CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

March 18, 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 Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Doris Nguyen, 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 5:10 p.m.

Chair McCormack opened the Administrative Session with any information from Staff.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there was no changes to the Agenda. At the last meeting information had been passed out on the City's Orange Goes Green Program and she had asked if the Committee wanted Staff to be available to open further discussion and answer any questions that might have come up.

The Committee concurred that they would want to have further discussion and for Staff to be available for questions.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she would schedule that for their next Design Review Committee meeting.

The minutes were reviewed from March 4, 2009. Changes and corrections were noted. Committee Member Gladson stated she had reviewed the minutes, however, would be abstaining as she had had not been present at the March 4, 2009 meeting.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session. Administrative Session adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

SECOND:	Adrienne Gladson
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: March 4, 2009

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of March 4, 2009, with the changes and corrections noted.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

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

- A proposal to remodel the exterior elevations of a skilled nursing/assisted living facility. The applicant is proposing a phasing plan.
- 1835 West La Veta Avenue
- Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
- Item Continued from DRC Meeting of January 21, 2009
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Marisol Sanchez, address on file, stated they had gone back to the site and they had looked at the entire site and determined what could be done and what could not be done. There were some issues, such as the trash enclosure which could not be moved from the current location due to site limitations. As far as upgrading the elevations for the entire site, it was something they could work with based on the timeframe they had provided.

Public Comment

None.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated there were two primary issues, besides the height. One, of course, was the length of time. The Committee had been quite concerned when it was suggested that with a Master Plan that it would be developed in phases. That could be problematic based on how long it would take and what type of assurance would the City have that it would be accomplished. He was also concerned that the phases occurred in such a way that the kind of juxtapositions of completed work that they were most concerned about, particularly at corners, would exist for a long time with one side being updated and the other side not. Rather than sequencing the phasing so changes at the corners would be eliminated as soon as possible in an orderly way. He was less concerned with the relationship of the project to the neighborhood as the site was fairly well concealed and 25 years was a long time and within that time who would know what the style would be.

Ms. Sanchez stated the 25-year timeframe that they provided was the worse case scenario. They would like to state that they would want to complete all work within the year, but the timeframe given would be the worse case scenario and they had arrived at that for each elevation and the funds and refunds that would be required for each phase.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would disagree a little with the Staff Report. The way the minutes were noted and as he recalled, the DRC had recommended one of two possible solutions; one being an overall design and phasing and the other being to use elements that were existing. They had recommended those and it appeared that the applicant had complied with what the Committee Members had asked the applicant to do.

Chair McCormack was concerned about the phasing. He was pleased with what they had presented; the applicant had listened to their recommendations and he felt they had done a good job on their design. He reviewed the plans with the applicants and asked if the trash cans were in the back or out by the property line?

Mr. Maedo pointed out where the trash containers were on the drawings.

Chair McCormack stated that's great. He asked if there would be a need for a fire lane?

Mr. Maedo stated there was still access on the property.

Chair McCormack pointed out a space for a wheel stop and an area that needed a 4' clear on the drawings. He stated a 4' clear for handicap access and where another wheel stop should stop. He also noted a location for a handicap sign.

Mr. Maedo stated they could include those recommendations.

Chair McCormack stated the applicant had done what they had asked and the only unpalatable thing was the timeline.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they would want them to complete the work as quickly as they could.

Mr. Maedo stated the side that they would start with would be the area that people using the site would have the most visibility. Over time there would be more equipment added to the building and the intent would be to screen those areas.

Chair McCormack stated there was a water element and unless they were placing the equipment for that element in the building that they would want to install it near the trash enclosure. He stated they would need a vault for the water feature.

Mr. Maedo asked what he meant by a vault?

Chair McCormack stated it would be the pump, vent, and all the equipment for the water feature.

Mr. Maedo stated the fountain would have an internal pump.

Chair McCormack stated to get the waterfall to work, the water would be pumped from the basin to the outlet.

Mr. Maedo stated PVC would be run with perforated pipe and through copper tubing and spill back in. It was the manner that they were currently using and it appeared to work. The water flowed through the gravel and filtered back thru the tubing.

Chair McCormack stated with water features he had worked with he had used other equipment. With the drawing they had submitted it appeared that they would require a bigger pump.

Mr. Maedo stated they would use a 2 HP pump and it was able to pump a lot of water. They would use a perforated pipe with a gravel bed to filter the water through and that there was a bio-filter in place.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they had a problem reducing the height to 32'.

Mr. Maedo and Ms. Sanchez concurred that they could do that.

