CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

June 17, 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

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner

Sonal Thakur, Assistant Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

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

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

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated for Item No. 4 there was not a quorum available as Committee Member Wheeler had a conflict due to the location of the applicant to his office and for Chair McCormack since he had a financial conflict. The item would need to be continued. There were no changes to the Agenda or any policy or procedural information to discuss.

Committee Member Woollett asked for additional copies of the General Plan document presented at the previous meeting. Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she would get him an additional copy.

Chair McCormack stated the Agenda would be moved to hear Item No. 3 first. Chair McCormack asked if there was any objection from the public or applicants present. There was none.

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett, Craig Wheeler

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

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.

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

- (2) DRC No. 4384-08 SIR WICKET FACADE (CUDDLEBACK) RESTORATION
 - A proposal for a façade renovation.
 - 100-104 S. Glassell Street and 30-36 Plaza Square, Plaza Historic District
 - Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
 - Preliminary Review from November 5, 2008 DRC Meeting
 - DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself due to the location of his office in proximity to Applicant.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Leason Pomeroy, address on file, stated the plans were very similar to what had been submitted previously, with the main difference being the elimination of an opening for the electrical room. If they had to have the electrical room they would not be able to house the restaurant, as the space they had was very small. The tenants were present and if they had not eaten at Francolis' they should; they were excellent restaurateurs and he was pleased that they would be moving into Orange. The site was so good and deserved a quality restaurant. One of the reasons for the set back was if they went beyond a certain size, two exits would be required. There was a good functional reason for going back to the period in time when the store front had been set back 8-10 feet. He was up for making the space appear as it had in some historic photos he presented and he was willing to add the marble and the bulkhead. Mr. Ryan had felt the bulkhead was a little high and they were planning on reducing it to be more in scale. The original bulkhead in 1906 was approximately 6". The Committee reviewed historic photos that he presented.

Chair McCormack asked for clarification on what detail he was speaking to.

Mr. Pomeroy pointed to the details he had spoken about. The Committee reviewed the photos. In reviewing the photos there was a cantered area of the building, and to keep it closer to the original design he agreed that he would duplicate the slant, which he pointed out in a photo.

Mr. Ryan stated that was a common feature and they varied to the degree of the slant, some were 45 degrees and some were very steep.

Mr. Pomeroy stated they would be incorporating what once was a jewelry display case into a table seating area. He proposed that they would be installing a glass panel all the way across the building frontage. They had not known if the original glass treatment would exist once the wood siding would be removed. He presented samples of glass that they were experimenting with that would be acceptable and would provide a screen to what was behind the glass. The idea was that

since the glass was transparent they would need to laminate the glass onto a more obscure surface. There was not an opening that would transfer light into the space and originally that was the reason glass had been installed in that area. He felt they could get very close to what the period glass tiles looked like and he presented a sample of what had existed on the building. He presented a sample of tile that had been mounted onto a wood painted background with dark grout. They would be experimenting with various glass materials to attempt to match as closely what had originally existed on the building. He had also had a conversation with Jeff Frankel regarding the project and Mr. Frankel had been very supportive of where they were headed.

Mr. Ryan stated the final determining body would be the Planning Commission and the tenant had also applied for an ABC License and the application would go through that process. The DRC's recommendation would be to the Planning Commission.

Public Comment

Bob Hitchcock, address on file, stated he wanted to commend the owners and planners in restoring the façade. He had a couple of questions, in regards to the recess the 1947 photo was kind of a stretch in going back to the period he wanted with the barber shop. He asked if the reason for the recess was to avoid the second exit? If someone could explain the corner glass, he was referring to the glassed in portion in the 1906 photo; he asked if that detail would remain?

Janet Crenshaw, address on file, representing the OTPA, she questioned the use of the 1947 photo as a reference as the cut-off date for historic buildings was 1940. She loved the fact that the wrought iron was being removed, however, there were plans to add more wrought iron at the sidewalk and she had not felt that it was very historic.

