CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

21 January 2009

Committee Members Present:	Adrienne Gladson Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett
Committee Members Absent:	Bill Cathcart
Staff in Attendance:	Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Sonal Thakur, Assistant Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

The Committee met for an Administrative Session beginning at 5:05 p.m.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated that Committee Member Cathcart would not be present. He had wanted the discussion regarding the Landscape Standards during the Administrative Session; she had asked Committee Member Cathcart if he preferred that the discussion be held over until he was present. She asked Chair Wheeler if that would work; the discussion would be held at the next meeting until all members were present?

Chair Wheeler stated that would be fine.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated there was no other policy or procedural information to discuss.

Chair Wheeler opened the discussion with a review of the Agenda. The minutes were reviewed and corrections/changes were noted.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session. Administrative Session adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Member Cathcart was absent.

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: (a) December 3, 2008 (b) December 17, 2008

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to approve the minutes with corrections/changes noted in the Administrative Session.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4359-08 - FOUNTAIN CARE FAÇADE REMODEL

- A proposal to remodel the entry façade of an existing skilled nursing facility.
- 1835 West La Veta Avenue
- Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
- Item Continued from DRC Meeting of September 17, 2008
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Assistant Planner, Sonal Thakur, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Marisol Sanchez, address on file, stated the applicants felt that the DRC was not in understanding of the full scope of the project. The facility had gone through some interior renovations, which were shown on a diagram she presented to the Committee. They had begun with the interior and had started with the rooms and then other areas of the building interior. It had been only recently that they had begun looking at the exterior and the proposed façade remodel.

Applicant, Greg Maedo, address on file, stated he wanted the Design Review Committee Members to understand there was a considerable amount of money put into the project by the owner. There had been a ton of money put in the project already. The façade was only one portion of the project, the State required upgrades. Each increment of upgrades to the facility was driven by the amount that was reimbursable from the State. There had been approximately $600,000.00 to $700,000.00 spent on the project thus far and there were future plans for more upgrades in the works. The upgrades were completed in increments due to the reimbursement process. Most of the work was being completed in the interior, it happened that the portion that they were reviewing had touched the outside, and had been brought to the DRC for their input.

Applicant, Richard Escontrias, address on file, stated the building was very dynamic. With St. Joseph's doing the upgrades, they had an affiliation with St. Joseph's, and they had wanted to continue the quality of care during the transition. They had not only worked on interior upgrades, but also wanted to upgrade the exterior and to have it be beneficial for the community. There were also future plans for more improvements.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Wheeler opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he recalled during the initial review, his thinking had been that there were a number of significant issues between the two buildings and the addition had not helped the situation. He recalled that the paving at the site was so bad and broken up that if the

applicant would not complete any exterior renovations and just tore out the pavement and replaced that element it would be money well spent.

Mr. Maedo stated he thought that there was a plan to repave the parking lot.

Committee Member Woollett stated he felt that was the most important thing and there was not a notation regarding repaving on the proposed project. There was a considerable amount of exposed equipment across the way which was also a significant part of the overall unattractiveness of the area. If the money would be spent concealing the equipment and re-paving of the whole area that would be far more important to him.

Ms. Sanchez stated they had considered that area, covering the equipment on the other building with a screen.

Mr. Maedo stated the paving, concrete and landscape were continually being upgraded. It was much better currently, than it had been six months ago.

Chair Wheeler stated he had been some what conflicted on the project. He felt what they proposed to do was almost impossible to view from the public right of way and in that sense it would not hurt the surroundings. He objected to the false front and the utilization of a design that was so totally alien to what was currently there. It was obviously being placed on the building to hide or decorate the building. He suggested the applicant go back and look at a design that was keeping within the design of the building that existed and not put up a stage set in front of it. Since the building was not visible from the street, if the applicant wanted to design the project as presented they should just do it, however, he felt the applicant should really consider an alternate design which could be a cost savings to them.

Mr. Maedo stated keep in mind the time period the building was built and the HVAC equipment wasn't as necessary as it was today. The design of the existing building had not considered the screening and how much more equipment had been needed.

Chair Wheeler stated that was his point. Rather than putting money into the false front the applicant could come up with a plan for screening of the existing and any future equipment needs.

Mr. Maedo stated he felt the proposed project would screen much of the equipment. With the amount that they had to spend they could only address the equipment on one of the buildings. The State was constantly imposing requirements for air and heating and there would be more equipment placed on the building in the future. The idea would be to start installation of the parapets to begin to hide some of the equipment. The mechanical equipment areas would constantly evolve.

Ms. Sanchez stated they had begun with the renovation of a few interior rooms and little by little they had been upgrading with a large portion being completed. In looking at the interior, one side looked nice with the other side of the interior, that had not been worked on, had not looked very appealing. By completing the exterior façade remodel they had just begun to fix up the building.

Mr. Maedo stated the interior of the building took priority as it was where the resident's lived, and the priority was to take care of their needs first. There had been some upgrades to the exterior in regards to landscape and paving.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had listened to the applicant's testimony and she inquired if there was a Master Plan or a scheme for the project. She felt that it could be the missing piece.

Mr. Maedo stated the proposed project was only one phase.

Committee Member Gladson asked if they had the whole thing available in written form or a narrative, drawings or anything that could help her understand the plan.

Mr. Maedo presented a drawing to the Committee.

Committee Member Gladson stated they had the drawing he referred to, which was information on the interior spaces of the project.

Chair Wheeler stated the interior of the building was not the concern of the DRC; they were only concerned with the outside. He felt if they knew there would be similar treatments to the remainder of the exterior buildings, then that would certainly make the project more palatable. They could not ascertain from the proposed project if they anticipated further exterior enhancements which could be a completely different style.

