CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

July 17, 2013

Committee Members Present:	Carol Fox Robert Imboden Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett
Committee Members Absent:	None
Staff in Attendance:	David Khorram, Chief Building Official Greg Hastings, Interim Community Development Director Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner Diane Perry, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Fox opened the Administrative Session at 5:10 p.m.

Chair Fox confirmed with David Khorram, Chief Building Official, that Item 3, Marywood Pump Station would not be heard tonight.

Mr. Khorram stated there were no other Policy/Procedural information but did have some flyers to pass out to the DRC Members for City Code Academy classes that would take place on Wednesday afternoons in August.

The Committee Members discussed and reviewed the meeting minutes from the July 3, 2013 Design Review Committee meeting. Changes and corrections were noted.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members were 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: July 3, 2013

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

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4650-12 – CAMBRIDGE MEDICAL PLAZA

- A proposal to enclose a breezeway, including façade and landscape remodel.
- 1038-1042 E. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- Continued From DRC Meeting: March 20, 2013
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Zoning Administrator

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report. Ms. Nguyen noted that there was a correction to the Staff Report, page 6, third finding, that the second paragraph be removed since it was a holdover from the previous Staff Report.

The applicant's representative, Randall Jepson, address on file, commented that they appreciated all the help that Ms. Nguyen had provided. He went on to explain all the changes that were made, including not doing the Craftsman style, introducing the bulkhead as previously discussed, and addressing some of the landscape plan in order to "soften" the front of the building. They have now included a permanent trash enclosure on the site instead of just a bin.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler commented that the windows on the Elevations sheet appeared to be bigger than what is there now.

Mr. Jepson stated the windows were not larger. He also added that in fact they were losing one window on the north elevation because of the entry. There would still be a portion that was retained as a glazed area but the window itself would be removed.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what was the cap/top detail going to be on the stone elements that are projecting up.

Mr. Jepson replied they were currently working with the manufacturer to understand if there may be some kind of flashing that will be impervious to rainwater coming through. He thinks there will be some form of a brick metal cap on top of it unless the manufacturer can demonstrate they have some kind of modular component that will integrate and not look imitation. He really didn't have a definitive answer at this time.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he wasn't sure how he would handle it either; using flashing might leave gaps underneath.

Mr. Jepson stated what they have used in the past on pilasters is full stone module up on the upper part that would lap to the extent it would allow water to run over.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if this would fit into their design.

Mr. Jepson stated he thought it could fit into the design. This was a relatively flat area where the veneer was going on. He stated although irregular in shape, with some judicious placement it wouldn't be obtrusive.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the whole building was going to be re-roofed.

Mr. Jepson replied that it wasn't their intent to re-roof now as they wanted to utilize the life of the current roof.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested when they re-roof, to consider grouping some of the plumbing vents together, especially on the west side of the building. There are many 1 ½ inch plumbing vents coming up all over the roof.

Mr. Jepson stated that they have already identified this as something to look at in the future.

Committee Member Woollett asked about the trash enclosures and the blocking of a potential parking space shown on the site plan.

Mr. Jepson replied that this was the existing location of the trash bin with a couple of bollards in front of it for protection. They've taken the parking stall out of the consideration of a usable active count of provided stalls, but it was still used by one of the physicians.

Committee Member Woollett stated it didn't make sense to block a parking space; just put a trash enclosure there instead. Everything is so tight in that area trying to get cars through there. However, if the parking space was used, then that explained why the trash enclosure didn't go there.

Mr. Jepson replied that there was entry to the building in the re-entrant corner. They wouldn't want to take the trash enclosure all the way up against the building for obvious reasons. However, they were willing to relocate if necessary. At Staff's request, they dimensionally identified that there was more than the minimum requirement for a one-way drive aisle.

Committee Member Woollett asked for clarification regarding the "bulkheads." He stated it looked like the applicant created the "bump in the wall." He also asked if they were using materials like stucco and then masonry over the bulkhead.

