CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES - FINAL

07 January 2009

Committee Members Present:	Bill Cathcart Adrienne Gladson Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett
Committee Members Absent:	None
Staff in Attendance:	Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Anne Fox, Contract Staff Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

The Committee met for an Administrative Session beginning at 5:20 p.m.

Chair Wheeler opened the discussion with a review of the Agenda.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there was nothing additional for the Agenda. In regard to policy and procedural information there was a new application form for Land Use and they would continue to accept old ones. The application had a few errors and there would be some minor changes to the form in the future. The form was longer, however, it was meant to be more user-friendly. Rather than all the required information being detailed in a paragraph there was a check list, which made the form longer. The hope was that when someone was preparing their package they could simply go through the check list to verify what was necessary for submission. The form was on line for their review and she would welcome comments the Committee Members might have or comments heard from applicants. There was also a section for water quality issues.

Committee Member Cathcart stated he had discussion for a possible future meeting regarding tree quantity requirements.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she had received an email from Committee Member Cathcart regarding the City's tree requirement and they could table that for discussion at a future DRC Meeting. There was much discussion about the budget and they would not have the ability to fund many projects and that included code amendments. They were attempting to look into issues such as the tree count and find ways within their abilities to solve those issues. They could schedule a discussion for the next DRC Meeting.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the General Plan Update would be pushed back with regard to the budget issues?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she had not thought that to be the case. Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, had been working on the final revisions and it was moving forward with the intent to

complete that. Monies for that purpose had been encumbered. There might be delays in some of the zoning updates.

Committee Member McCormack asked in regard to a round table discussion, were there specific items that would be discussed and could they have some bullet items that would be discussed.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she could certainly pull together an Agenda. The main issue being the formula used to arrive at the number of trees to be used on a site and the placement of the trees. In many instances the number of trees out numbered the number of trees that could be counted and sustained. The number was in the code and in the landscape standards, however, the standards also contained language that the standard was a benchmark and they were attempting to clarify that.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was a connection with open space on a parcel?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated not on commercial or industrial property.

Committee Member Cathcart stated particularly on properties with zero lot lines, the perimeter of the building and lot line were considered separately in the formula and in order for the formula to work the space needed to be substantial and in some instances it would not work.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated they had many discussions at a Staff level regarding the same issue and if they could move through changes through a code amendment they would want to do that, or it could be a possibility to move through it in the landscape standards with the Committee's discretion and formulate a policy. The standards contained some flexibility.

Contract Planner, Anne Fox, stated that there were only one or two zoning districts where the formula was actually codified; resulting in variances but the latitude would be contained in the benchmark area.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session. Administrative Session adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

SECOND: Joe Woollett
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett, Craig Wheeler
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

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 was none.

CONSENT ITEMS:

All matters that are announced as Consent Items are considered to be routine by the Design Review Committee and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of said items unless members of the Design Review Committee, staff or the public request specific items to be removed from the Consent Items for separate action.

---

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4303-07 – BULLOCK RESIDENCE

- A proposal to expand the living area of a contributing 1910 Bungalow, including adding a matching dormer, new rear porch, several smaller pop-out additions, and a fully habitable 768 sq. ft. basement with bathroom.
- 373 South Grand Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Dan Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Item Continued from the August 20, 2008 DRC Meeting
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Chair Wheeler stated he had spoken with Senior Planner, Dan Ryan, regarding the packet that the DRC members had received and that the packet had not contained the front elevation or floor plan. He had asked that Mr. Ryan put together a complete packet and asked the applicant if he had received those drawings.

Applicant, Bill Bullock, stated he had given all elevations and floor plan drawings to Staff.

Chair Wheeler asked the applicant if he had any further information?

Mr. Bullock stated during the previous meeting they were pretty much dialed in and he had made the recommended changes. He presented two options and he was fine with either one. He had chosen an option with the dormer sitting on an exterior wall. He presented the plans to the Committee. The second option contained the dormer set back in, as it existed.

Public Comment

Janet Crenshaw, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated she had a few questions. She stated she could not find a front elevation and asked if the north and south dormers showed different vents and wondered what they were attempting to match? She had not remembered what the proposed roof style for the porch was and asked for clarification on the design. The Committee Members had, in previous projects, recommended that the dormers not be even with the roof ridge and she could not tell if that was the case in the proposed project.

Chair Wheeler opened the item for discussion.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she had the elevations from the previous submittal and presented those to the Committee Members.
Chair Wheeler asked what were the plans for the vents?

Mr. Bullock stated he had shown two options to allow the Committee Members to advise him of which ones they preferred. There was a window that was offset; an aluminum slider and he would add a vent there. He had driven around the neighborhood and had designed the vents to match ones that he had found.

Chair Wheeler stated regarding whether the dormer should extend to the ridge, there was discussion regarding floating dormers; however, the existing dormer went to the ridge.

Mr. Bullock stated the existing dormer went to the ridge.

Committee Member Woollett stated he felt the Committee had been fairly consistent regarding the dormers and he had not remembered if they had spoken about the ridge connection on the dormers. They normally dropped that a foot or so.