Committee Member Gladson stated her comments were in line with the comments of her colleagues and related to Staff. She was puzzled why they could not have a condition that would trigger some sort of City review. The Staff Report stated that the project would not go through the City's Building Division, but through OSHPOD, but it was discretionary action and she asked if there was a way to tie in a condition? There was a condition that related to the Building Department. She asked if a bond or something could be put into place?

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, asked what she was attempting to condition?

Committee Member Gladson stated the phasing.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry asked if she was referring to whether the phasing would be done in the manner it was presented?

Committee Member Gladson stated she concurred with Committee Member Woollett, in that it would be nice to have some sort of way to at least have the City's eyes on the phasing. It was a difficult thing to do, and she wanted some sort of mechanism to give her some comfort level with the project.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated typically they had not looked at a quarter of a century phasing for a façade change. They could not force something to be completed, unless it was a code enforcement or building code problem. If someone elected not to complete construction it would only become problematic if they left the building unfinished or they wanted to build the house without a garage. The building was standing and if the phasing was standing with no exposed beams and wires, she was not certain how they could address that. If they simply looked at an extension of the phasing, over the next 25 years, most of the planners, including herself, would probably have moved on.

Committee Member Gladson stated she wanted something to memorialize it so that a future planner could refer to the record knowing what the Committee Members had dealt with.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated that information would definitely be in the record for future review. If they were not pulling permits the building inspectors would not be reviewing anything. There would not be any triggers for checking the project unless there was a complaint.

Committee Member Gladson stated in remembering the initial presentation what had troubled her was that internal consistency, either being mid-century or being contemporary, she had not had a preference, she had wanted consistency. The applicant had achieved that with the current presentation. She would like to have the project implemented and they had a leap of faith that the project would be followed through. If they would not they could complete the first few phases then make changes which would possibly cause them to return to the DRC. She appreciated where Staff was at on the project and CHOC had just been presented with a 20 year plan.

Ms. Thakur stated Staff's concern was that the phasing proposed was based on whether or not the funding would be available and if it would be allocated to the project. If Phase 1 was the north elevation of the skilled nursing facility and in the future funding was not available or they decided to use the funds for other improvements they would be back at the original submittal.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was concerned with the corners as commented on by Committee Member Woollett. If they were anticipating approval of the project, possibly they could recommend what part of the project could be started first. She would want the corners to get attention and she was concerned with the roof equipment.

Mr. Maedo stated the equipment would be addressed. The assisted living was permitted through the City and the skilled nursing facility through OSHPOD.

Committee Member Gladson stated with the project laid out on paper would that allow them the ability to seek funding?

Mr. Maedo stated it was set funding and he was not certain how that worked.

Applicant, Roger Cove, address on file, stated they fund projects through the capital budget. They had the funding for Phase 1 of the project in their capital budget for three years while they attempted to get approval. If they could not get the project approved through the DRC, they could not get their approvals through OSHPOD. If they could not gain approval those funds would be allocated to other things in the facility. They had a capital budget every year and they would fund the phasing as it came in throughout the years, they wanted the finished façade as presented.

Chair McCormack stated on Phase 1 and Phase 2, one was the façade and fountain and he asked why the fountain and courtyard was not part of Phase 1?

Mr. Cove stated the intent was to complete Phase 1 and then immediately complete Phase 2. They were not through OSHPOD yet and they might not be able to start the project. The project was at a standstill until they were able to get through the DRC. What they had hoped was for the DRC approval which would allow them to submit their plans for OSHPOD approval.

OSHPOD's requirement was to get the DRC approval before they could submit the final project. Phase 1 and Phase 2 would be completed in conjunction with each other.

Committee Member Gladson asked if they changed their expected start date on Phase 2 from June 2012 to June 2009, which was the start date of Phase 1, would that be fair?

Mr. Cove stated he was not certain they could keep that Phase 1 start date as the project had to be submitted through OSHPOD. Once they gained approval for Phase 1, Phase 2 would be started.

Mr. Maedo stated the construction documents would be submitted to OSHPOD as they were more concerned with structural elements, fire controls, and safety that were OSHPOD's priority. OSHPOD had reviewed the plans for Phase 1 only and they would not review Phase 2 until they had gone through the DRC.

Chair McCormack stated the applicant would not return to the DRC for any subsequent phasing reviews and he stated OSHPOD would only review what the applicant wanted them to review for the other phases.

Mr. Maedo stated the submittal to OSHPOD would be the same documents that were reviewed by the City. They would want to submit the courtyard proposal to the City, which was preferred as OSHPOD's review was a much longer approval period.

Mr. Cove stated they honestly preferred to work with the City.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to deny DRC No. 4359-08, Fountain Care Façade Remodel.

Chair McCormack stated they had a motion on the floor and asked for a second?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated they would need a second to discuss the motion, if there was not a second the motion failed and they could seek another motion.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4359-08, Fountain Care Façade Remodel, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report, and with the following additional conditions:

1. The height would be reduced from 34' to 32'.
2. Specific specifications to the courtyard presented by Chair McCormack be added.