Mr. Jepson replied that they were trying to respond to the DRC's comment to provide a base to the building.

Committee Member Woollett stated the comment from the previous meeting meant that they should paint the 6 inches of exposed concrete at the base of the building under the drip. He also

referred to the prior meeting minutes and stated he wasn't sure what the applicant had meant by the term "stone bulkhead." However, the DRC would review what was being presented today.

Mr. Jepson stated he thought an appropriate response to the previous meeting's dialogue was that they add a minimal projection, about 2 inches, so it would be visible across the front of the building and a contrasting color would be visible on the base/bottom of the building. The applicant took this to mean more than the 6 inches that the DRC had suggested. From researching other architectural examples used, this feature was not uncommon; it's very linear.

Committee Member Woollett stated he didn't recall a stone piece and a "bump" in the plaster being characteristic of the style.

Mr. Jepson stated they would be happy to minimize or remove the bulkhead.

Ms. Nguyen explained that the applicant was just trying to address the DRC's comment but added they would be happy to remove the bulkhead if that wasn't the original intent and do what was originally suggested.

Chair Fox suggested letting the other DRC Members give their responses.

Committee Member Woollett agreed, but had one more question regarding the widening of the wall and asked if there was masonry on the wall.

Mr. Jepson replied no, and referred the DRC Members to the site plan. He confirmed that there was a 2 x 4 flat with 1 ½ inches and would add smooth plaster on it but in a different color. This was for two purposes: an introduction to color and allows for future repairs due to irrigation or other problems.

Committee Member McCormack asked for clarification as to how the 2 x 4s would be laid.

There was discussion among the Committee Members, and the applicant explained that the design would get sheathed and smooth stucco across it.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the 2 x 4s were going to be 16 inches on center, as it goes the length of the wall.

Mr. Jepson replied none of it would be seen.

There was additional discussion by the Committee Members and the applicant, explaining to Committee Member McCormack about the details of the wall and how the 2 x 4s would be laid.

Committee Member McCormack stated that it would then be furred out 1 ½ inches.

Mr. Jepson explained that the 2 x 4 was flat and gave an example: take the wall behind and take a 2 x 4 and attach it to that; it wouldn't have to be 16" on center as there would be no load on it - it could even be 24" - but merely something to attach the sheathing over it and then stucco over that.

Chair Fox confirmed it would be 2 and 3/8 inches.

Mr. Jepson replied yes, that accounts for the 7/8 inches of the stucco.

Chair Fox directed the Committee Members to include in their comments if they liked the wall as they each give further comments on the project.

Mr. Jepson stated across the entire north elevation, anywhere where there's a colored differential that's where they're proposing the drive area or it's visible from the public area.

Committee Member Wheeler commented that he didn't think it was inappropriate for the period and it added a nice base which helped the horizontality of the building; it gave it a ground anchor and he wasn't opposed to it.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they were going to put that screed line on the bottom, that piece of metal wrapping up underneath it. Otherwise, there would still be water wicking up through it.

Mr. Jepson stated they would take care of that; there's a screed that will be on the bottom and one where they are introducing a wall plane.

Committee Member McCormack stated his concern was the bottom one; that water doesn't wick back up.

Committee Member Woollett stated there's no foundation.

Mr. Jepson stated it would project off the wall base a bit.

Committee Member McCormack asked if that was due to all the irrigation.

Committee Member Woollett stated there would have to be a piece of wood underneath it; the bottom stringer would be exposed.

Committee Member McCormack commented it would have to be about 1 inch above grade.

Committee Member Wheeler stated theoretically it should be about 6 inches above grade.

Committee Member McCormack questioned the 6 inches shown on the plans. The screed line would typically come just above the foundation, with the bottom plate wrapped and then have the stucco system.

Chair Fox stated if it was finished grade adjacent to the building it should now be 8 inches between wood and finished adjacent grade.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was out at the site today and it's not like that.