Chair Wheeler stated the existing dormer went to the ridge.

Mr. Bullock stated it had been discussed.

Chair Wheeler felt the dormer could go to the ridge.

Committee Member McCormack asked what the roof material was?

Mr. Bullock stated it was asphalt shingle.

Chair Wheeler stated he agreed with Committee Member Woollett that the inset dormer was better and they would not be adding to it. It was a toss up and they would not require that the window be changed, or the trim be changed to be more historic or to add mitered corners to the dormer. The proposed project would have different dormers. If they allowed the applicant to extend the dormer it would need to meet current requirements and encouraged the inset dormer.

Committee Member Woollett stated there should not be vents on the dormers.

Chair Wheeler suggested that the vents be removed.

Committee Member Gladson stated that she agreed the dormers should be inset.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the front elevation showed that the north was out and the south dormer was in?

Committee Member Gladson stated she had the original set of drawings and it had shown that detail.

Committee Member Woollett stated they needed to remain consistent.

Chair Wheeler stated he had put together some additional conditions, one being that the dormers shall be inset. Conditions 1-4 were already contained in the Staff Report and he read the additional proposed conditions:

5. New exterior siding to match original lower floor in material, texture and corner treatment.
6. New roof rafters at the enlarged porch and new dormer match existing as closely as possible with modern lumber sizes with care taken to respect existing differentiation between barge boards and intermediate exposed rafters.
7. New barge extension at gable ends to be framed in the traditional manner without the use of flat outlookers.
8. New windows to be of wood construction to match existing.
9. New exterior opening trim to match existing as used on the original lower floor.
10. Eliminate vents on dormers.

Committee Member Gladson asked if a landscape plan was required?

Committee Member McCormack stated that a landscape and hardscape plan would need to be submitted and asked the applicant if there was a hardscape plan and suggested the applicant use some type of simple scoring on the hardscape areas to tie the new areas in with the existing concrete.

Mr. Bullock stated the Committee had suggested standard gray and that was what he intended to use.

Chair Wheeler stated a condition could be added to use simple scoring on the hardscape.

Chair Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval on option #2, DRC No. 4303-07, Bullock Residence, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the additional conditions:

5. New exterior siding to match original lower floor in material, texture and corner treatment.
6. New roof rafters at the enlarged porch and new dormer match existing as closely as possible with modern lumber sizes with care taken to respect existing differentiation between barge boards and intermediate exposed rafters.
7. New barge extension at gable ends to be framed in the traditional manner without the use of flat outlookers.
8. New windows to be of wood construction to match existing.
9. New exterior opening trim to match existing as used on the original lower floor.
10. Eliminate vents on dormers.
11. Simple scoring be added to hardscape.

SECOND:	Adrienne Gladson
AYES:	Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4209-07 – CHOC MASTER PLAN (PRESENTATION ONLY)

- A proposal to expand the existing hospital facilities and associated medical offices implemented in three construction phases. The project site encompasses the entire CHOC hospital properties on both the north and south sides of La Veta. However, the primary focus of the project is to increase the number of hospital beds to 404 by the year 2020, through the addition of 425,524 sq. ft. identified as the South Tower, and the remodel of 54,250 sq. ft. of the existing North Tower, including related site improvements to landscaping and parking areas. The existing 91,000 sq. ft. medical offices and related parking structure at the northwest corner of La Veta and Pepper would be demolished in order to facilitate this portion of the project construction.
- 455, 505, 541, & 557 South Main Street, and 1201 La Veta Avenue
- Staff Contact: Anne Fox, 714-744-7229, afox@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: None; receive and file project presentation only

---

Committee Member Cathcart recused himself from the presentation as his firm was the landscape firm on the project.

Contract Staff Planner, Anne Fox, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report. She stated that the project was a preview of a project that the City had been working on with the applicant for some time and was being presented to the DRC to familiarize them with the proposal. The purpose of the preview was to receive feedback from the DRC on any areas that needed clarification on the plans, they wanted to steer clear of any commentary from the Committee Members that would indicate or imply an approval or denial or potential conditions. The Draft Environmental Impact Report was circulated prior to the holiday break and was available on the City's website and at the Public Library. CHOC implemented some community outreach and would continue to do that. The proposed project was substantial.

Committee Member Gladson asked on the EIR was that for the entire project that went to 2020?

Ms. Fox stated yes, it took the item through 2020. The DRC would receive excerpts from the draft EIR.

Applicant, Fred Talarico, address on file, stated they had a number of their staff members present to answer questions the Committee Members might have. He introduced his team. The project was complex and long range and would be built over multiple years. There were 5 components to the project, remodeling of the north tower, building of a new south tower, remodeling of the CHOC Commerce Center, building of a new medical office building and the entire project would be tied together with a Master Landscape Plan. It would occur in 3 phases over several years. The end result being an incredible building that matched the community architecture for the children.

