved by the Design Review Committee on July 17, 2013. Any change to the exterior of the building from the approved plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Design Review Committee.
4. The applicant agrees to indemnify, hold harmless, and defend the City, its officers, agents and employees from any and all liability or claims that may be brought against the City arising out of its approval of this permit, save and except that caused by the City's active negligence.

5. The applicant, business owner, managers, successors, and all future assigns shall comply with all Federal, State and local laws, including all City regulations. Violation of any of those laws in connection with the use will be cause for revocation of this permit.
6. Except as otherwise provided herein, this project is approved as a precise plan. After any application has been approved, if changes are proposed regarding the location or alteration of any use or structure, a changed plan may be submitted to the Community Development Director for approval. If the Community Development Director determines that the proposed change complies with the provisions and the spirit and intent of the approval action, and that the action would have been the same for the changed plan as for the approved plot plan, the Community Development Director may approve the changed plan without requiring a new public hearing.
7. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall pay all applicable development fees including but not limited to: City sewer connection, Orange County Sanitation District Connection Fee, Transportation System Improvement Program, Fire Facility, Police Facility, Park Acquisition, Sanitation District, and School District, as required.
8. Construction permits shall be obtained for all construction work, as required by the City of Orange, Community Development Department's Building Division and Public Works Grading Division. Failure to obtain the required building permits will be cause for revocation of this permit.
9. All structures shall comply with the requirements of Municipal Code – Chapter 15.52 (Building Security Standards), which relates to hardware, doors, windows, lighting, etc. (Ord. 7-79). Approved structural drawings shall include sections of the security code that apply. Specifications, details, or security notes may be used to convey the compliance.
10. The final approved conditions of approval shall be reprinted on the first or second page of the construction documents when submitting to the Building Department for the plan check process.
11. If not utilized, project approval expires twenty-four months from the approval date. Extensions of time may be granted in accordance with OMC Section 17.08.060. The Planning entitlements expire unless Building Permits are pulled within 2 years of the original approval.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map
2. Existing Site Photos
3. Materials board and details
4. March 20, 2013 DRC meeting minutes
5. Site Plan, Floor Plan, Details, Color Elevations (date stamped received July 8, 2013)

cc: Peters - Jepson Partners
ATTN: Randall Jepson
413 S Glassell Street
Orange, CA 92866

File