Chair Fox agreed, and stated that it was also drawn on the plans much closer than that.

Mr. Jepson stated there are portions of sidewalk or walkway immediately adjacent to it so there would be no problem with the introduction of the drip screed.

Committee Member Imboden suggested to just back wrap it with flashing underneath.

Chair Fox replied that even with a weep screed there's not supposed to be wood within 8 inches. It's not whether or not it's covered, it's just not supposed to be there.

Committee Member Imboden asked "not even as a decorative element."

Chief Building Official, David Khorram, agreed with Chair Fox's comments.

Committee Member Woollett stated that on an existing building under the old Code it was required to have 6 inches; the new Code called for 8 inches. He asked if 6 inches would be allowed because it's on an existing building for this project.

Mr. Khorram replied that even though it's in the Code, in an "existing" situation the City couldn't always enforce it. Sometimes it could be 6 inches or 4 inches. He would be more concerned if places didn't have anything at all. For this project if it can be kept about 2 inches above the slab, that would be fine. He also mentioned that the sidewalk that surrounds the building is not all level either.

Committee Member Wheeler stated this may be a good suggestion for the applicant; that if the grade was that close to the slab height then to raise the bottom.

Mr. Jepson replied they certainly would be code compliant.

Committee Member McCormack said when the bulkhead wraps around the corner on the north elevation going to the west elevation, that's where it goes from dirt/planting area into a paved zone where the parking starts. There's at least a 2"-3" grade change so no matter where the bottom is, the corner would have to be wrapped same way at the bottom; otherwise, it would be exposed. It's not that there's going to be a plant in front of it because it's parking and paving area so the northwest corner needs to be flushed out; otherwise, it won't look right. He asked about the heads at the site that are located so close to the wall. He noticed there was water around the area as the heads tend to go a little further back and he suggested a design element of using gravel as an edge and set the heads away from the building. He also asked if there was a landscape plan for this project because a certain number of trees are typically required.

Ms. Nguyen replied overall landscaping was not a part of this project as the applicant was not modifying it to the extent where Staff asked to review an entire overall landscape plan.

Committee Member McCormack asked about the walkway (pointing to the plans) and door. He stated it was concrete now and the door opened inward to a private office. He discussed with the applicant about the way the door opens out to the back and which way the access should be, and suggested this could just be landscaping instead of paving.

Mr. Jepson asked if he had been to the site and stated the drive aisle width was 10 ½ feet.

Committee Member McCormack replied yes, he had visited the site. His views from an overall site presence were that if some of the site concerns weren't changed, it would look like certain areas were just forgotten/undone. The changes being done were good, like the change from Craftsman to contemporary, but currently the site appeared sub-standard when looking at the bollards and pipe rail. The site won't look as good as the improvements to the building itself. The entry has a good upgrade but other areas, like the side where the one person office is, could be changed to landscaping. Also, he asked if they needed the egress to the parking lot. Regarding the walkway, it should be straight since now using a contemporary style. Since this meeting was a "design review," his comments were addressing items that were visually sub-standard and suggested doing some minor upgrades so it looked like the whole project was done, and not just the building.

Committee Member McCormack went on to comment that the pipe rail seemed to get hit by skateboards and/or cars and it appeared that cars driving by couldn't see it. He asked how they were taking care of "site jewelry" which would be the low-profile curved bollards, wheel stops, etc.

Chair Fox stated that it looked like on the plans that the applicant had proposed some additional planter area to round out that corner so the bollards wouldn't be needed. The bollards were there so people wouldn't drive off the path.

Committee Member McCormack replied that the plans do not show to remove the bollards. Something like this is usually shown on the plans to remove; otherwise, the contractor isn't going to know to do this.

Mr. Jepson confirmed although not shown on the plans, that was the applicant's intentions.