Applicant, Waldo Romero, address on file, stated he was the V.P. of Design and Construction for CHOC and stated he wanted to articulate why they were present – beyond bricks and mortar. They had a purpose in the community and that was to serve the children of the community and the greater community. They wanted to continue their mission and philosophy by extending that ability through their design. They benefited from the DRC's time by gaining feedback and input to allow them to continue to partner with the City, he felt they had a strong relationship with the City and wanted to continue that relationship moving forward. He was the bottom line on the project and if they were not responding to the needs of the City he wanted to be made aware of that.

Applicant, Paul Gloriod, address on file, stated he was the Project Manager for the architectural team. He thought it might be useful to set some context on how the project was started. Between the years 1998 and 2006 the inpatient admissions at CHOC had increased in excess of 100%. CHOC initiated a strategic plan in 2004 that led to a Facility Master Plan in 2005. Their services were retained in 2005. In October of 2005 they began validating a previous Master Plan to verify that they had sufficient data to begin the project. They were in pre-design through February of 2006. From February 2006 through June they completed the Master Plan Update that began their rethinking of the campus and they went through room by room programming and in schematics from June of 2006 to February of 2007. It had been a very lengthy and carefully drawn project. The primary drive behind the project that had come from the strategic initiatives evolved from the strategic plan along with the inpatient volume growth. The ultimate objective was to meet the pediatric demands of the community. To attempt to improve their recruiting and retention ability in a very competitive pediatric market nation wide and to reverse some of the out migration of high acuity patients.

Committee Member Woollett asked for an explanation of high acuity?

Mr. Gloriod stated high acuity would be the more critically ill patients that continued to go to Los Angeles and other areas for service. He stated the ultimate goal for CHOC was to become one of the top tier, nationally ranked pediatric facilities in the nation and ultimately evolve into a full scale trauma capable center. CHOC had been partnered with St. Josephs' hospital since its inception and they were primarily a bed hospital with the ancillary diagnostics, surgery, ER, radiology with all the core diagnostics being provided at St. Joseph's. The patients were moved back by tunnel to CHOC. The goal being to have CHOC be self sufficient and be able to recruit and retain the best talent they needed to become a self sufficient facility. When services were shared with a facility for adults and pediatrics they would never be able to gain the pediatric specialization to become a world class facility. Those were some of the guiding strategic initiatives that guided their work. As part of the bed analysis they concluded that by 2008 they needed 238 beds, which had been met through a six floor build up, by 2012 they would require 298 beds, and by 2020 the projection was 380 beds. That formed the core of the tower two project.

Mr. Gloriod stated they had been through hundreds of meetings. Meeting with nursing staff, medical staff, and as it involved many departments that had not existed; they also met with outside consultants. Programming took months to develop. There were 3-4 rounds of meetings with 25 different departments, and several rounds of schematic designs and development. Due to the complexity of the project they broke it up into 13 different permit requests, which had more

to do with OSHPOD than the City permits. OSHPOD was challenging, they had done a great job and were on schedule. They had submitted every major permit package to OSHPOD and they were well on the way of receiving the first major back check on the build out, which was the largest single component, within two days of the agreed schedule. OSHPOD was responsible for permitting the building itself and the content of the building.

Committee Member Woollett asked for an explanation of what level of permitting the applicant was at?

Mr. Gloriod stated they had submitted the excavation package, foundation portion, and they had reviewed the structural and building envelope packages, they were all in process of various stages of back checking. On the largest single component, which was the build out, which encompassed all of the interiors, they had just received their first comments two days ago.

Committee Member Woollett asked on the packages what phases had gone to OSHPOD?

Mr. Gloriod stated they were for tower two, the big tower. The first permit they would require would be for the demolition of the existing 1201 building, the garage, and he believed they were into the City now and contingent on the DRC's approval.

Committee Member Woollett stated if the packets had already been submitted to OSHPOD for construction document review they were essentially complete.

Mr. Gloriod stated no, as one of the conditions of OSHPOD's permitting was that they needed the City's notice of determination before their final approval. The problem with OSHPOD projects was that the actual window for review of a large project was 18 months. In order to get to their deadlines they had to work backwards in time, to get their plans submitted.

Committee Member Woollett stated if the Design Review Committee found that they were not pleased with the mass of the project it was too late. It was too late and why had they not reviewed the project 18 months ago?

Mr. Gloriod stated they had completed preliminary review with some of the Planning Departments. They had completed some informal presentations with this being the first presentation to the DRC.

Committee Member Woollett stated it had happened before and he understood that some of them had experience with hospitals so it was not brand new. He knew it was a very involved process and they had worked with OSHPOD before and certainly a project of its size entailed all the meetings the applicant had spoken about and researched.