Committee Member Gladson stated the purpose of the continuation of the proposed project from its original presentation was for the applicant to come up with a long range plan and to have that available for the Committee to review. There had been concerns regarding the screening of the mechanical equipment and she felt that they had not presented a plan to address that and it was a critical piece of the project that was missing.

Mr. Maedo stated with the limited budget the applicant was working with, the parapet would screen a lot of the equipment from being visible to the public upon entering the facility. There was no parking on La Veta and in reality most people approached from the other side.

Chair Wheeler pointed out an area on the drawings and asked if people drove down that area to enter the parking lot?

Mr. Maedo stated there was a parking valet and there was no access to drive through in the area Chair Wheeler referred to.

Committee Member McCormack stated what had been discussed during the initial presentation, which had been noted in the minutes, was that there was a parking stall that was not a handicap stall with all the remainder being handicap stalls and it appeared to him that all the parking was being shoved into the entry area. He pointed out on the plans where his area of concern was, and showed where he felt the pedestrian traffic areas where. He had previously brought up an idea to the applicant to explore the idea of moving the handicapped parking to another area and to move the trash enclosure. If that was possible it would open up the entire area for redesign. He felt the completion of a Master Plan would be helpful and it would allow the applicant to review the

parking count and conceivably be able to open up the entire space and not have cars conflicting with people in wheelchairs. In reviewing the drawings, there were people walking on concrete and asphalt and there were walls, and pipes and cars.

Mr. Maedo stated keep in mind the lot was valet parked and there would not be cars entering an area he pointed to on the drawings.

Committee Member McCormack stated with valet parking it presented an even better opportunity.

Mr. Maedo stated the main deliveries for the kitchen and laundry would use the main thoroughfare for access. Everything went through there.

Committee Member McCormack stated they were spending a lot of money and there were deliveries and trash and all the cars coming into the area, and from a purely design review, he asked if they had explored the opportunity to get all of that out of there and the possibility of having the service and delivery vans use carts for access.

Applicant, Roger Love, address on file, stated he was the owner and worked for Skill Health Care and they were an Administrative Services Company that oversaw everything that went on with Fountain Care. The Committee had asked the question if there was a Master Plan, they could not provide a Master Plan, as they worked off of a budget every year that was based on Federal and State reimbursements. They could sit down and draw up a Master Plan; however, it was not a plan that they could present to the Committee as it would rely on obtaining reimbursements in order to move forward with any plans presented. If monies were not available the Master Plan would not have any validity. They had the proposed project budgeted and again they had not known if they had budgeted enough money to construct the façade and they had budgeted funds for the interior as well. They would much rather use their money to complete interior enhancements. When the traffic entered the parking lot and everyone walked up to that facility they saw a 45 year old building and there was nothing that could be done to that 45 year old building to make it appear 5 or 6 years old, other than to construct a façade. They were limited by OSHPOD constraints as well. OSHPOD limited them on many things that they could or could not do. They could come up with a Master Plan; however, it would not mean that they would be able to follow through with that Master Plan over the course of 5 to 10 years. What they were attempting to do was to give family members and referral partners a building that presented well and was marketable, that was the intent of the façade design. They had planned on painting the exteriors of both facilities and there was money budgeted for an entrance cover to the Fountain Care assisted living facility. They were limited based on their anticipated reimbursements.

Chair Wheeler stated he had not understood how that would stop them from preparing a Master Plan.

Mr. Love stated that was what he had stated, they could prepare a Master Plan, however, they could not guarantee that they would follow through with a Master Plan.

Chair Wheeler stated at least it could establish a direction that the applicant anticipated moving in and it would show the Committee the plans for the future. The issue was consistency, and they had not wanted a hodge podge of various styles and forms to evolve over the years.

Mr. Love stated he was certain they would not have a hodge podge, and he felt they would stick to the same design that had been presented in the proposed project. He certainly would not change the design and knew that their architect would not change that design. They could go back and present a Master Plan; again he was not certain if that could be completed over the next 5 to 10 years.

Chair Wheeler stated his feeling was that they would not need to state when the Master Plan would be complete, it would be helpful to have the plan to get a general feel of what future projects might look like. There would not have to be specific dates attached to the various phases.

Mr. Love stated they could go back and look at that. To answer the questions, regarding the trash enclosure, if they started re-locating trash enclosures they would loose parking spaces and again cause a balloon effect for the entire project.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the project was fully parked and had anyone looked at that? A Master Plan would turn that page and give them a better idea of what could be done.

Ms. Thakur stated once they started looking at moving trash enclosures and parking spaces it changed the scope of work and would require review by Staff prior to presentation to the DRC.

Committee Member McCormack stated in reviewing the façade treatment he saw two things going on; a façade treatment and a minimal paving treatment. It appeared that all the people would be walking on asphalt and it was not very welcoming. He was not certain that the solution would be to add more paving for people to walk on or to totally eliminate vehicular traffic to make it a people space. It appeared that the applicant was spending a lot of money; however, they were not sending the message that it was not a parking lot anymore. It had been upgraded to be a pedestrian area and an entry. Adding $8.00 to $12.00 a square foot for concrete to the area would not be a back breaker.

Mr. Love stated they would not hesitate to do anything like that. When Committee Member McCormack pointed out La Veta as being a main entry point, it was not the case, when driving up La Veta there was not access to the main entry. The entrance to the driveway was from Culver, that area was the main entrance to the building. The front entrance which was on La Veta could not be used.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the people on the drawings were Staff or family members.