Committee Member McCormack stated if that was the intention, it would be nice to continue to landscape off the edge of the building so the whole corner was landscaped instead of stopping at the new proposed wall. It could be the applicant's choice to keep the walkway that goes nowhere.

Chair Fox replied that it seemed like that was a walkway for people to use in case there were cars driving down the driveway.

Committee Member Imboden commented that Committee Member McCormack was trying to point out that a person would still have to step out into the drive before getting to the back. He agreed with Committee Member McCormack to bring the bush out to the corner.

Ms. Nguyen asked if the bollards could be hidden by the landscaping, would the applicant want to keep them.

Committee Member McCormack replied yes, but the bollards would still be seen.

Mr. Jepson replied that the whole intent was for someone not to damage their car so he wouldn't want to hide the bollards. He asked the Committee Members to remember there's a 6 foot-plus wall on this side, and 10 ½ feet away from the drive. The visibility of the building face, down this "alley way," was extremely severely restricted. That was the reason for taking the

treatment/bulkhead and terminating at the door. That's as much of it as will be seen from the street. They didn't want to expend any more money and introduce further landscape and irrigation along that wall face, as the applicant saw it as a minimal benefit to anyone except when someone was exiting the development.

Committee Member McCormack replied that it's one-way and would include everybody; everybody would be leaving every day.

Committee Member Imboden stated he wasn't implying that the landscape should be brought around the building; he clarified with Mr. Jepson that he just wanted to extend it further out eastbound. Keeping it tight would cause people to slow down, and having the bush stick out wouldn't be a bad thing.

Committee Member McCormack said his point of view was that the area looked like it should be upgraded, and suggested it could be landscaped with irrigation, or concrete added, or adding gravel that wouldn't require irrigation.

Mr. Jepson asked if gravel would be an upgrade.

Committee Member McCormack replied yes, gravel could be beautiful and could be used in different colors. Everyone who leaves the premises would see this area. His opinion was that the area currently looked sub-standard.

Ms. Nguyen asked Dr. Ehrlich if people walk along the walkway.

Dr. Ehrlich, applicant, address on file, replied that no one walks along that walkway as it's too narrow. The cars go out but not all the cars exit that way. He appreciates that Committee Member McCormack was there today and perhaps it looked like most cars exited that way but he's there every day and most people are concentrating on getting out. He understands it would be nice to put something aesthetically pleasing there but it's not a lot of space. If the concern is safety, the greatest issue is the bush between there and their neighbors, blocking traffic from the east.

Chair Fox suggested asking each Committee Member how they felt about these issues before introducing them as requirements.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had another concern regarding the plant palette. The "Sundowner" plant would eventually be 5-6 feet wide by 6 feet high. On the plant palette it's only shown as a 3-foot diameter on the south. The plant will get much larger than the space that's being provided for on the plan. He also asked for clarification regarding the removal of the Palm trees.

Mr. Jepson explained, referencing the plans, that one of the Palm trees will be relocated.

Committee Member McCormack asked which Palm tree would be relocated?

Mr. Jepson replied, referencing the plans, the one Palm tree in the middle would be moved. The one in its present location would remain.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were two Palm trees.

Mr. Jepson replied there are two Palm trees outside of the building. The Palms in the atrium are going away because that area would be getting a solid sheath.

Committee Member McCormack wanted it made clear that the Palm in the breezeway in the center of the building was being removed and taken away; that Palm wouldn't survive as it's an inside Palm that grew up in a hole in the ceiling. The other Palm tree wasn't shown as being relocated so he stated to show it on the site plan.

Mr. Jepson and Ms. Nguyen both pointed out where the reference to "relocated Palm" was on the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler commented that the species made it clear that it wasn't the one in the breezeway.

Committee Member McCormack stated that normally plans would show/say "existing Palm tree in place," "existing Palm tree to be relocated," and "relocated Palm."

Mr. Jepson asked that even though it wasn't clear on the plan, did the Committee Members understand their intent.