Mr. Gloriod stated the bed capacity and size was driven by what it would take to support the community. In terms of building size it was driven by what CHOC needed to support its goal. Why it had not been brought to the DRC earlier he could not speak to. He understood in 2005 that 16 other sites had been evaluated with the conclusion that the community would be best served keeping it in the same location. There had been some strategic moves that needed to take place, the building at 1201 on the corner of La Veta and Pepper Street that occupied a portion of

the building footprint and a parking garage, and both buildings needed to come down in order for the proposed project to occur on the site. There was a shared parking situation that had to be addressed with an attempt to move tenants and staff. They built a very large garage across La Veta as an anticipatory project to set the campus up to allow the demolition of the two story garage and solve growing parking demands and to set themselves up to keep the campus viable over the long haul. As they moved forward the sequence would be to tear down the 1201 building and move into excavation and there was another set of projects which was the lobby expansion and reorienting the doorway from the front of the building to have it face south.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had interrupted the presentation, and before the applicant continued, he wanted to share some background information. When documents and projects such as their proposed project had come before the DRC it really was a final, because when it came back it would be already approved by OSHPOD and they would not even be able to move a door two feet if they wanted to, and actually the presentation was not just a review – this was it, as sketchy as the documents were. With the project being in OSHPOD they had final construction drawings and they were way ahead of where they would be even with a small project, much less one that had the impact of the one before them, on the City of Orange.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated from the City's viewpoint and Staff's viewpoint that the applicant had obligations to OSHPOD and the City. The City, just because it was a hospital, would not mean that it would not go through the same review plan. The environmental work was still necessary and it would not be built until the EIR was certified and the design was approved by the DRC, recommended to the Planning Commission and recommended to City Council.

Committee Member Woollett stated they were reviewing preliminary drawings, when there were already complete drawings that were far more advanced. He asked the applicant if that was correct?

Mr. Gloriod stated yes that was correct.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was not stating the building had changed.

Mr. Gloriod stated the drawings were color versions of construction documents that were complete and Committee Member Woollett was correct.

Committee Member Woollett stated he wanted the Committee Members to understand as they may not have been through the process before.

Mr. Gloriod stated in the State of California OSHPOD was the only permitting body for hospitals and they were so stringent and had the longest lead permit issued.

Committee Member Woollett asked why had the preliminary drawings been brought before the DRC before their submission to OSHPOD.

Mr. Gloriod stated they had completed some of their preliminary reviews with the Planning Committee.

Committee Member Woollett stated they needed to be aware of what was really happening and unless he stated it, they were not.

Mr. Waldo asked Committee Member Woollett if his statement "that it had been happened before" if he was speaking specifically about CHOC or in general?

Committee Member Woollett was speaking about hospitals in that locality.

Mr. Waldo stated if it had been brought to their attention previously and they had not responded he needed to be made aware of that.

Committee Member Woollett stated the last large project that had come through from CHOC had come through with preliminary drawings that they had assumed were truly preliminary drawings and they had felt their review of them would have some meaning and affect what went into the construction documents and to OSHPOD. They were wrong, when the project had come back for the actual approval by the DRC, OSHPOD had already approved them. The DRC had concerns between the relationship of the old and new building that was not addressed. That was an offense to the City, as it made the statement that the reviews really had not meant anything. Granted the project was so substantial to the City of Orange and no one wanted to limit its progress, it was a wonderful project, he had not wanted to be part of a farce and that was what it came down to. He was insulted by that and believed his colleagues to be insulted as well.

Mr. Waldo stated the point was well taken.

Chair Wheeler stated he certainly had opinions that he formed in looking at the drawings but he could not understand how that could be done. Why weren't the opinions of the DRC asked for when it would have made a difference?

Mr. Waldo stated he could not speak to that and apologized for his organization and their team.

Committee Member Woollett stated the applicant had the right people and went through the right processes and it was admirable, and it was a terrific project.

Mr. Waldo stated the concerns were not taken lightly and understood what the comments represented as part of the process.

Committee Member Gladson stated on the flip side, without getting into any discussion on the merits of the project, the applicant takes a risk in moving ahead with OSHPOD and completing full construction drawings and if the DRC were to find something in a project that had a major issue the DRC had the discretionary authority to recommend to the Commission and ultimately the Council DRC concerns. She was not so convinced that they would not have an opportunity to suggest changes if they felt strongly about them, however, she had not lived through a CHOC project before.
Committee Member McCormack stated with that being said he asked the applicant what they had wanted to hear from the DRC.

Committee Member Woollett stated they had not wanted to hear anything they just wanted to go through the process.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had reviewed the drawings and he had some questions on a more global type approach which he had not heard yet in terms of the check list for urban design, about the year 2020 and transportation issues. All those things he was concerned with. The beds were important, but how would they be dealing with other issues such as environmental issues and had they touched on any of that. They had interrupted the presentation and possibly that information was forth coming. His question, as Committee Member Woollett had stated, was what had the applicant wanted from the DRC?

Committee Member Woollett wanted the applicant to realize where they were coming from and he felt the presentation might proceed differently.