Ms. Thakur asked if the Committee would consider re-sequencing the phases, such as moving the courtyard to Phase 1 and Phase 1 be Phase 2?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt it was a moot point as it had not mattered which one was completed first. He felt the phasing as presented had made sense as the surrounding area of the courtyard would be completed first and then the courtyard, he was not concerned.

Chair McCormack stated he felt Phases 1 and 2 should all be Phase 1.

Mr. Cove stated with OSHPOD the two phases would roll together.

Chair McCormack stated he would want to add a condition that Phase 1 and Phase 2 would all be Phase 1.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would amend his motion to add the following third condition:

3. Phases 1 and 2 to be Phase 1.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(3) DRC No. 4369-08 – BRIARDALE PLAZA SIGNAGE PROGRAM

- A proposal to modify an existing sign program to allow can signs.
- 1762-1776 North Tustin Street
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- Item Continued from DRC Meeting of September 3, 2008
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Chad Bruce, address on filed stated he was available for any questions they had.

Public Comment

None.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion.

Mr. Bruce presented a sample sign which he illuminated for the Committee.

Chair McCormack asked if the sample was the actual color they proposed to use?

Mr. Bruce stated it was and he had brought samples of other color schemes that they could use. He stated on the sample sign at night the only visible part of the sign would be the letters of the sign. He explained how the other sample would work and which parts of the signs would be illuminated. It was at the discretion of the DRC which sign they used.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the sample was the actual depth of the signs?

Mr. Bruce stated yes.

Chair McCormack stated he was fine with the sign as presented. He asked if the conduit would be fed from behind and if any conduit would be visible?

Mr. Bruce stated that would be correct and the conduit would not be visible.

Committee Member Wheeler pointed out on page 2, line D, he suggested it should read: sign cabinets (take out the word "no more") be 24" in height. He would want all the signs to be the same. He also stated the depth should read: 10" (take out the word "no more") depth. He felt the proposed signage would work quite well.

Chair McCormack stated he liked the sign that was presented in the can over the other options and he asked for consensus from the Committee.

Committee Member Woollett asked what would occur if a business had a logo they wanted to use?

Mr. Bruce asked if he was referring to a trademark logo? He was certain that they had made an exception for that in their sign program.

Committee Member Woollett stated they could use their logo or trademark color within the same can.

Chair McCormack asked how that would work?

Mr. Bruce stated they would use the same sign can with their logo and colors within the blue outline of the sign.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated they had run into the situation before and for example Subway had a very distinct lettering and color combination, the City could not deny the use of their registered trademark or logo. The business could use their established lettering, colors or logo, however, it would need to be contained within the same can and follow the same height and depth requirements. There would not necessarily be consistent signage in a center.

Chair McCormack asked if they would need to make those specific comments as a condition?

Committee Member Woollett stated what the DRC would be doing was to approve a 24" high sign with the maximum length criteria that was conditioned and that was what they would be approving.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the DRC would also be selecting the color/material choice.

Chair McCormack stated it would be up to Staff to make accommodations for trademark or specific logo signage.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated Staff would ask for proof of a registered trademark.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4369-08, Briardale Plaza Signage Program, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

1. The signs to be white polycarbonate translucent vinyl with blue vinyl as presented by the applicant.
2. Clarify the sign height to be 24" and depth to be 10".
3. Signs to be evenly positioned midway in the fascia.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(4) DRC No. 4403-08 and AA No. 0168-08 – CITRUS MEDICAL IMAGING CENTER

- A proposal to construct two MRI chillers in the front yard of a two-story medical office building.
- 1031 West Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- Item Continued from DRC Meeting of February 18, 2009
- DRC Final Determination

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Chuck Coryell, address on file, stated they had been working toward solutions and they believed they took in all the recommendations and comments from the previous meeting. They had completed research for some of the points. The solutions related to the location were through a pro and con process. They believed the location presented was the best location for the equipment. The location had the least impact to the adjacent neighbors and neighborhoods. It allowed integration to the surrounding area and was in context to the street scape. They had a landscape proposal and first and foremost they needed to insure the integrity of the equipment. Those requirements would stand up to not only the manufacturer requirements but to operating procedures. It was a critical piece of equipment and would serve a need in the community. The patients who would utilize the equipment would be residents of the community. Ultimately the chiller had some restrictive criteria and he felt they had done their due diligence and believed the proposed solution and the noise aspect of the project fell within the City's requirements and the location would support the least impact. Clearly the landscape was a subjective matter and they were open to suggestions.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had a rather lengthy conversation with Mr. Coryell regarding the technical concerns and the investigation that he had been involved in.