Chair Fox said no; this was the first time she had seen this project and she interpreted it as destroying one of the Palms and moving another one to another location.

Mr. Jepson clarified with the Committee Members that he should state on the plans: "existing [Palm] to be relocated;" the other [Palm] is "existing to remain;" and the other one with the dashed lines around it which shows "relocated trees" in the plant legend/schedule, should say "relocated Palm;" then there's no confusion in the intent. He stated they never intended to preserve any of the atrium trees.

Committee Member Imboden stated he appreciated that Mr. Jepson had listened to what the Committee Members had previously discussed. The applicant brought back a building plan much more compatible with the surroundings and respectful to the existing architecture; they didn't try to create a Craftsman-style office building. He added that he wasn't so concerned about the bollard, but it did appear that it's been touched a few times so if the bollards were going to be removed he strongly recommended that the bush come out further to take its place.

Mr. Jepson replied they can't extend the curb face out because it's already a non-compliant existing condition with the driveway.

Committee Member Imboden clarified that they could bring the plant material further out to take the place of the bollard.

Ms. Nguyen confirmed that this would be on the southeast corner of the building along the exit driveway.

Committee Member Imboden commented about the winding sidewalk and that he agreed a straight sidewalk would be more appropriate for the style of the building. However, he didn't feel strongly enough about it to make it a condition but it would probably be an improvement. The walkway along the side of the building wasn't the best, but there's only so much room. But having a walkway does encourage someone to use it and stay close to the building. He wasn't convinced that gravel would enhance the area over having concrete. If planted, it would enhance the area but then there would be less space. His suggestion would be to leave it as it is; he didn't think it was worth the investment aesthetically to rip out the concrete to replace it with gravel.

Chair Fox asked Committee Member Imboden for his comments regarding the bulkhead/color face.

Committee Member Imboden replied that he thought it was probably a misunderstanding of the direction given by the DRC but he was okay with it. This building was marginally/potentially historic but now going away from that which was okay. It's not a listed building so no concerns of trying to maintain a historic style. There are ways to solve some of the problems to be code compliant regarding constructability/material issues by using synthetic decking materials. He's fine with the design the way it is.

Chair Fox stated her comments included the ability to have the other color on such a big building was good. She had concerns about having this much glass block wall without interruption, but after double-checking it with Pittsburgh-Corning the applicant was right on it with the correct maximum of 144 sq. ft. The plans didn't show dimensions but only 144 sq. ft. was allowed. If there were breakups in the wall it might change the aesthetics. She also agreed that as a suggestion the current winding path should be straight.

Mr. Jepson replied they would make the path straight.

Chair Fox agreed with her colleagues about the southwest corner concerns discussed earlier, and agreed Committee Member Imboden's solution was a good one.

Chair Fox continued and stated she agreed that the walkway along the side of the building should stay as a concrete walkway to help with the narrowness of the driveway so it's not all drive; water would be a concern if landscaped in this area. Also, since the bulkheads were being wrapped a bit on both ends, leaving it like this was okay as it was mitigating some of the unsightliness of that façade. Lastly, she was okay with the doctor's office to have a door to the outside. Chair Fox asked Committee Member McCormack if the number of Flax should be reconsidered since they would get too big.

Committee Member McCormack replied that the number and design was okay but to change the variety of Flax because what they have will be too wide for the space. There are Flaxes of varying widths and colors.

Mr. Jepson confirmed it was the New Zealand Flax.

Committee Member McCormack stated not to use the Sundowner as currently shown on the plans as it gets too wide.

Chair Fox confirmed with Mr. Jepson that the applicant would change the species/variety of Flax to a smaller width.

Chair Fox asked Committee Members Woollett and Wheeler for their comments about the walkway along the side and the curvy path.

Committee Member Woollett agreed the path should be straight. He also stated the bulkhead was fine. Regarding the sidewalk along the east side, it was okay, although he didn't like to see concrete right up against a stucco wall.