Mr. Gloriod stated he would continue and give them enough of an overview of the project and his team would hope that they had completed the design well. Basically the design objectives and what was important to CHOC and the design team was that there was a campus that had multiple skins, multiple buildings and no campus symmetry and the new building was a different style. CHOC wanted a children's hospital that looked like a children's hospital without looking too thematic, without being too childish, but still recognized as a children's hospital. It was a challenge. They had picked up on some of the dominant materials that would remain on the left side of the campus that would be visible to the community and the building on the corner of main and La Veta was a concrete and stucco white building with the north tower being an off-white and blue glass building. The dominant glass color they proposed would be blue to attempt to relate the white buildings and the blue glass buildings together. There would be a total of 7 different colors of blue glass to make the design a bit more unique. They were challenged by the early reviews from the Planning Committee to not have a major entry point off of La Veta for traffic reasons and concerns, which forced them to reconfigure a modification of the building footprint on the site. They had also changed the drive approach from Pepper Street.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was interested in what they had proposed as they needed an obvious approach to the entrance.

Ms. Fox stated Mr. Gloriod had made reference several times to a Planning Committee and she wanted to clarify that it was the applicant's Staff Review Committee and not the City's Planning Commission.

Committee Member McCormack asked for clarification on the placement of the entrance?

Mr. Gloriod pointed the location out on the drawings. They had modified the front to move the entrance to bring traffic back under the building and allow drop off at the front with an egress exit only. They created a traffic circulation system with a new entry into the 5 story garage parking structure. There was also a 5 story tower elevator proposed with a connecting pedestrian bridge. The primary concourse area was located on level 2 of the building. He presented a side view of the drive and noted the fairly whimsical element in the canopy that undulated under the building and was visible from the intersection. The thought was that it would draw people

around and it would be a major entry point identifier. There was a two story space to allow for an open feeling.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the stair tower was primarily for egress?

Mr. Gloriod stated that was correct. It would be an emergency exit only. He pointed out the main entry and the proposed pedestrian walkways and described how they perceived people would move through the parking areas to the main building. The elevator was a design feature for the outside of the building. The bridges would match and there would be a stairway for a fire exit between the bridge and the building, due to the OSHPOD requirements for travel. The glass materials were matched to the existing campus, which were the most dominant materials on the site. The garage had hints of blue and they wanted to create a strong visual image. There was a corner of the building that would have night lighting. The attempt was to get people off La Veta, off Pepper, to the doorway and draw people under the building to the hospital entry.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there were any queuing elements along Pepper to give a visual of where people needed to go. He understood how the building worked and he understood the traffic issues involved with the site. He asked how they attempted to get people from the exit of the freeway to the entry? Where there any issues going to 2012 with City design plans, which the hospital would be coordinating with on the major streets.

Mr. Talarico stated they wanted to attempt to take pedestrians off of the street to move people. He pointed out some of the changes on the drawing that they proposed to alleviate stacking and to free up traffic at the signal. They had spent a lot of time planning on how a family with a father, mother and two children would get into the emergency room and they had analyzed that and he had data that detailed how they arrived at that. They had spent a lot of time with both their Traffic Engineer and the City's Traffic Engineer to attempt to find the best solution for bringing people in. Signage would be a part of that.

Ms. Fox asked if they were speaking of way finding in the public right of way?

Committee Member McCormack stated that was correct.

Ms. Fox stated there were street tree discussions and they were revisiting that and they would continue to discuss signage and way finding issues.

Committee Member McCormack stated he felt they had addressed pedestrian traffic; however, he was concerned with vehicular traffic issues.

Committee Member Gladson stated she would want to have the General Plan goals for the intersection and the Master Plan. She had believed the area was under a Master Plan.

Committee Member McCormack stated it had been stated that the vision was for CHOC to be a world class facility and for patients to not have to travel to Los Angeles. There needed to be a plan or concept and a goal to get people to a place where they had not been before. That was the challenge.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was interested in the plans for the inter-connection between all of the facilities in the area. There were so many aspects to the project.

Committee Member McCormack stated 9 years ago he worked on the Center Line Project and it had been going through that general area to connect Fullerton to Orange County Airport. There were many connections from Fullerton and when it arrived at Orange and Santa Ana the project was dropped. In looking forward to 2012, had the Center Line taken a silver bullet through the heart or would it ever come back. He wanted to ask the question of how they could make the design work for future planning. He did not have the solution, but just wanted to put the question out for future planning.

Mr. Talarico stated that many of the patients who came to the hospital arrived on public transportation busses.

Applicant, Stephanie Shermoen, address on file, stated she would be presenting the landscape elements and she would be identifying the individual spaces and then the unifying factors of the plan. She presented drawings and pointed out the existing areas and the new areas that they were proposing. Paving would be carried from the existing paving and carried throughout the landscape and walkway areas. Ground level planters would be added. There existed diamond planters around the existing Palm trees and the diamond shape would be continued throughout the landscape areas along with seating.

Committee Member Woollett asked who would be using the space?