Doug Ely, address on file, stated he wanted to commend the applicant on doing a thorough job in restoring the building back to what it once was. He was expecting to be heard for his project, but had not, and there were some things that he had been looking at in his building next door, as they were also doing a restoration. They had found that the store fronts over a period of time changed. He had seen photos of his building where the store front had been recessed. It was a question of what period the building would be restored to. He felt that as long as the framework of the building remained intact the store fronts could change as they had done over time. He felt there was historical precedence for having the building recessed and they were restoring the corner element with the angle that it had previously had; it was important and the proposed project was a wonderful renovation that he was in support of.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he wanted to disclose that he had discussed the project briefly with the applicant. He thought the project was very challenging for a number of reasons and that they should think about the time issue. In discussing time, they had recently had a project where they accepted it based on a time in the 1950's, and that style had been accepted. With the proposed project they were going back to a time for many years when the styles were essentially the same and for that reason he had no concern in mixing 1947 with 1920 as during that timeframe the buildings had essentially the same styles. It had not bothered him that what the applicant wanted to do was in a sense mix and match. There was not a mixing and matching of styles. It was dependent on an attitude towards historic preservation. They had returned to

that discussion over the years and he had consistently had the point of view that the style was more important than attempting to replicate the building based on one point in time. Some of the reviving and restoring of historical buildings became not viable in some instances without any flexibility. It was a situation of having a historic building that was so eaten up by termites that it could not be restored and to say the building could not be torn down because it was an existing historic building and the building would sit and it was not viable and that to him was defeating the whole standard. He had been consistent on his comments and the points that were made during public comment by Mr. Ely were correct; within certain limits they could exercise the same kind of freedom that the original property owners had in changing the store fronts from time to time. He was in support of the recess.

Committee Member Woollett stated on the glass he had an issue as the proposal presented a plan that was deliberately deceptive; one of the key things that they attempted to keep with historic buildings was integrity. He had previously felt installing a metal door on a historic building was permissible as it would stand the test of time, however, it had lacked integrity and a wood door would be more appropriate and they had changed his view on that. Even though in historic styles there was a lot trickery; when the prism glass units existed it was into an interior space and having stated that he was inclined to ask that the applicant could only do the very next best thing and that was what the applicant was attempting to do. He was working on a building across the street that had maintained the leaded glass. He asked what existed in the space behind the glass that the original treatment would not work?

Mr. Pomeroy stated there were seismic brace frames in that area.

Committee Member Woollett stated he understood why they would not want to use the leaded glass that was very expensive, but they could mount the glass on glass and use a similar divider that he had presented with the tile and the glass would function as glass.

Mr. Pomeroy stated they had not considered taking away all the construction that would sit behind the glass to allow light into the building; there was seismic framing and other framing that existed in that area and they would not know exactly what the view would be until after they began to remove that frontage area.

Chair McCormack asked why the diagonal wood had not been removed before the meeting?

Applicant, Al Ricci, address on file, stated they had not wanted to do that without the DRC's approval. They had not wanted to run into a situation as the Grinder had faced when they had begun to remove things without the DRC's approval.

Chair McCormack stated if they knew what was behind it that would help them to determine what could be done.

Mr. Ryan stated it was referenced in the report if the applicant would discover transom glass that it would be incorporated into their project and would cover them from getting into a situation. He believed strongly in the way the building had been retrofitted that there would be elements that existed that would eliminate the use of glass as a light source. The ordinance for retrofitting required the frame to be set back 3 feet and boxed in; that was typically what they would find.

Committee Member Woollett asked what had been back there and what they had explored. It sounded to him that the applicant had no choice in not using a translucent application.

Chair McCormack stated in responding to public comment there had been a question regarding the recess and it appeared to him that the door was ajar with two different square footage issues and not having to add the second door. He asked the applicant if the reason for the recess was to avoid installation of the second door?

Mr. Pomeroy stated in finding the photos it enabled them to solve the second exit issue. To secure the tenant they had not wanted to cut into the building.

Chair McCormack asked if the corner glass would remain?

Mr. Pomeroy stated it remained. They would restore that to the historic period and he explained the existing design and what they would be restoring to.

Chair McCormack stated they would be going back to a 1909 use.

Mr. Pomeroy stated they were attempting to build the exact façade.

Chair McCormack stated there had been a concern with the use of a 1947 reference.

Mr. Pomeroy stated he had found another photo, which had period cars on the street, which showed that the building had a recess during a period of time thought to be in the early 1900's. The Committee reviewed the photo and discussed the recess in comparison to the proposal.

Chair McCormack asked about the use of wrought iron.

Mr. Pomeroy stated the proposed project included a planter wall to fulfill the ABC requirement. To soften the wall they wanted to add plantings to that area and a railing would be added; they wanted to use some period wrought iron and to keep the design very simple.

Mr. Ricci stated they would be removing the New Orleans style wrought iron that existed currently on the building.

Mr. Pomeroy stated a barrier was required.

Chair McCormack asked what would have originally existed?

Mr. Pomeroy stated there was not a barrier on the building and they would need to research what types of wrought iron or steel could be used.

Chair McCormack stated it would be a visual aspect that would require some scrutiny.

Committee Member Woollett stated they should use wrought iron and not tubular steel.