Chair Fox asked about getting rid of the bollard and adjusting the landscape along the southeast corner.

Committee Member Woollett stated he wouldn't comment on these two items.

Committee Member Wheeler agreed it was a good idea to move the plant out further on the southeast corner and remove the bollards; concrete was fine along the driveway side; and he was okay with a straight or curved walkway. He also reiterated that he thought the applicant did a wonderful job.

Mr. Jepson thanked Staff and the Committee Members for all of their assistance.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had two more issues. Regarding wheel stops, since everything was zero elevation, no 6-inch curb, he stated there should be a note on the plans showing that wheel stops should be relocated to conform to the new parking layout for safety reasons. Also, he asked what was going to happen to the storage container currently on the south side.

Mr. Jepson replied they would revise the plans to show where the wheel stops should go. Also, he indicated that the storage container was only there for immediate file purposes and would be removed once construction was completed; there was a comment about the storage container removal already on the plans.

Ms. Nguyen added that there was already a condition in the Staff Report about the applicant having to apply for a TUP if they wanted to keep the storage container.

Committee Member McCormack confirmed with Mr. Jepson the space would be a parking space once the container was removed.

Chair Fox made a motion to recommend approval to the Zoning Administrator for DRC No. 4650-12, Cambridge Medical Plaza, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report, except to delete the second paragraph in Finding 3 on page 6 of the Staff Report as it no longer applies; and with the following additional conditions:

- The curvy path from the door on the north façade shall be changed to a straight path that goes out to the sidewalk.
- The bollard in the southeast corner of the building in that location shall be removed; and that in the landscaping, the plant nearest to that corner shall be shifted east.

- The Sundowner flax variety shown on sheet L1 shall be changed to a variety that grows to a smaller width, and the applicant can still place the plants as drawn on the plans.
- Sheet L1 shall clarify where the existing Palm is to be removed and relocated to, and shall also clarify where the existing Palm is to remain.
- The wheel stops shall be relocated for the new parking layout.

Committee Member Imboden asked for a modification to the conditions regarding the glass block wall: to make it a condition that if the applicant finds that the material is not capable of spanning the width, that the overall width shall be reduced.

Mr. Jepson replied that they would encroach on either side; they would just reduce the size of the wall and not introduce another structural component.

Chair Fox added one more condition regarding the glass block wall as follows:

- That if the glass block [wall] cannot be installed as drawn on the north elevation, it would shrink from the sides and shall not add additional structural component inside the panel.

Committee Member Wheeler added the following suggestion:

- That if the roofing is replaced, to do what is possible to consolidate the plumbing vents on the north, especially on the northwest of the building.

Ms. Nguyen asked if they would like to add gravel to the north side of the building, between the planter and bulkhead to push the irrigation out.

Mr. Jepson stated the intent is to fully remove and relocate any of the existing irrigation element. He asked if it was appropriate to note in the conditions that there's gravel between the building and the sprinkler.

Chair Fox added to the conditions:

- The gravel buffer shall be installed on the north side of the building between the landscaping and the new bulkheads.
- All of these conditions shall be incorporated into the plans prior to building permit.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Committee Member Wheeler asked Ms. Nguyen to make a change in the March 20, 2013 final minutes for this project on page 14, third paragraph from the bottom: change "plum" to "plumb."

(3) DRC No. 4665-12 – MARYWOOD PUMP STATION

- A proposal to demolish the existing Marywood Pump Station and construct a new pump station building, emergency generator/enclosure, and electrical transformer/enclosure on a 5,228 square foot City easement (currently a landscaped hillslope).
- 1815 E. Villa Real Drive
- Staff Contact: Jennifer Le, 714-744-7238, jle@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the City Council

Chair Fox stated that this item will be continued to the August 21, 2013 DRC meeting.

Committee Member Imboden made a motion to continue at the applicant's request DRC No. 4665-12, Marywood Pump Station.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(4) DRC No. 4692-13 – LETNER ROOFING CO.