Mr. Love stated it was everybody. Everybody entered the main parking lot from Culver. There was a sign on the street and there would be an additional sign added to direct traffic into the Fountain Care facility. There was no parking on La Veta, an ambulance could not park on La Veta. He pointed out two parking spaces on La Veta and stated those where the only two spots to park on La Veta.

Committee Member McCormack pointed out an area on the drawings and asked if they had people that came in through that entrance and became trapped in that zone?

Ms. Sanchez stated in the corner he pointed out, they would not have people accessing that drive aisle, due to the valet parking that was available.

Mr. Love clarified the parking situation with Committee Member McCormack.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had been to the site and was familiar how the valet parking worked.

Mr. Love stated the valet parking worked very well.

Committee Member McCormack stated that a Master Plan would allow them to present their ideas and the possibility that in another phase they could explore ways to make the parking and pedestrian access more user friendly.

Mr. Love stated being involved with the facility for the last 5 years he knew that the architect had spent a lot of time in planning on how to bring in the deliveries, address the handicap parking and also design an exterior façade. Due to the layout of the buildings they were limited to what they could do, unless they wanted to eliminate portions of the building structure. They would have wanted to change the parking lot; however, there were many factors that kept them from doing that. They wanted to enhance the facility to be an aesthetically pleasing facility upon entering from Culver.

Committee Member Woollett stated he felt they were at an impasse, the DRC was charged with evaluation of the design and it was not a matter of their personal opinions. They were charged with looking for consistency. The Chair stated in so many words that consistency was the bottom line. He felt they had only two choices, to ensure that the new development had consistency, and in many cases it meant that applicants were using design styles that could be 50 years old as the rules had not allowed a newer design, due to the need for consistency. The dilemma was that the Committee might appreciate the new style and design, however, they were charged with basing their judgments on consistency and avoid to situations where there was a disjointed appearance to a building. He felt that the Committee could deny the proposed project due to inconsistency or to take a position of no exception to the project based on the fact that the building was not visible to the community. If they approved a project that was not in accordance with the guidelines they needed to follow, the DRC would be setting a precedent.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated one option that the Committee had was to continue the proposed project and have the applicant look at design options, as had been requested at the last meeting.

Committee Member Woollett asked if they could approve it based on the fact that the building was not visible from the street.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she felt that was not an option. They could deny the project and allow the applicant the opportunity to appeal the decision and take the project to the Planning Commission and to the City Council if necessary. That would be the chain of events if they

received a denial. The City strived on consistency from project to project, it was important, and it was a finding to be internally consistent. The DRC had to default to the findings that they were charged with making.

Mr. Love asked what the inconsistency was?

Committee Member Woollett stated the proposed project was a completely different style than the rest of the building and that was the problem.

Mr. Love stated that was what they wanted to achieve.

Committee Member Woollett understood they wanted to make the facility better and to look different; however, it was not in compliance with the City's regulations.

Chair Wheeler stated if they were completing all the buildings at once that would not be a problem. In completing a small portion of the building in a completely different style brought inconsistency to the project.

Mr. Love stated the Committee had just told him that they wanted a Master Plan. If they had a Master Plan and they were very honest with the Committee in stating they might not be able to complete all the elements of that Master Plan, would they be willing to consider the proposed project?

Chair Wheeler stated it would be a move in the right direction. It would take a leap of faith on the Committee's part to accept that they would have a consistent structure. He hadn't particularly liked that idea, and had wished that the applicant had given more thought to the suggestions that the Committee had presented at the previous meeting to take into consideration the existing forms in formulating their design. They had made it very clear during the last meeting and that information was very clear in the minutes from that meeting. He felt the Committee should consider approval of the project based on the fact that prior to any work being completed on the exterior of the building that the applicant would present a Master Plan.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated any further changes to the exterior of the building would require the applicant to present their project to the DRC. The best case scenario would be for the applicant to have an overall design concept with a time line and to bring that back to the City, with a time frame for the different phases of the project. That would be the best of all worlds. If the DRC knew the whole project would be internally consistent they could have a basis for approval, however, based on the presentation they had not seen that.

Mr. Love asked if they wanted the applicant to draft up a Master Plan and bring it back to the Committee for review, or would a date suffice to approve the project the way it was presented?
Chair Wheeler stated he would be going even further on behalf of the applicant by stating he had not cared when the Master Plan was completed, however, they would not look at any further enhancements to the building exterior until the applicant had one.

Committee Member Woollett stated what the applicant was proposing might not work for the remainder of the building.

Committee Member Gladson stated she struggled with the internal consistency and she needed the bigger pieces to assure her of that consistency. She was in support of having the building remodeled and to get a better look, however, she was not comfortable enough to make the findings. She could be persuaded to lean toward denial or offer the applicant the option of another continuation.

Committee Member McCormack stated he did not think they could do that, as the DRC action was a final determination.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated they could continue the item, the final determination referred to the DRC as being the final determining body on the item.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was in favor of a continuance with the input and direction from the DRC.

Chair Wheeler stated the consensus appeared to be a continuance to allow the applicant to return with a Master Plan, and to come back hopefully with a more compatible design, or the Committee could deny the application and the applicant would have the opportunity to appeal the project to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Love stated it was costly. The time that had already been spent with the architect and in working with a limited budget had not given them many options, the intent was to make improvements that everyone would enjoy. He felt there would not be any problems with the neighbors once they saw the planned improvements.