Applicant, Dale Hadfield, address on file, stated primarily his objective was to mitigate the view of the equipment. They had to get to a certain height and they were proposing a wall of Podocarpus to screen all sides of the chillers. The other objective was to not make it obvious that the intent of the landscape was to hide the equipment. In front of the hedge they had removed the lawn and to gain continuity they removed the lawn along the entire strip. They moved some Crape Myrtles away from the building and he pointed out that those trees were not intended to be a screen, rather they were used as continuity of what occurred around the building. There were Palm trees on the site. The Palms were initially approved along the frontage of Chapman and the Palms that existed on the side where the proposed chiller was to be installed were existing. There were access issues behind the hedge for servicing of the chillers and that was the purpose of the stepping stones-to identify a walkway. They needed to screen from the ground up to the top of the chillers and the hedge had done that, but beyond that they wanted a bit more screening without having a tree that would grow directly over the chiller. It was a bit of a puzzle of what they were attempting. He welcomed any suggestions from the DRC.

Mr. Coryell stated Mr. Hadfield had some experience with the site and he had worked with Staff on the street scape intent for the plant materials presented.

Mr. Hadfield stated he was involved with the original landscaping and he had taken the assumption that what he had to start with was acceptable.

Public Comment

None.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was in favor of the condition regarding the sound. It appeared that the sound would be marginal. He understood that with higher temperatures the sound would increase and it could reach the windows to the property to the north, possibly above the recommended levels. He stated that Staff had requested input in addressing the equipment running during the night. He asked the applicant if that was a possibility.

Mr. Coryell stated the equipment would need to run at night in an idle condition. The unit was a cooling unit for an MRI unit. Essentially as the equipment was being used the magnet was being cooled in its diagnostic state. Generally the equipment was used during the day and into the early evening hours and cooling would go to a static temperature with the cooling cycling in and out. At night the equipment could kick in, it would not be a constant. At its full capacity the noise was below the maximum noise threshold and it would not be of consequence in the evening.

Committee Member Woollett stated he felt the starting and stopping of the equipment during the night would be more of an annoyance.

Mr. Coryell stated an MRI unit had unique characteristics. The units had alarms on them that in the event there was extreme highs or lows that would cause continuous cycling in, there would be a diagnostic call out.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the applicants were comfortable with the condition that if anyone complained the applicant would conduct a noise study and correct the problem if one existed.

Mr. Coryell stated they were okay with that condition.

Committee Member Wheeler stated at the last meeting they had recommended that the landscape immediately screen the equipment.

Committee Member Woollett stated if a neighbor complained, would the owner be required to complete a noise study within a specific timeframe and if it had not complied would there be a number of days for the noise situation to be fixed and if not addressed was that information spelled out in the conditions?

Ms. Nguyen stated the noise test would need to be completed within 30 days of the applicant being made aware of the noise complaint.

Committee Member Woollett stated he would want the solution of any mitigation acceptable to the DRC.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated if a requirement was for a solid barrier it could come back to the DRC or it could be added as a condition that any changes to the site to mitigate the noise would be brought back to the DRC.

Committee Member Woollett stated there was a lot of pressure to accept the manufacturer's equipment, especially a company like Siemens, precisely as it was sold to them. He felt it was unnecessarily high and if the landscape shielding was acceptable he had no further concerns.

Committee Member Gladson asked the applicant if they had investigated the ground cooling that had been suggested at the previous meeting?

Mr. Coryell stated that type of installation had great value and in time would work its way into a project. The particular piece of equipment was probably the outlier of the MRI and a linear accelerator would be the two pieces of diagnostic equipment, with their sensitivity, that could not meet an undergrounding installation. Their general feeling upon investigation concluded that the equipment would not tolerate that type of installation; it was very restrictive.

Committee Member Gladson asked if they had considered adding the berm in the landscaping?

Mr. Hadfield stated that berming presented a drainage issue on the site. Due to the grade the drainage would go back to the building and drains would be required that would need to go back to the street. Viewing the location at an angle from Chapman across the walkway with a very short distance to the wrought iron fence, there was not adequate space for a berm to have any effect. He felt they were able to provide a screen with the proposed planting. They would be layering the plantings which would give the same effect. He wanted to ensure they were satisfied with the proposed screening and would welcome any suggestions.

Chair McCormack stated the applicants had done everything that was asked. On the Podocarpus that would get to approximately 2'-4', the conditions stated that the screening would be immediate. He felt they should be spaced 3' on center to get the plantings to screen from day one.

Mr. Hadfield stated they could use a 24" box, 3' on center.