Mr. Pomeroy stated there was a lot of wrought iron on the Starbucks building and the Sunkist building also had wrought iron and they could use that as an example to build from.

Chair McCormack asked if it would be appropriate to carry an element across, which he pointed to on the plans, with wrought iron on top and would it be something that would have been used as a base?

Mr. Pomeroy stated they could have a solid 2-foot piece across the front.

Committee Member Gladson stated they would need to incorporate the wrought iron as they would need a 36" or 43" height to meet the ABC requirement.

Chair McCormack stated his comment was not to pull the bulkhead all the way across but to have the bulkhead smaller with wrought iron on top.

Committee Member Woollett stated he felt the bulkhead would not be needed as its original use was to keep water out and that the wrought iron alone would be sufficient.

Mr. Pomeroy stated they would research and come up with some good examples for their installation.

Chair McCormack stated the tile would be on top and there would be a grade change in that area. Where the tile met the concrete there would be a slope up. The wrought iron would then be on top of the tile.

Committee Member Woollett asked what were the thoughts on the tile?

Mr. Pomeroy stated the thought was to use a similar color to concrete with some larger tiles that would be an appropriate outdoor treatment. It could be a ceramic tile or stone.

Committee Member Gladson stated in the 1906 photo there were elements that were attic vents and she had not known if they were a character defining feature and would they want to incorporate that?

Mr. Pomeroy stated one of the things he had noticed around town was that some of those panels were rectangular and some of them had a band of colored glass within them, and there were all kinds of examples of that. He had not wanted to add a detail that would draw more attention to that part of the building.

Committee Member Gladson stated she also felt the project was very challenging and it was a lot to get her head around, there were many pieces to it. A property owner that wanted to take on a project of that magnitude should be highly commended and the effort was long overdue for the building. She struggled with two things; the recessed element and when the project had been previewed there was not the photo documentation presented that they had now, and it helped to know that the recessed element that it had occurred in an earlier time frame on that building. The other thing was the issue of the period of significance for the Plaza and there would be all kinds of opinions on that and that the 1930's was a time when Orange became a prominent community and that was the stuff she was looking at for the details she needed. What was an issue that the DRC would speak to would be character-defining features of the building and the architecture and design elements of the building that would be going back to the level of

importance, and elements that were inappropriate would be removed. Was the recess issue so character-defining that she would have to disagree with the design, and was it enough of an issue to have her say "no" to that feature? She thought it was not, with the information and documentation that had been provided. She felt the transoms and windows were a character-defining feature. To have a complete match would be cost-prohibited and getting to something similar was what the Standards required. If it was the Committee's desire to recommend the proposed project she would want to review the detail of the transoms at a later date and to find out what was in that area after they began construction and she would feel more comfortable being able to review the ultimate treatment prior to its installation.

Mr. Ryan stated it was only the transom that would be an issue. The other project that was continued would be returning with a solution to the glass issue and they would be presenting a treatment that would be similar to the treatment that Mr. Pomeroy would be incorporating.

Committee Member Gladson stated she would be more comfortable if she was presented with what was found and what the treatment would ultimately be.

Mr. Pomeroy reviewed the photos and pointed out what had existed; he pointed to the photo that they would be working from to replicate the features. They would be working towards getting the building to as rich as they could get it. If they found that behind the siding was useable glass they would celebrate that.

Committee Member Woollett stated that would present a problem as the detail would only be present on one side of the building and another solution would need to be found.

Chair McCormack stated if it was found or replicated, when they went to the building next door would the entire area be of the same treatment. The stores were all different uses and would it not be better to have it be different.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated they were starting to venture into the hypothetical and what the Committee needed to do was to look at the solutions that were being presented in the proposed project and if that solution was acceptable to make that part of their recommendation. She advised that the conditions were clear that if the applicant found that the transom existed that perhaps they return with an FYI or if the applicant found that the transom was not there, they could return through the DRC and work through the issue. What would occur next door was another matter completely. They could move forward with some conditions in place and they could explore options once they found what existed on the building; the proposed project could move forward to the Planning Commission.

Committee Member Woollett asked the applicant what he wanted approved regarding the glass issue?

Mr. Pomeroy stated he wanted to have approved a system similar to the examples he had presented using an opaque glass treatment and they would work out something with the other building to make certain it was different. They could begin working to discover what existed to have more information available once they reached the Planning Commission.

Committee Member Woollett stated they were proposing to add awnings to the second level and he asked why they wanted to do that?

Mr. Pomeroy stated to add another detail. He pointed to the areas where that treatment would be added. The first floor would be retractable and the 2nd floor awnings would be fixed. The awnings would be removable.