Committee Member Gladson stated her concern with the project was that the discussion and suggestions they were going over were the same discussions and suggestions that had been presented at the initial presentation. The applicant had the opportunity to review the project and make changes; instead they had returned asking the DRC for a decision using the same plan as previously presented. It was certainly the applicant's prerogative. The process would cost the applicant more time either way and if the applicant had not liked their ultimate decision they could appeal the proposed project to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Love stated he would want to move forward and continue with the process. To take the proposal to the Planning Commission when the DRC had basically denied the project would not assist them either.

Ms. Thakur stated the Planning Commission could make the same findings.

Committee Member Gladson stated they could disagree with us. The DRC was charged to review the aesthetic scope of the proposed project.

Ms. Thakur stated it was not a matter of not being able to move the handicap spots; it was the fact that the changes to parking would create a larger scope for the project. The project would go back to the Staff Review Committee, however, that would not solve the fact that the other parts of the building were being ignored.

Committee Member McCormack stated a Master Plan would work.

Ms. Thakur stated possibly with Phase 1 it could be the building upgrade, Phase 2 could be the parking lot, keeping in mind that the DRC approval was valid for 2 years and within that 2 year period they could request an extension. If the Master Plan or project was approved it would not need to be built right away.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was concerned that the Master Plan could come back with the intent to build a façade around the entire building. It would be very costly and the project could not sustain that. He was concerned that they could get into that type of a dilemma.

Committee Member McCormack stated if the Master Plan was prepared that would be specifically for the entries, such as a signage program. With an architectural style that could be somewhat contemporary, the project could be handled as a beautification, entry and pedestrian space project. Not necessarily treating of the sides of the building. It would be limited to the two entries on site. He was posing the question. They could also look at the parking situation.

Committee Member Woollett stated Committee Member McCormack was speaking of a very sophisticated design approach, which was possible.

Chair Wheeler stated he had not felt comfortable asking the applicant to improve areas that they had not anticipated improving. He would not want to state that the applicant would have to move trash or parking. If they moved parking he felt that the applicant would need to meet current requirements and that could be a whole other issue.

Ms. Thakur stated that would open up a can of worms. Stalls would need to be widened, Crime Prevention would require lighting that met current standards and there were other issues involved.

Chair Wheeler stated due to the valet they probably had adequate parking and the space could be used as a plaza area that would be technically a parking space, however, would not be used for that purpose.

Mr. Love stated the handicap stalls were not used as much due to the valet parking.

Chair Wheeler stated the main point was that the buildings needed to be consistent.

Committee Member Woollett asked if it was possible to do a façade that would honor the existing style, something that would obviously be a façade and be designed in such a way that it would enhance what existed. It would be a very sophisticated approach.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had observed that type of approach on shopping centers that were going through upgrades.

Chair Wheeler stated in the case where an entire structure was being changed it would be consistent with itself. When doing just a small piece is what created the dilemma. There was a hip roof on the tower, where hip roofs had not existed anywhere else on the site. There was a line of parapets that began very suddenly, and when driving along La Veta that change would be very apparent. Those types of things were very incompatible with what existed at the site.

Mr. Love stated the tough part was in working with the structural elements of the building.

Mr. Maedo stated that was the problem, once they touched the structural elements of the building it would then be necessary to bring the structure up to code. They worked with very stringent guidelines, the option for skilled nursing was that if structural elements were touched the project would require code enhancements and in that case they would knock the building down.

Chair Wheeler stated they could enhance the building with elements that appreciated the existing design of the building.

Mr. Love stated the focus was to establish the entrance to the building and he was positive what they had presented established that entrance. The design itself was not consistent, he was very clear on that point, but what they had attempted to do was establish the entrance.

Committee Member Gladson stated there could still be that focus with a more consistent design.

Mr. Love asked could they maintain the style as presented and develop a Master Plan for the site?

Chair Wheeler struggled with the idea of having the applicant develop a Master Plan that may not ever come to fruition or might not be possible to build.

Committee Member Woollett stated or it might not be the intention of the applicant to complete such a project.

Chair Wheeler stated he hesitated setting a precedent.

Ms. Sanchez asked if they could prepare a Master Plan just for the entry areas, and would that help to move the project along?

Chair Wheeler stated it would help, however, there was still the fact that only a small portion of the building would be addressed and there was the compatibility issue. He would rather have the exiting forms be used in a way that would not appear as if they were hiding them.

Mr. Love stated the Committee had to appreciate their dilemma; they were in between a rock and a hard place in attempting to get the project through. It had been difficult at best and they had not wanted to give up. To return with a Master Plan and then be told that the Committee felt that they had no intention of building further areas of the project was not what they wanted. They were attempting to upgrade the entrance to the building.

Chair Wheeler stated he was sensing that the Committee should ask the applicant to do what had initially been asked of them, to come up with a more compatible form for the entry.

Mr. Maedo stated without the parapet, they would be loading the roof with additional equipment and no means to screen it. They had been through this design issue, there were ways to get around the gables and hips, as soon as the screen reached 4’ it became a 1 hour structure that

would weigh a certain amount and impact the lateral loads on the building and would trigger a lot of other issues.

Chair Wheeler stated if the tower had a gable form instead of a hip form it would at least match the existing, and on the parapet, they could use more of a raised parapet that followed the roof line and appreciated the existing forms. He suggested that the pilaster forms be removed.

Mr. Maedo stated the area where the pilaster forms were proposed was located near an interior spa that had already been permitted by the State; it was everything above mid level that they were asking for approval on. The pilasters were there for a reason, as they could not impact the existing structure the area was being built independently.

Chair Wheeler suggested using deep set windows rather than the pilaster form. That was the direction that he suggested in persuading the DRC to make a finding on the project.