Chair McCormack stated it would be the same way they would treat a Ficus hedge, he would be happy with that. The landscape was peppered with a good combination and a good composition of plant choices. He felt the berming was not an issue.

Mr. Hadfield asked if he would be more comfortable with a Podocarpus henkelii?

Chair McCormack stated that choice, henkelii, was a bit "droopy". He felt good about the proposed plant choices. He asked for clarification on some of the plantings.

Mr. Hadfield stated he intended to relocate the Crape Myrtle. They completed the landscape theme of the site.

Chair McCormack stated that was even more screening and the applicant had completed the task as asked.

Mr. Hadfield reviewed the plans with the Committee.

Chair McCormack stated he would want the Podocarpus to be maintained at the height of the equipment. Normally if that condition was not added the gardening crew would trim it too low.

Committee Member Gladson stated she liked the concept that had been presented and the solution was better and the applicants had taken to heart the suggestions from the DRC. She would want to specify if there was a noise issue requiring mitigation that the DRC would have the item return for approval.

Applicant, Louay Auyoub, address on file, stated he would want to change the mitigation requirement from 60 days to 90 days to allow them to arrive at a workable solution.

Chair McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4403-08, Citrus Medical Imaging Center, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

1. Change Condition No. 1 to change the requirement for the installation of mitigation measures to occur within 90 days.
2. Space the Podocarpus at 3' on center and they shall be 24" box and maintained at a height of 6'.
3. The DRC to review any mitigation measures that would arise from a noise complaint.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(5) DRC No. 4181-07 – VERIZON WIRELESS FACILITY

- A proposal to install an antenna facility consisting of 8 panel antennas and 2 parabolic antennas to be located on an existing SCE tower.
- SCE Tower - Via Escola & Portofina
- 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, Paul Slotemaker, address on file, stated it was a small scope of work. They would be installing some equipment for Verizon and installing cabinets at the base of that wire. AT&T had a similar situation on the adjacent wire. They would have outdoor equipment cabinets behind the fence.

Public Comment

None.

Chair McCormack opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler asked why recommendation #2 was included?

Mr. Garcia stated that was an oversight and it would be removed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that mitigation measures were included in the Negative Declaration and should they add the biological resource information?

Mr. Garcia stated that would be included with the Conditions of Approval that would go to Planning Commission.

Committee Member Woollett asked if Staff had received any public input?

Mr. Garcia stated he had received one phone call from a gentleman that was attempting to get the exact location of the installation. The noticing had gone out last week to all properties within a 300' radius of the proposed project and there were no other inquiries.

Chair McCormack asked on the chain link fence with vinyl slats was there a color preference?

Mr. Slotemaker stated there was no color noted and the Committee Members could suggest a color.

Chair McCormack stated he would want brown or tan. He asked if there was a service road required to get to the equipment?

Mr. Garcia stated there was an existing road that would be used. The trenching would occur along the road.

Mr. Slotemaker pointed out on the drawings where the access road was. Verizon would be servicing their equipment once a month. Edison, AT & T and Verizon would be using the same service entrance. He was not aware of their maintenance schedules.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission, DRC No. 4181-07, Verizon Wireless Facility, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

1. Condition No. 2 be deleted.
2. The biological mitigation information in the environmental report be added.
3. The vinyl fence slats be earth tone.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(6) DRC No. 4205-07 - COPTIC ORTHODOX CHURCH

- A proposal to expand an existing church on the first and second floor, to remodel the exterior, and make associated site developments in the form of new parking, landscaping, and lighting.
- 491 North Hewes Street
- Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Comment

Committee Member Woollett stated the applicant Richard Garcia had worked with him, however, it had not presented a conflict of interest.

Assistant Planner, Sonal Thakur, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report. The project was being presented for preliminary review and would ultimately go to the Planning Commission for final determination.

Public Comment

None.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was not accurate to call the project Mission Style, it had some Mission elements and the design stood on its own. There was nothing that constrained them from accepting the design, but it was probably not a good idea to call it Mission Style.

Committee Member Gladson asked if there was a hybrid of Mission Style?

Committee Member Woollett stated it had a red tile roof and arches.

Chair McCormack asked in looking at the additional parking for such a small addition if the site was under parked?

Ms. Thakur stated there was an original CUP on file, additionally the parking that was required for the sanctuary area and classrooms and the other uses was not available, and the parking would help to alleviate any parking issues that would arise with the new uses.

Chair McCormack asked in cases of churches certain areas were exempt, and when the parking count was calculated with two uses occurring what would they get?

Ms. Thakur stated they arrived at the parking requirement in looking at all the uses at the church. The school, the mass, the pre-school which would not be occurring simultaneously and for that reason there would be a parking study that would go to the Planning Commission to ask for a variance arguing that exact point. Based on the Coptic religion no other activity could occur while mass was in session. There was not a concern that there would be a parking issue.