Ms. Shermoen stated the employees of the facility and it could be used as a smoking area. When she had walked the site there had been approximately 6 women using the area for their lunch break and she was told they had no other place to go and they asked for a water feature. The seating was pushed toward the center of the space. The most prominent feature of the proposed project was the driveway paving feature. It was a wave feature that had been prepared by the interior designers. It was a dominating factor and she presented some preliminary drawings. The area would be animated, but not over the top, and the waves would invite people in. There were bubbles also designed into the pattern which would flow through the design. There would be integrated colors in the concrete. The wave pattern and color, which was blue, would connect to the sidewalk and ultimately to the planter areas with a mow curb. The driveway and sidewalk areas would be colored concrete with the bubbles consisting of some type of a shell or plastic material to make the bubbles stand out.

Ms. Shermoen stated in the landscape areas throughout the proposed project there would be seating areas for people to wait or employees to break. There would be spheres strategically placed throughout the project which would be painted red and glow at night. The Kids At Play sculpture would be relocated to a central area on the corner. A water feature would be used in the seating area off the main walkway and a dry river rock stream bed would be used in various areas of the project. She pointed out the areas she spoke about. There were constraints with regard to the underground utilities, however, they had added as much as they could. In the upper terrace areas, in the dining area they proposed the use of architectural pavers and the seating areas would have a wood decking material. There would be various seating areas.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the upper terrace area interfaced with tower two?

Mr. Gloriod stated level two was predominantly a public floor and it was laid out to accommodate those needs.

Chair Wheeler asked if they had completed any solar studies on the terrace areas?

Mr. Gloriod stated they had completed sun angle studies for the entire campus. The terrace areas were shaded a lot. He point out the areas he spoke about.

Chair Wheeler asked if the studies took into account the reflectivity of the north building?

Mr. Gloriod stated they had looked at the reflectivity and those studies were available if the Commissioners were interested in reviewing those.

Committee Member McCormack asked how the landscape concept of the terrace dealt with the sun/shade issue?

Ms. Shermoen stated the plant material would need to be shade adaptable, there would be a lot of green and texture. The area would be shaded most of the time.

Committee Member McCormack stated in terms of the trees in that situation he recommended all deciduous, not evergreen.

Ms. Shermoen stated there were vertical elements all along the area and they wanted mid level range plantings to break it up and they would be working with the best plant materials that would work in the spaces.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had experience with another terrace area and what had occurred was a disconnect between the design to the construction drawings. All light weight soil had been placed on the project. Light weight soil was organic and over the course of a year it volatized and just disappeared. All the trees settled and all the shrubs and plantings sunk down. The project had been originally sized for real soil. He recommended that the applicant verify the type of soil that would be used to avoid any future problems.

Committee Member Gladson stated regarding the landscape design concept, to link the two non-contiguous sides they would be using similar concrete, seating and decorative walls.

Ms. Shermoen stated she wanted to get back to the unifying point of the project. She pointed out an area for a future donor participation water feature. There would be a screen wall that would act as a privacy wall to the hospital rooms and as a block to some of the parapet walls. They would use green screens. There would be trees in pots on foundations. She pointed out an area on the drawings that would be used as an assembly area and stated there would be a wooden platform with seating areas along the space. They had initially looked at installing a piece of play equipment in one of the landscape areas, however, decided on the use of cast concrete bears that were fairly light weight, which worked as an art piece and could be used by the children for climbing.

Committee Member McCormack asked what was proposed for lighting?

Ms. Shermoen stated lighting and signage would be presented in another package. They planned on using lighting under the benches and up lights on the plants and some basic landscape lighting.

Mr. Gloriod stated it was important to keep the light levels low in consideration of the patients.

Committee Member Woollett asked about the use of an area he pointed to on the drawings?

Mr. Gloriod stated the area would serve a dual function, to host events and for general use it would be used for family members. He stated that a potential donor opportunity had recently been presented that might allow them to add another stage area.

Committee Member Woollett stated the reason he asked the question, was that during the time children were hospitalized family members would spend a great deal of time at the facility. He felt that was an area that people could use.

Mr. Talarico stated there were also family amenities available inside the facility.

Mr. Gloriod stated that most people arriving by vehicle would enter the building on level two. Level two contained a public lobby space, a chapel, library and meditation space. The first floor of the building would contain the Emergency Room and services, a lobby and the Radiology Department. There were separate public and private elevators. On level two, the east side would contain a future Administrative Suite, a teen room and a very large waiting area, There was a two story opening between the first and second floor to visually connect the two lobbies. There would be reception areas on both floors to direct people and way finding. The two bridges would intersect at a reception point when exiting the bridge. The dining area was located on level two. Level two also would contain medical staff offices, two dining facilities and an exercise space. Registration was on the first floor off of the main lobby doors. The third floor, east side, would contain surgery, waiting areas, pre-op, and a minimal procedure suite. The left side would be a major operating suite that would include robotics OR, 4 conventional OR's, with central sterile elevators, and a post anesthesia room. There was an elevator bank that moved vertically through the building with a trauma capable 10' x 10' platform. The new tower at its total height would be 30' taller than the existing bed tower. One full floor was higher and the screen walls went up 17' to hide the mechanical equipment, they would be completely screened on all sides. The elevator would be capable of reaching the helistop. Currently the travel distance from the helistop was quite lengthy. The new design would enable patients to go directly from the helistop directly to the Emergency Room or surgery.