Mr. Maedo stated they were attempting to improve the exterior, however, the roadblocks made it almost impossible and the budgets made it even more difficult and the building could become the worse looking building in the City.

Committee Member Woollett stated he felt the applicant understood what the DRC was suggesting and how the design needed to be consistent.

Ms. Sanchez asked if they were to come up with a Master Plan for the entire building would they encounter the same situation where the project would not be approved due to the style they were using?

Committee Member Woollett stated they would need to have a plan for the entire site; however, he questioned whether the applicant would intend on following through with that plan. It would be easy to draw a façade around the entire building, however, it could end up not being feasible to build.

Committee Member Gladson stated she wanted to take a run at a motion. She was recommending continuation of the project to allow the applicant to pursue coming up with a plan for the site that would be internally consistent with an integrated design theme that was reflective of the existing architectural style, or to come up with a comprehensive Master Plan to change the architectural style for the entire complex in a phased approach.

Committee Member Woollett stated he would not second that motion, as a non-consistent Master Plan might not be feasible over a reasonable period of time.

Committee Member Gladson stated she could amend her motion to add a determination of feasibility over a reasonable period of time.

Committee Member Woollett stated that he would second that motion.

Committee Member McCormack stated in calling it a façade entry Master Plan, would in itself limit the scope of what the applicant was doing.

Committee Member Gladson stated that was correct.

Committee Member Woollett asked Committee Member Gladson if she was just referring to facades?

Committee Member Gladson stated that was correct.

Committee Member Woollett stated he could not accept that motion. That would be stating that the DRC would accept a façade entry design that was totally different from the rest of the building.

Chair Wheeler stated it would accompany a Master Plan and asked were they speaking of only an entry plan?

Committee Member Gladson stated yes, that was correct as Committee Member McCormack had stated. For parliamentary sake she would withdraw her motion.

Chair Wheeler made a motion to continue DRC No. 4359-08, Fountain Care Façade Remodel, in order to allow the applicant to study one of two possible solutions:

1. The re-design the facade enhancement at the entry in a design style that was more compatible with the existing architecture of the building;
2. To prepare a feasible overall Master Plan for a re-do of the entire complex, which shall include dates of completion;

in accordance with the discussion from the previous meeting and the current discussion.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(3) DRC No. 4366-08 – JOHNSON RESIDENCE

- A proposal to expand the first floor of an existing single-family residence and construct a new second story.
- 5028 East Glen Arran Lane
- Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
- Item Continued from DRC Meeting of October 15, 2008
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Assistant Planner, Sonal Thakur, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Darshan Shah, address on file stated they had followed the suggested changes from the DRC. He was requesting that they could further enhance an area he pointed out in the plans, with ledger stone. He felt it would look much better. The eave overhangs had been increased and all the pitches matched. The height had been lowered and as requested the left elevation had been created to break up the mass. They had reviewed the design further and he had a further enhancement to the elevation that he wanted to share with the Committee. He had enhanced the oval shaped windows and asked for their comments.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Wheeler opened the item for discussion.

Chair Wheeler stated that the applicant had done just about everything they had suggested and the design worked much better and was more compatible with the single-story homes on the street. Personally, he suggested against adding the ledger stone to the dormer. He felt a stone item on the roof was inappropriate as it was a heavy item and appeared foreign.

Mr. Shah asked if a foam trim would be o.k.

Chair Wheeler stated yes, and asked if the foam trim would be enhanced with a key stone?

Mr. Shah stated they would like to do that.

Chair Wheeler stated they could pick up that element in the arched windows. He was concerned with 2 walls in the same plane and asked if a larger eyebrow would be constructed? The overhang appeared larger and the roof cantilevered out more.

Mr. Shah reviewed the drawings with the Committee Members. He stated it was intended to match the load in front and back.

Chair Wheeler stated it was a nice enhancement and broke up the wall. He suggested adding a plant-on to an existing barge board. He stated on the drawings there was a call out for 4 x raised trim, and he assumed he meant 4 x wide. He would read it as 4 x deep.

Mr. Shah stated it should read 4 x wide.

Chair Wheeler stated he was not fond of the oval vents, however, they were consistent all the way around. He suggested a circular arch on each of those. He suggested they review the railing heights in the back as some of the codes had changed for railings.

Applicant, David Johnson, address on file, stated the semi circulars matched some of the other forms.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had no objections to the project.

Committee Member Gladson stated the applicant had taken their suggestions and she was agreeable to the project.

Committee Member McCormack asked Chair Wheeler if he had suggested that the stone should not come up all the way?

Chair Wheeler stated on the dormers in the front he suggested that they not use the ledger stone as it had not appeared structurally sound.

Mr. Shah stated the ledger stone was very light.

Chair Wheeler stated it was very light, however, it was supposed to give the appearance of stone.

Committee Member McCormack agreed that it should not be carried up at that height. He asked for the column size?

Mr. Shah stated they proposed the use of 6” x 6” wood columns painted to match the fascia board to remain consistent. It would stop at an existing wall.

Chair Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4366-08, Johnson Residence, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the additional conditions:

1. The left elevation may be constructed with the drawings provided on January 21, 2009.
2. Stone not to be used on the dormers.