Chair McCormack pointed to an area on the drawings and asked if all the area was required for parking.

Ms. Thakur stated yes.

Chair McCormack stated the plant palette was good.

Applicant, Richard Garcia, stated in addition to the parking there was a large courtyard that was being planned, he pointed that out on the drawings. There would be a water fountain, a fire pit, and some overhead entry areas with wood trellises. He had spoken with the church council several years ago and they had interest in using Queen Palms. Most of the plantings would be along the perimeter of the courtyard.

Chair McCormack reviewed the plans with the applicant and verified that there were seat walls and concrete in between the seat walls. He was a huge fan of the Pink Trumpet, Tabebuia. The only downside was that from November through March the trees were bare. He brought it up as his personal thing was in a plaza area there should be some shade and green. He had not thought the Queen Palms or Bronze Loquat would not get to a size that would shade. He suggested using a tree that would give a bit more shade. He would use the Pink Trumpet tree as an accent tree; they also dropped a flower that would stain.

The applicant, Mr. Garcia, stated during the winter months they would not want a heavy shade tree in that area. Most of the activities would take place during other times of the year. He had selected the Pink Trumpet as the applicants were looking for something to add color.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the area was intended to be a gathering spot after a service? She would think that they would want to program the area to be used all year round.

The applicant, Mr. Garcia, stated during the winter when it was cooler you would not need the shade.

Chair McCormack stated the plaza would be shaded from the building so maybe they were fine with providing adequate shade. He suggested moving some of the trees and adding an Evergreen tree.

The applicant, Mr. Garcia, stated the design of the courtyard was given to him; he had not redesigned the courtyard.

Chair McCormack pointed out a line on the courtyard and asked for clarification.

Applicant, George Behnam, address on file, stated the line was a step up.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if Chair McCormack thought it would be useful to have some shrubbery on top of the berm on the west side to screen the parking?

Chair McCormack stated the typical treatment was to screen the area from headlights and vehicles. He pointed out an area on the plans and stated it appeared to loosen up in that area.

Applicant, Georgette Farag, address on file, stated there were huge trees in that area that offered too much shade and the shrubs in that area would not grow.

Chair McCormack asked if the plan had developed from parishioner's input?

Ms. Farag stated they had received input from the church-goers.

Chair McCormack asked if some of the trees being taken out would be used elsewhere?

The applicant, Mr. Garcia, stated "yes." He pointed out the areas where trees would be removed for the expansion and parking areas; 90% of those existing trees were Eucalyptus trees that had been there for several years, they were quite large and he was not certain that they could be saved. There were trees that would remain; some specimen-type trees and they were far enough away from the building to not have an impact.

The Committee reviewed the plans with the applicants. The applicant, Mr. Garcia, pointed out an existing Basketball court area with lawn around it that would remain intact. The walkway areas and handicapped access areas were pointed out.

Committee Member Gladson stated on the southern elevation she was only seeing two trees.

The applicant, Mr. Garcia, stated on the other side of the property line there were many existing trees and shrubs that exceeded the wall height. He had not wanted to place trees there that would be squeezed into that area.

Committee Member Gladson stated the parking lot had not appeared to have much shading.

Chair McCormack stated what was missing was the City's tree count as it related to parking. Prior to the next plan presentation they should obtain a tree count requirement and a parking count.

The Committee and applicants discussed the tree count/parking count requirements.

Chair McCormack stated they would need to include those numbers with the plans.

Committee Member Gladson stated they would want to landscape the parking lot appropriately and add shade.

Mr. Garcia stated he would need to follow the City's requirement for parking and tree count as far as quantity of trees. If they were short in the tree count he pointed out areas on the plans that trees could be added.

Chair McCormack stated they could add trees for shading in the parking lot.

Ms. Farag stated on the other side of the wall between their building and the single family homes were huge trees 45' Junipers and 50' Pine trees that provided shade almost to the end of the parking lot. To add more trees to that space they would be crowding that area and she was concerned with the aesthetics of that area.

Mr. Garcia asked if those trees should be added into their design.

Chair McCormack stated they would have an impact on their design as they would not want to plant a tree under another tree; there would be some understanding and common sense.

Mr. Garcia asked to address the existing trees on the property line would he be required to survey that area and show the trees on his plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that would be a good idea, just a general sketch.

Chair McCormack stated one thing he was concerned with was how they would handle the overhang area and to put something very, very low there or to use gravel.

Mr. Garcia asked if they should cement the entire area?

Chair McCormack stated they could concrete the area.

Mr. Behnam stated the cars that would park there would be there only twice a week. A very short period of time. Maybe something a little bit better than concrete in that area would work.