Ms. Shermoen stated getting back to the family space; they had variations of seating space from large to medium to small. The smaller spaces could be used for more quite time and the larger spaces for families.

Committee Member McCormack stated many times siblings, or small children were not allowed into the hospital rooms, and asked for children 10 and under were there any features that would attract younger users?

Ms. Shermoen stated they had not addressed it down to that level. They had attempted to address families with children in the medium seating areas that would allow children to move around, as well as the use of the continual walkways.

Mr. Romero stated there had been reference regarding a future donor that was interested in introducing music to the children and provide an environment and instruments to entertain children while they were waiting.

Committee Member McCormack suggested adding some type of educational element to the space as well. The landscape architect could provide the proper armature to allow that to happen.

Mr. Gloriod stated the interior spaces provided some activities for children and it would be beneficial to look at the outdoor spaces.

Ms. Shermoen stated there were 5 main unifying factors. The biggest punch would be in the street trees. They would be using Palm trees, as Queen Palms were already established. There were a few that were not looking very well and those would be removed. The City had voiced their opinion that they had not wanted any more Queen palms. To beef up the Palm plantings they proposed the use of Washingtonias, there would be a big repetitive factor between the trees. They would be used along La Veta and Main Street.

Committee Member McCormack asked how the landscape would relate to Main Street as it left the site?

Ms. Shermoen stated King Palms were used on the other side of Chapman and there were different locations of Kings and Queens.

Committee Member McCormack stated if the tone was set for Main Street the City could buy into it, or the City could set the tone and the applicant could buy into it, or they could both ignore each other and do whatever they wanted. He was from the design aesthetic that everyone should get on the same page and have a unifying theme. He suggested that the overture to the City be made to come up with a plan. If they had not wanted to go that route, then to have their landscape stand out.

Mr. Gloriod stated he would want their project to be part of a bigger street scape.

Committee Member McCormack stated that was the intention, not to just throw something out there that would not match the other side of the street or the length of street that would tie into it.

Committee Member Woollett stated that was the issue, there was a campus that was separated from itself and they could use the landscape elements to unify the components. It was a challenge.

Mr. Talarico stated one of the goals was to make a statement, that people had arrived in Orange and that the area was something special and use a design that made a statement.

Committee Member Woollett stated the applicant would not only want to be more concerned with arrival in the City, they would want the statement made to people that they were in the vicinity of CHOC.

Mr. Talarico stated to play off that, not only would they want it known that the area was CHOC, but to also identify CHOC amongst all the other medical buildings and services along La Veta.

Committee Member McCormack stated if the concept was a campus, the design trick would be how to have La Veta and Pepper look like interior roads although they were not. Many times landscape, signage and jewelry of the landscape could help to achieve that end. Those elements could happen along the street scape. He suggested that approach and to use the landscape elements to achieve that goal. If the applicant was not going to coordinate the landscape with City landscape, the proposed project could incorporate a unique and strong vocabulary on the site that would be recognized as driving through CHOC and St. Josephs.

Committee Member Gladson stated that could be the biggest challenge. They needed to get people entering the hospital to Pepper Street and also to incorporate elements along La Veta and Pepper that would acknowledge that people would be on the campus.

Chair Wheeler stated if there was a vocabulary of trees on the CHOC campus and it was carried along Main Street and interspersed with the trees along Main Street it could achieve that result.

Ms. Shermoen stated the Queen Palm trees already existed and were used as a street tree along Main Street and across the street there were some Washingtonias. The materials of the Palm trees and the Washingtonias would be integrated into the campus landscape. They would be beefing up the tree quantity and intermingling both species.

Committee Member Gladson stated as they were looking at the project from a twenty year scheme the building at Main and La Veta should have the tower and she understood the struggle with wanting the tower at Pepper. There almost needed to be a phase in the project that dealt with Main Street.

Mr. Gloriod stated the long term goal would be to build the ambulatory care center and the next domino for the future. That would open up the next checker board for the tower.
Committee Member Gladson stated she would want to understand the backside and the Pepper side of the project when it would be brought back formerly. They had spent almost an hour and a half talking about the main entrance and she wanted to understand the plans for other entrances.

Mr. Gloriod stated in moving the front door and parking access there would not be any other public entrances. He pointed out the Staff access on the plans. When the Emergency Department was opened they would have the ambulances move around and allow that former emergency access to become a loading dock.

Committee Member Woollett asked what would take place in the CHOC Commerce Tower?

Mr. Romero stated there were three components in that existing tower; there were administrative services, general office use and medical use. The long term plan would be to build out the Commerce tower to as much medical use as they could build out and conform to the City Codes. When the hospital was complete they would require those additional medical offices.

Mr. Talarico stated their application listed that 40% of the Commerce Tower would be medical offices.

Ms. Fox stated the building was part of the overall project and what was being evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report. All the changes would be interior to that site; however, it was still a part of the project.