And with the following suggestions:

1. The fascia barge board on the existing construction be beefed up to match the existing.
2. The trim call out to be called out as 1 x or 2 x , rather than 4 x.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(4) DRC No. 4402-08, MJSP No. 0484-07, and ENV No. 1794-07 - ORANGE LUTHERAN HIGH SCHOOL EXPANSION

- A proposal to expand the school by 35,500 square feet. The construction will include classrooms, a sports court, additional parking spaces, new sports locker rooms, new athletic offices, and a multipurpose room. An Initial Study was completed to determine the appropriate environmental document.
- 2222 North Santiago Boulevard
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Jeff Rabbitt, address on file, stated he thought the Staff Report was very thorough. He wanted to emphasis the point that the proposed project before them was the final phase from an original Master Plan that was approved in 1999. The final phase was the completion of an evolving need for space by the school. They attempted to present in their exhibits and to provide an outline of the building that had been previously approved. With the new space requirements they tried to stay within the envelope of what had been previously approved. There was some additional square footage and they had been respectful of the height requirements and screening requirements. There was consistency in the architecture from what one would view from Santiago. It was an improvement to the current condition to the rear of the building.

Applicant, Rich Kahler, address on file, stated the space was being used to accommodate further academic, administrative, storage and meeting space needs. It would improve the quality of life for the increasing student population at the site.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Wheeler opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the neighbors to the north had reviewed the plans?

Mr. Rabbitt stated there had been a mailing with plans, which included an invitation to a meeting at the school. There were a few residents that showed up.

Mr. Kahler stated there were approximately half a dozen residents at that meeting with the main questions being student enrollment. They showed them the original plans from 1999.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there was a mailing for the distribution of the environmental document and notice of intent to adopt. They had not mailed notices for DRC

meetings, however, once the project had a final determination there would be noticing prior to the Planning Commission Meeting.

Mr. Kahler stated he believed in their mailing they used the same criteria as the City used for Planning Commission Meeting noticing.

Committee Member Woollett stated the reason he had asked the question was in limiting sky views from the south it was either an asset or deficit based on the attitude of the person living in the house to the north. Some residents would appreciate shielding from the southern sun, while others would not.

Chair Wheeler stated he felt what the applicant proposed was completely consistent with what was there now. He had a concern with the solar study report. The angle for the 4:00 p.m. sun was the same as the 2:00 p.m. angle study. The results with the shadow lines had not appeared consistent. In reading the building, he pointed to the solar study, the shadow casting edge of the new construction was 15 feet above grade then went out to 28 feet above grade and he felt the shadow would be twice as deep, but had not appeared that way in the study. He had completed his own solar calculations and came up with a different calculation. He reviewed his numbers with the applicant. He felt that the topography was not entered correctly in the model for the study and suggested that prior to the submittal to Planning Commission, that the shadow study was reanalyzed.

Mr. Rabbitt stated the difference in their solar study calculation could be due to the discrepancy in the residential backyard elevations. The shadow that would be cast from a 25' wall at a consistent level would show at 100+ feet, however, when the elevation was raised from the residential side it would cut off much shorter and he believed that was where the discrepancy appeared to be. They would look into that.

Chair Wheeler stated on the floor plans the north side building mass appeared that the building was 159' plus in one area with a wall, however, on the elevations it showed 176' without a wall setback and he asked for clarification of that area.

Mr. Rabbitt stated, referring to the plans, it was grade at the top where the fire lane crested to the main school level; there was an existing electrical transformer in that area. Part of the gymnasium phase contained a vertical circulation along with an enclosed electrical space for panels. The electrical was being shown in an area that in reality, was an area where the new structure encroached on that space and the floor plans were accurate.

Chair Wheeler pointed out a missing door on the floor plans and stated he could not tell where the fenestration occurred on most of the floor plans.

Mr. Rabbitt stated each classroom had fenestration at the head of the classroom to allow some natural light in.

Committee Member McCormack stated he thought it looked great. In regards to the water quality on the project, there was a pervious sidewalk and he asked for some explanation on why the filtera was required and how it worked?

Mr. Rabbitt stated the concept was that there was a link between the school and the fields. There were pavers set in sand that created the pervious walkway.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a system that collected water to be channeled to the tree wells. There were three trees in landscape, he pointed out the area he was referring to on the plans, and asked if the parking lot all drained to the filtera band?

Mr. Rabbitt explained the drainage direction on the plans. He stated that he felt the systems could be linked, they had to be cautious with the fire lane access and the loads in that area would need to be reviewed to ensure that the filtera system worked.

Committee Member McCormack stated if the filtera system would not work, the material which he pointed out on the plans, could be beefed up and a clean connection made.

Mr. Rabbitt stated that would be appropriate in protecting the pedestrian access.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the landscape plan there were existing Phoenix dactylifera and he wanted to suggest that the height of the new Palm trees to match existing. He felt that they could make them all the same height or they could have the two separate areas match the height of the trees in those areas.

Mr. Rabbitt stated that the trees, in an area he pointed to on the plans, followed grade and actually gave the appearance of slopping down.

Committee Member McCormack stated if that request was not spelled out in the plans the visual effect would not be consistent. He thought the project was great and would be a great addition.

Committee Member Gladson stated her only question, which was out of their purview, were they picking up 11 parking stalls per the previous plan?

Mr. Rabbitt stated that was correct.

Committee Member Gladson stated that was something they would want to be mindful of in their discussion with the neighbors. She concurred with her colleagues that it was an excellent project and it had internal consistency.