- A proposal to conduct a façade remodel of the east (street facing) elevation of two on-site buildings and a façade remodel to all elevations to the northernmost building on the site.
- 1490 N. Glassell Street
- 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 Wheeler confirmed with Staff that the landscaping plan will not be a part of this submittal but it will be brought back later under a separate submittal.

The applicant's representative, Terry Jacobson, J7Architecture, address on file, introduced the applicant, Dennis Olson, President of Letner Roofing. Mr. Jacobson said the applicant was doing improvements to the property in phases; cleaning it up and getting it organized. They brought color boards to show physical samples and he explained in detail the proposed finished colors for the exterior plaster, and the other materials being proposed for the storefront and surrounds, canopies, skylight, green screen, etc.

Chair Fox commented to the applicant how much she appreciated the improvements and effort they were making to the site in this industrial area.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett asked for a description of the shadow box around the windows, specifically the dimensions for the width and depth; and the sill.

Mr. Jacobson replied that for the depth, it would stick out from the building about 4 inches. The width would be about 8 inches surrounding the windows. The sill would be continuous and fully clad in aluminum.

Committee Member Woollett asked if that would stand off the siding or was there actually a hole in the siding that it would go through.

Mr. Jacobson replied that in most cases it occurred on the plaster. Referencing the plans and photo, he showed the detail in the siding that occurs, not only where the canopy occurs but also over the windows.

Committee Member Woollett confirmed with Mr. Jacobson that when it's at the stucco, it's applied to the stucco by a surface-applied metal trim that would go around it.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the integrated metal parapet cap with decorative edge metal was the similar kind of treatment.

Mr. Jacobson replied yes, that this was introduced to conceal and wrap an existing masonry protrusion.

Committee Member Imboden asked how would they make the corner in terms of the seam, what does it do at grade, and what does it do going away from the street.

Mr. Jacobson replied, referencing the plans, that in the opposite corner the turn down is in plane with the wall that protrudes out to Glassell Street but is flush with the other side. He agreed there needed to be a reveal between the metal and the plaster.

Committee Member Imboden confirmed with Mr. Jacobson that the corners would be mitered and it was then held up at grade.

Mr. Jacobson replied that Letner Roofing has a division that deals in architectural metals so the company was, in a way, "celebrating" this in the design.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that what the applicant was doing was fantastic and an improvement. He commented, however, that the drawings seemed to be lacking in detail. He asked if the metal was wrapping around the building the same as the other one.

Mr. Jacobson replied yes, the metal was wrapping around but not going quite as far because of the windows that are there. He agreed with Committee Member Wheeler that the windows were close to the corner, so they were looking into that as to how far they could go around.

Committee Member Wheeler confirmed with Mr. Jacobson that they were considering wrapping it further and cutting windows into it as an option.

Committee Member Wheeler also confirmed with Mr. Jacobson that the façade was an applied element that attached directly to the CMU; that it goes up higher than the current parapet with a finish but no wrap back. Also, they are almost in the same plane but the vertical member would stick out to make the transition.

Mr. Jacobson agreed with Committee Member Wheeler to consider bringing it out further to get more of a mass feeling.

Chair Fox also asked about the plane change and confirmed that the end would not return back over the parapet.

Committee Member Wheeler confirmed with Mr. Jacobson that they were infilling and moving the windows on the north elevation. Details of the doors and windows were discussed.

Committee Member Wheeler asked about signage.

Mr. Ortlieb confirmed that this building complex would not have a sign program; the signs/signage would just be subject to the regular sign codes. However, the DRC could comment on the signage at this meeting and such comments could then apply for the future permit.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the signs were nicely done.

Chair Fox confirmed with Mr. Jacobson that the lettering was out on the edge of the canopy.