Chair McCormack stated they could use a low grass in that area.

Committee Member Gladson asked if they had gotten any preliminary feedback on a water quality plan? She wanted to ensure that upon the applicant's return that they had all of those details in place.

Ms. Thakur stated the preliminary water quality management program had been approved.

Chair McCormack stated in planting areas with larger shrubs. He suggested to not come back with too many varieties of plantings and to simplify the landscape palette. He suggested creating layers of plantings and to not get too fussy in the large sweeping areas.

Mr. Garcia stated there were areas that had existing trees and shrubs and those areas were pointed out on the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the Staff Report mentioned the windows being a bit busy. He had no real problems. He stepped over to the presentation board and made suggestions. On the windows he suggested using the same type of window forms throughout the project. He pointed out some windows that were not consistent with the floor plan. Some of the roof and portico areas had not agreed with the elevations. He pointed out a window that appeared a bit weak and he presented some examples to the applicant. The applicants reviewed his suggestions on the plans and they discussed his ideas.

Committee Member Gladson asked how Committee Member Wheeler felt about the doors? That was the main door and it had looked more "store front" and she wondered how that could be changed. Committee Member Wheeler agreed that the doors looked "store front".

Committee Member Gladson stated they may want to explore some options with that area. The two tower elements provided good symmetry.

Chair McCormack stated when there was that type of architecture at the doors or the windows it gave a sense that they were punched in and the walls were thick, would that help the issue to recess the door back.

Mr. Behnam stated the doors were recessed 2' already.

Committee Member Gladson stated they could emulate the Immanuel Church on Chapman and it could be beneficial to visit that church.

Chair McCormack stated there was so much celebration going on and they could change the paving to pull people into that zone and celebrate the area more, to have it be different in that area.

Committee Member Woollett stated it could be an area where they went to zero curb.

Chair McCormack stated they could go to a zero curb, with bollards for protection. The concrete could be carried straight across with the handicapped ramp beginning in an area he pointed out on the plans.

Mr. Behnam asked if they preferred pavers or stamped concrete?

Chair McCormack stated either would work or they could use concrete saw cuts. They could also remove the turn and bring an area he pointed out on the plans straight in.

Mr. Behnam asked if at a later date would the Building Division ask them to add the truncated domes in that area?

Chair McCormack stated that had happened at the library, they wanted to have them blend in and they used red tones in the concrete. He was exactly correct, they could explore their options.

Ms. Farag stated there was a cross that they would be moving to another area she pointed to on the plans and they would not want to move the walkway away from that area.

Chair McCormack suggested celebrating that area and making it the focal point.

Committee Member Gladson stated on the fencing plan there were some notes that had high wire fence and chain link, she asked for clarification on those fences?

Ms. Farag stated they had an Eagle Scout that was planning to do fencing on the children's playground and remove the chain link. They planned to use wrought iron. Part of his project was having him get his approvals through the City.

Ms. Thakur requested that Committee Member Wheeler provide a brief review of his suggestions.

Committee Member Wheelers stated his suggestions were:

1. On the east side there was a gable roof, but the roof plan had a hip roof.
2. Match the windows on the floor plans.
3. On the north elevation the roof had not matched the floor plans.
4. The west elevations had not matched the floor plans.
5. Study the round window.
6. There was some grillage on the south elevation and he was not certain if they should appear on the north elevation as well.

Chair McCormack stated it would be nice to shift the road back.

Ms. Thakur stated it would encroach on the setback.

Mr. Behran stated they would solve that area with the other suggestions Chair McCormack had made.

Applicant, Michael Morcos, address on file, asked on the driveway there was no back-up area.

Ms. Thakur stated when it was 90 degrees and two ways 25' was required.

Mr. Morcos stated there would not be parking there, could they make that area narrower.

Ms. Thakur stated they would want to check with the Fire Department to ensure they had adequate access.

Mr. Morcos stated the Fire Department required only 20'.

Committee Member Woollett asked if they could have that roadway be a one way access and it would be less of a conflict for the traffic area. Someone could stop and let someone out and there could still be traffic access. He pointed out the area on the plans for the access of the one way road. The Fire Department was happy with 20'.

Committee Member Gladson stated in the Staff Report there was a comment regarding lighting.

Mr. Behnam stated they would provide a photometric plan with their final submittal.

Chair McCormack stated there was no action needed on the item.

There was no further discussion.

(7) DRC No. 4410-09 – ZAKI RESIDENCE ACCESSORY SECOND DWELLING UNIT

- A proposal to modify the previous DRC approval. The applicant is requesting approval to utilize concrete instead of grass cell along the driveway and rear of the primary residence. The applicant also requests to remove the vehicular gate.
- 375 North Cambridge Street
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Public Comment

None.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had remembered thinking the use of Grass Crete was a bit odd. He agreed with concrete and suggested something more attractive for the extra parking space such as pavers. He felt concrete was more appropriate.