Committee Member McCormack reviewed the drainage area with the applicants, and suggested that they add a zero curb in an area he pointed out on the plans, and to have the water collected in the filtera system. He suggested that their civil engineer review the plan to ensure everything went around and went in.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve for recommendation to the Planning Commission DRC No. 4402-08, MJSP No. 0484-07, and ENV No. 1794-07 – Orange Lutheran High School Expansion, with the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following conditions:

1. The solar study be reanalyzed regarding the shadows to the north.
2. The north elevation be clarified to match the floor plans.
3. The zero curb or other curb relationship at the basketball court be reviewed.
4. The new Palm trees to follow a consistent pattern of height with regard to the existing Palm trees.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(5) DRC No. 4254-07, GPA No. 2007-0002, ZC No. 1245-07, MJSP No. 0521-07, CUP No. 2685-07, and MND No. 1796-07 – HOBBS MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING

- A request to construct a 28,800 square foot, two-story medical and professional office building and associated parking lot with landscaping.
- 164 South Water Street
- Staff Contact: Chad Ortlieb, 714-744-7237, cortlieb@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council

---

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

Applicant, Peter Belcher, address on file was available for questions and had nothing to add.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Wheeler opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett felt the most important concern was the impact on the adjacent properties. The design was consistent with what existed and the relationship appeared appropriate. He agreed with Staff's comments regarding the lighting to ensure it would not be a problem for the adjacent properties.

Chair Wheeler stated at the last meeting his concern was to save the large Oak trees, which he gathered were in the right of way. His question to Staff was why was Water Street being widened?

Mr. Ortlieb stated what had happened between the last review and the current review was that Water Street would not be widened. There would be a red curb no parking area added. There might be an issue with only one of the trees, if it was in the area of the requirement for a new curb cut or a continuous ramping curb. The only other thing that could happen would be if there was a tree where the new entry would be. The way the plans were represented would be what would actually occur on site.

Committee Member Woollett clarified that the plans they were reviewing were based on the street not being widened?

Mr. Ortlieb stated that was correct.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there were street trees in an area he pointed to on the plans? If they lost one tree and kept another, he felt all the other trees should match the street trees.

Chair Wheeler stated when Henry Huntington built his home there was a north vista that had a view to the mountains that was supposed to line up with the home. When the layout for the

house was finished he realized that it would mean the removal of two Oak trees and he had the house rotated 8 degrees. If he could save two Oak trees by moving the house, they should be able to save the Oak trees on this project. The drawings appeared too inconsistent, one showed one Oak tree remaining and the other showed both trees being removed.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was probably due to the street widening.

Mr. Belcher stated the street was the full width, as it approached Almond Street it curved out.

Chair Wheeler stated the drawings had some inconsistencies, one drawing showed two pairs of columns and the other showed one pair of columns.

Mr. Belcher stated there had been different iterations and the columns would be coming out further, he was not certain if they would be using two columns or one. He stated he was from the Finance Department and was a last minute fill in, and he would answer the questions the best he could.

Mr. Ortlieb stated the recommendation to the Planning Commission would be to make everything consistent.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was a percentage of trees required, and if the total required was 20% and 80%, or 30% and 70% and 30% had to be 24" box and 70% could be 15 gallon?

Mr. Ortlieb stated there was a percentage requirement; it was 25%.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a notation to enhance decorative paving at pedestrian entry – see landscape drawings. In reviewing the landscape drawings it was missing from one sheet. He was not certain that there was that need along Water Street. There was no ramp, unless they were using a zero curb. The loading zone required some type of truncated domes if they used a zero curb. He also suggested not having wheel stops.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to recommend to the Planning Commission DRC No. 4254-07, GPA No. 2007-0002, ZC No. 1245-07, MJSP No. 0521-07, CUP No. 2685-07, and MND No. 1796-07 – Hobbs Medical Office Building, with the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following conditions:

1. To save the Oak trees if possible.
2. To clarify that the distance of the entry portico as it extends toward the parking lot.
3. To work out the handicap ramp situation and loading zone.
4. To address the key note 31 pedestrian access off of Water Street.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(6) DRC No. 4394-08 – EL CAMINO CENTER FAÇADE REMODEL

- A proposal to remodel the exterior façade which includes the complete remodel of the former Foster Freeze end unit.
- 1615-1649 West Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Zachary Sham, address on file. stated he was available for questions and had nothing to add.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Wheeler opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett asked if there was a signage package?

Mr. Garcia stated the applicant was working with the Economic Development Department, and initially they had wanted to complete other improvements which included signage. It had been scaled back to just the façade improvements. Any type of signage would be looked at separately. The hope would be to do that over the counter and it would not require a signage program.

Committee Member Woollett stated the major issue he felt would be the signs and landscape. He understood the development had existed for quite a time and he wondered how that pertained to signage. The parking remained the same and the occupancy would remain the same. He asked what would trigger a landscaping upgrade?

Mr. Garcia stated if there were changes to site improvement, reconfiguration of the parking lot, or the addition of square footage to the center, any of those things would require a review of the Development Standards.

Mr. Sham stated initially their intent was to reconfigure and add landscaping, however, once they started in that direction it triggered so many other things that it became economically not feasible.

Chair Wheeler stated there was a proposed parking plan with Sheet A and he asked if the parking would remain the same.

Mr. Sham stated there was a layout that showed the original parking, with the street widening that had already taken place. The new layout was what existed there currently.

Mr. Garcia stated the only change was the re-striping to accommodate handicap spaces.

Committee Member McCormack stated he felt the handicapped ramp was not up to code.

Mr. Garcia stated it was an existing ramp and the only change was re-striping.

Committee Member Woollett stated there appeared to be a lot of signage that would not be permitted.

Mr. Sham stated he felt the owners would like to get rid of a lot of that signage.

Mr. Garcia stated it was not consistent. He believed it was an issue that the property owner would be addressing and it was not part of the proposed project before them.

Committee Member Gladson stated window signs typically were permitted.