Committee Member Wheeler confirmed with Mr. Jacobson that the landscape plans would return to the DRC at a later time. It was also confirmed that the existing stone would come off; the screen block would go away, along with removal of continuous planters; and the concrete masonry eyebrow would be removed.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was concerned about the setback requirements. He asked if all the details shown on the plans, plus the DRC comments, were really buildable due to the required setbacks. There could be a possibility of this design not ending up the way the DRC was looking at it today.

Mr. Jacobson replied that the existing canopy profiles were not any greater in depth than currently exists.

Committee Member Imboden stated the canopies were architectural elements that are allowed, but if the face of the building was brought out, they should make sure it's buildable.

Committee Member Woollett stated there were Administrative Adjustments (AA) that could be made for setbacks; even if the existing walls were right on the setback, it could probably still be allowed.

Committee Member Imboden stated everything that the applicants have done looked great. He just wanted to be sure it wouldn't end up being a "water-downed" version of what was being reviewed. Also, he stated the signage looked fine.

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed the project looked great. Regarding the landscape plans, he suggested making the site plan larger and readable when it does return for DRC review, including details about the ground plane and soil space. He also mentioned to pay attention to electrical and site lighting. He went on to discuss details about the placement of the A/C unit and the appropriate screening to conceal the A/C.

Mr. Jacobson stated they were raising one parapet to align with the other in order to address this concern.

Committee Member McCormack stated that doing green screens was tough on south and west exposures. Green screens in pots tended to bake in warm/hot weather; the soil heats up, and the plants die without plant material and a watering program to account for these conditions. A permanent green screen in a planting area is preferred. He stated these items would be discussed in detail when the DRC reviewed the landscape plans.

Mr. Ortlieb stated he was hesitant about having the landscape plan return by itself for DRC review; it would have to be in association with something else. There was discussion about this by the Committee Members.

Chair Fox commented that the landscaping was such an integral part of the façade treatment that it seemed the DRC could condition the landscaping to return for review.

Mr. Ortlieb replied installing/changing out landscaping didn't require building permits so they would have to find something to tie it in with.

Committee Member McCormack commented that roofing drains, scuppers, landscape pots/elements, etc. should all be considered in thinking of the landscape, hardscape, and the site; everything should work together.

Chair Fox confirmed with the applicants that the corner would return for some distance. Also, it was confirmed the building would be painted; and other buildings would be painted or demolished in phases.

There was further discussion between Chair Fox and Mr. Jacobson, confirming on the plans the location of the infill areas, the material changes, and how far the canopies would stick out.

Chair Fox asked the other Committee Members if there were any conditions for this project.

Committee Member Wheeler replied they had discussed the landscaping returning to the DRC.

Committee Member Imboden discussed the details of the parapets and returns; the stucco ones returning but not the metal ones. He stated for this project, he was okay with the way it was.

Committee Member Wheeler agreed and stated it was being treated as a false front and not trying to suggest it was something else.

There was more discussion among the Committee Members and the applicants about the conditions for the returns, landscape and hardscape plans, and the A/C unit.

Mr. Ortlieb stated again that he was hesitant about mandating the applicant to bring the landscape plan back for DRC review unless they were willing to agree to do so prior to final inspection.

The Committee Members confirmed with the applicants that they agreed to bring the landscape plan back for DRC review prior to final sign-off; however, they wouldn't have to implement the landscape plan now.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4692-13, Letner Roofing Co., subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report, and with the following additional conditions:

- The landscape and hardscape plans shall be submitted to the DRC for review prior to final inspection by the Building Division.
- The raised parapet on the southeast corner of Building B extend back from the front façade towards the rear, with a minimum of 10 feet.
- The proposed raised parapet and horizontal siding material on the north elevation of Building B extend back "a distance to be determined" by the coordination of the siding with the existing windows in that location, with a minimum of 4 feet.
- The signage, if submitted for approval to Staff is usually consistent with the signage shown on the drawings, the DRC would be in favor of that design.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on August 7, 2013.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.