Mr. Talarico stated that many of the services that were presented for use at the new site were services that had not existed, and many had not existed in Orange County. A dedicated children's facility for the high end services that were required was what was driving the project and they never wanted to loose sight of that goal. They wanted to bring to the community a world class facility.

Committee Member Gladson stated the DRC had an opportunity to focus on all the visual things and allowed the Planning Commission to deal with the traffic and air quality issues and the more complicated issues. She asked if they had received any input from the neighborhood?

Mr. Talarico stated there would be 2 Community Meetings over the next few weeks. They had sent out noticing with the intent to gather community input. They had also spoken with local businesses. The Planning Commission would also hear how they attempted to keep two hospitals open during construction.

Chair Wheeler stated he was able to grasp a better understanding from the colored renderings as it had been hard to get a feel from the black and white submittals. He had concerns regarding the relationship between the existing and new structures and he had a better understanding how they proposed to do that. He recommended bringing in more color to the north tower to tie the buildings together.

Mr. Gloriod stated they had discussions about adding color to the existing building. The annex of the building had a completely different architectural style. They had matched the glass where the two buildings met. On the elevator tower there was the same fenestration and line work to tie the two together. He presented a side elevation and stated they had attempted to pick up the same rhythm and massing of the buildings.

Chair Wheeler pointed out a form on the building that he visualized as a stack of children's blocks and asked for details on the lighting?

Mr. Gloriod stated they would be colored glass with translucent colored glass and had the same color effect during the day. At night there were overhead lighting sofets with colcatha bands behind screens to add the same glow.

Committee Member McCormack stated he appreciated the design on the building at the corner. The building was compatible and had good design features.

Mr. Gloriod stated the building had 3 different glass colors and it would bring some of the high tech whimsy to the building that had been used in the children's room. He pointed out the building stairway and explained to the Committee the proposed design.

Committee Member McCormack stated he noticed that at the stairwell and the elevator there was a handicapped designation and pointed out that there was no crosswalk access and he suggested that the applicant could explore the possibility of having a zero curb in that area. The Long Beach Aquarium had used the same concepts with bollards and it gave the sense that upon entering the zone, that it was a pedestrian zone. It gave the feel of driving as if on the sidewalk and would tend to slow traffic down. It would assist with traffic calming. He felt there could be an adult that wanted to move quickly through the parking structure area, or small children in the space and it would add to the safety factor. He suggested that they visit the Aquarium parking structure.

Mr. Romero stated he felt that was an excellent suggestion and they would consider it.

Chair Wheeler suggested adding something to the north tower. Some element that would reflect to the courtyard and add more natural light and add more warmth to the area.

Ms. Shermoen stated they proposed the use of reflectors in the concrete areas.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had worked on a project that had used LED lights. He stated that blue was the most expensive color to use in paving and suggested that they go with a darker color as it would fade over time. Glass would hold color; however, it was an expensive material to use. It could present a possible donor opportunity.

Ms. Shermoen stated there would be some contrasting colors used in the design.

Committee Member McCormack asked where the parking structure exit was?

Mr. Gloriod stated the exit was on Providence. He explained the traffic flow to the Committee Members. He appreciated all the suggestions and regretted that they had not had the conversations earlier when the designs were more preliminary. They had the pressure of getting the project submitted to OSHPOD. Architecturally if there was something that gave the Committee Members heartburn they would certainly consider the suggestions.

Chair Wheeler stated his suggestion was for the two buildings to be more compatible with color and some architectural features.

Mr. Gloriod stated they were working on that.

Chair Wheeler stated the new building had so many interesting forms and anything they could do to add some fun and playfulness would help the design. He requested that the non-rendered drawings be submitted when the item came back for their review.

Committee Member Woollett asked how would a person coming to the hospital for the first time understand where they needed to go upon entering the parking structure?

Mr. Romero stated there would be literature available.

Mr. Gloriod stated there was a way finding study underway. Public transportation would be included in that study.

Mr. Talarico stated they would work with the landscape architects to add elements to assist with way finding.

Committee Member Gladson stated she would want to review material samples.

Committee Member Woollett asked Staff what the next steps would be for the project?

Ms. Fox stated the draft environmental document was out for review. The schedule projected the item returning to the DRC with the first meeting in February, then to the Planning Commission and City Council shortly after that. The applicant was anxious to get through their approval process. The approvals through OSHPOD would also play a part in the time frame. There had also been public scoping meetings on the onset and the City had not received much response from the public and the agency response had been addressed in the environmental document. The project affected many agencies including Cal Trans, the City of Santa Ana and Orange and they had addressed utility and traffic concerns. Due to the length of time of construction there were traffic studies that had to be looked at. She felt the applicant had responded favorably to the City's requests and the idea for the DRC was to receive their feedback and she had hoped that they would have had materials available for their review.

Committee Member McCormack asked where the construction staging would occur?

Mr. Gloriod pointed out the area on the plans that would be used for staging.

The item had been presented for project review and there was no motion needed.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled meeting on Wednesday, January 21, 2009 at 5:00. The meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson
AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.