Committee Member Woollett stated he remembered the concern being that there was too much concrete and little green areas. The suggestion of turf block was to mitigate that.

Chair McCormack stated in coming back they had not wanted to do that. Many times they required at least a ribbon.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that requirement was done primarily in Old Towne.

Chair McCormack stated it would be a way to mitigate the concrete.

Committee Member Gladson stated her concern was that if it was not maintained properly it would not look good.

Chair McCormack stated he had no reason to have them use the turf block.

Applicant, Eric Audet, address on file, stated they would also need some type of irrigating system and they would need to add a timer with people parking there it would be less than ideal. The area would be used for parking and there would be approximately two cars per dwelling.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the code required was three cars.

Committee Member Woollett stated the code allowed them to use the space for parking and it would not leave much for their concerns. If the turf block was installed properly it would not be well maintained and be a negative use for the area.

Chair McCormack stated it would be a plus to use concrete and to add a grass ribbon, no more than 2' wide. They would irrigate it under the concrete with pop up heads. He had the same treatment at his own home and the sprinkler head would not be touched with only a 2' wide grass area. He had a 2' strip with an 8' driveway with the concrete being 6" thick for driveway use. They needed to go 6" or it would crack.

Applicant, Sherif Zaki, address on file, asked if the life span for that design would be the same as a life span of a normal driveway?

Chair McCormack stated it would be the same.

Mr. Audet stated the area was 14' at the house.

Ms. Nguyen stated there was a neighboring fence that encroached on the property and had been that way for quite a long time.

Chair McCormack stated he felt the use of a grass strip and using concrete for the driveway would be a huge plus for the house.

Mr. Audet clarified that they agreed to have the 3rd parking space be concrete.

Chair McCormack stated in parking a car over the grass irrigated area the sprinkler heads only popped up 4" and would not hit the undercarriage of the car, and the grass would only go to the gate.

Mr. Zaki stated they wanted to remove the gate, and asked what a logical point would be to stop the grass if the gate was removed.

Ms. Nguyen stated there was a door on the house and that would seem to be the stopping point.

Chair McCormack stated that was up to the applicant.

Applicant, Amir Zaki, address on file, stated they would add somewhat of a design with saw cuts in the concrete.

Chair McCormack stated they could use a diagonal grid to have it appear more interesting.

Mr. Audet asked if the benefit of having the grass strip more for aesthetics?

Chair McCormack stated it just broke up the concrete and had the appearance of a walkway when a car was not parked there.

Mr. Audet stated they had done a great deal of driving around the neighborhood and only found one house that had that treatment. They had not found any turf blocks.

Chair McCormack stated in Old Towne turf ribbons were everywhere.

Mr. Audet stated the only concern with adding the grass strip was the maintenance issues, to keep it the same way they intended it to be.

Chair McCormack stated it was grass and the maintenance person would just mow it, one up and one back and be done with it.

Mr. Audet stated he had concerns with the life span of the concrete without the rebar and just the strip.

Chair McCormack stated he suggested the use of rebar in the concrete strips. Rebar the entire driveway and use 6" of concrete and not 4".

Mr. Audet stated could they use fiber mesh, the additive to the concrete and not have the need for rebar.

Chair McCormack stated fiber mesh was just an added measure he would still recommend rebar as well in a 6" thick slab. The standard set of drawings he would produce would be 6" concrete and rebar for the entire space.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt they were getting into the engineering of the project which was outside of the purview of the Committee.

Mr. Zaki stated with the whole project they were over budget and anything that would add to their costs was huge. With the forms that would need to be set up for the grass strip they would be adding additional costs to their project.

Chair McCormack stated the difference between the concrete forms and turf and irrigation would not be that great.

Mr. Zaki stated initially they had presented concrete and then it was suggested that they use turf block, it was more expensive.

Mr. Audet stated from the initial meeting they were under the impression by comments made that the cost for the Turf Crete versus concrete were the same which was not the case.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was a balanced approach that they could live with, by the applicant dropping the Turf Crete, but they were respecting their colleagues options by adding an aesthetic element. She assumed the property was an income producing project.

Mr. Audet stated with the Turf Crete it was the approach that would have another set of maintenance issues and it was not part of their original plan.

Chair McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4410-09, Zaki Residence Accessory Second Dwelling Unit, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

1. Add a 2' to 2 ½' wide irrigated grass strip at the front portion of the driveway.

2. To eliminate the Grass Cell at the back portion of the property.
3. Remove gate.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled meeting on Wednesday, April 1, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

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

MOTION CARRIED.