Committee Member McCormack stated the proposed project was for an exterior façade remodel and a complete remodel of the Foster Freeze unit and asked if that triggered a signage upgrade or site elements for landscape?

Mr. Garcia stated no, as the proposed project was for façade enhancements. There were some improvements to the other stores, with the Foster Freeze being the majority of the enhancement area.

Chair Wheeler asked if the square footage was being reduced?

Mr. Sham stated there was an old plan that had been drawn up much earlier. The plans before them were what existed now. They would not be changing the square footage.

Chair Wheeler stated there was a notation that the aluminum signage would be removed.

Mr. Sham stated he had not prepared information on the signage as he understood it was not being addressed with the proposed project they were reviewing. It would not remain as existed and they would be coming up with a sign plan that was appropriate.

Committee Member McCormack stated the project could conceivably go through the façade enhancement, new signage, new parking lot slurry and have no landscape requirement? It would probably remain that way for another 15 years.

Mr. Garcia stated potentially it could.

Committee Member McCormack asked what triggered a landscape change?

Mr. Garcia stated a change to the parking, reconfiguration or expansion of the footprint.

Committee Member Gladson stated there was probably some interest from the Redevelopment Agency to attempt to get that block to start looking better and incrementally it would be with façade enhancements.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was time and money spent without adding any landscape.

Mr. Garcia stated with all fairness to the applicant, at a later date, they would propose and complete landscaping with a reconfiguration to the parking lot. Currently they had not wanted to add that.

Committee Member Woollett stated with a reduction in parking it would reduce the viability of the project. The City had widened the street and reduced the parking, which would be an imposed hardship. He was surprised that in the street widening process they had not placed tree wells in the right of way.

Committee Member McCormack stated that would have made sense, as Chapman had all the King Palms.

Committee Member Gladson stated there was an El Camino Real bell on the public right of way and she was concerned that it was protected and ideally it should be properly landscaped. She mostly wanted to ensure the bell was not harmed. She asked if the mechanical equipment had been screened?

Mr. Sham stated the mechanical equipment was very well screened.

Chair Wheeler asked if there were any landscape suggestions Committee Member McCormack could suggest to the applicant, in the way of pots for the breezeway?

Mr. Sham stated when the parking was rearranged, there were a few spaces near the driveway that had been approved 8 to 10 years ago, and those spaces were unsafe due to their relationship to the entrance. They had gotten one space back and Mr. Garcia informed them that they could not lose anymore parking in order to continue moving forward with the project.

Chair Wheeler stated they could come up with some creative way to add landscape without interfering with the parking.

Committee Member McCormack stated they may want to ask the City regarding the absence of street trees.

Mr. Sham stated there were no tree wells on the sidewalk. They had wanted to add a vine to a wall to add some green.

Committee Member McCormack asked to re-lay the parking would it trigger further required upgrades?

Mr. Garcia stated with any change to parking the Public Works Department would require a 30’ standard driveway with a 30’ throat and that would mean the loss of 6 parking spaces.

Committee Member McCormack and Chair Wheeler pointed out an area that asphalt could be cut away to add a tree to the project.

Mr. Garcia stated there was a sign in that area.

Committee Member McCormack stated they could add potted plants. There was a fence structure and he asked the applicant if they could get rid of it?

Mr. Sham stated if there was not a safety hazard, they could potentially remove it.

Committee Member McCormack suggested some alternate landscape areas on the plans and suggested the applicant contact the City regarding the street trees. The project needed some green. They could add some green screens in areas he pointed to on the project.

Mr. Sham stated they had thought about placing potted plants in the breezeway.

Chair Wheeler stated on Sheet No. 7, he assumed it was buildings 15 and 16, but it looked different from building 15 and 16 on Sheet No. 5A.

Mr. Sham stated Chair Wheeler was correct it was different and it had an illustration of how they had initially proposed to make changes. Sheet No. 5A was correct.

Chair Wheeler asked for additional clarification of details on the plans. Mr. Sham reviewed the plans with the Committee.

Chair Wheeler asked if the new cornice on the Foster Freeze building would match?

Mr. Sham stated yes.

Committee Member McCormack asked for some details on the split faced block?

Mr. Sham stated it was split faced block that existed.

Chair Wheeler suggested moving the split face and replacing it with tile.

Committee Member McCormack suggested the use of potted plants, there were some interesting materials that could be used, zinc, steel, terra cotta, and metal were very contemporary. They could match terra cotta pots to the cornice. He had seen a project that used corrugated metal made into a circle with horse tail in it; it caught your eye, and added interest to the building. They would not necessarily need to copy that, but use a similar concept.

Mr. Sham stated he would take those suggestions to the building owners.

Committee Member Gladson stated she noticed there was a brick treatment along Chapman, some type of banding and wasn't sure if it was something that went in with the street widening. It appeared to be brick and were there any thoughts about that?

Committee Member Woollett stated it was on City property.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4394-08, El Camino Center Façade Remodel, with the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following recommendations:

1. Addition of planter boxes be added to the breezeway and to explore other landscape ideas.
2. The City be requested to add Street trees along Chapman.
3. Study other possibilities for the split face, such as green screen or tile.
4. Suggest the applicant to pursue an appropriate sign program.

And with the following conditions:

1. Sheet No. 5A and Sheet No. 7 be consistent.
2. Bridging parapet be the same depth as the parapets of the adjoining buildings.
3. The concrete cornice match existing concrete cornice.
4. To ensure that the El Camino Real Bell was properly protected.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled meeting on Wednesday, February 4, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

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

MOTION CARRIED.