Committee Member Gladson stated awnings that were removable were acceptable and not troubling to her. There were other issues that the Planning Commission would discuss, such as if a restaurant should be located on the corner of the Plaza. It was a land use issue.

Chair McCormack stated the awnings had not bothered him. The demising wall was being removed and he asked if that was an original wall?

Mr. Pomeroy stated there had originally been two tenants in that space. It was now one building with one owner and there were no easements on the property. He presented photos with evidence that the building had awnings during the historic period.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4384-08, Sir Wicket Façade (Cuddleback) Restoration, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report, and with the following modifications to Item No. 2 that Reed Glass be used in a similar configuration as provided in the drawings, and with the following additional condition:

- 1. To add Item No. 8: on the return wall on the south, that the corner glass element angle shall be sloped.
- 2. To add Item No. 9: that the bulkheads be polished stone.
- 3. To add Item No. 10: that the fence enclosure next to the sidewalk be of a historically relevant wrought iron and not tubular steel.
- 4. The exterior tile be historically relevant.
- 5. Upon discovery of historically relevant glass, the applicant shall return to the DRC for review of that element.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart RECUSED: Craig Wheeler

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4297-07 – MAIN MEDICAL PLAZA

- A proposal to construct a new 7,981 square foot, two story medical office building with one level of underground parking.
- 396 S. Main Street
- Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Comments

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

Applicant, Bruce Manzer, address on file, stated it was a pleasure working with the City to get as far as they had gotten; the project had been previously approved and had not been constructed. The project was going through the process again. The applicant presented color samples for the DRC's review.

Public Comment

None.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the first level the stairway was not consistent with the second level.

Mr. Manzer pointed out which one was correct.

Committee Member Wheeler reviewed the plans with the applicant and pointed out the inconsistencies between plans and they discussed the corrections that were needed. He stated the roof plan elevations had not shown the parapet returns and he stated all those details would need to be cleaned up. His biggest design concern was that it appeared as though there was a floating design that had not yet landed. There was a rather cliché device for roof bracket treatments that really would not do anything and he suggested playing around with some other ideas. He was very much a fan of the Market Place in Irvine and there were those large structural elements with bold colors, something very simple and strong. He suggested possibly losing the use of stone and using strong colors and larger structural forms. There was one window that was different that stood out from the other windows and he felt the window should match or that it should be very different to make a statement.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the building was in the Main Street Corridor which had a specific design theme?

Ms. Thakur stated although it was addressed off of Main, the frontage of the building was off of Culver and not Main.

Committee Member Woollett stated as far as he was concerned it was, as it was visible on Main and part of that commercial center. It also lined up with the buildings on the south side of Culver. He agreed with what Committee Member Wheeler suggested. He was evaluating the project that he felt fell within a context area that was defined by the City. He encouraged the suggestions made by Committee Member Wheeler. He remembered the project that had been presented previously and there had been problems. There was parking in the basement and he wondered why the ramp was being placed before them; he felt he was not qualified to make recommendations on it.

Ms. Thakur stated they were looking for architectural input from a design perspective.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had not wanted to be responsible for a bumper dragging on the ramp.

Ms. Thakur stated the project had been reviewed in a Staff Review meeting.

Mr. Manzer stated the ramp design had been reviewed and planned per L.A. County guidelines.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was concerned with cars entering the basement and he asked if the parking was intended for visitors or tenants?

Mr. Manzer stated for both, but primarily visitors would park above.

Committee Member Woollett asked if there was any provision for protection of the properties by other businesses?

Mr. Manzer had not known if there was a reciprocal parking agreement.

Chair McCormack stated due to that issue and if the public was allowed to enter the underground parking, they could essentially get trapped in that area due to the design of the parking area.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the project would need to go to Planning Commission?

Ms. Thakur stated the DRC would be the final recommending body.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that the underground parking could be designated to employee parking only with signs posted to direct that.

Chair McCormack stated there could be a key access to that parking and they were suggesting design ideas to the applicant.

Ms. Thakur stated the only thing that she would worry about in regard to a key entry would be if multiple cars were attempting to exit or enter and there could be a possible potential for stacking. The Committee Members discussed the stacking issue with the applicant.

Committee Member Wheeler asked for some clarification on the treatment of the sides of the ramped area?

Mr. Manzer stated it would be CMU with a plaster coating. He pointed out the landscape areas and where a guard rail or pipe rail would be installed.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if he felt there was any danger that a small child could go into that area and potentially fall.

Mr. Manzer stated it was certainly something they could explore and discuss. That was the intent of the guard rail.

Chair McCormack pointed out areas for landscaping and asked how much room was being provided for soil?

Mr. Manzer stated it was noted on the plans as 1 foot, and he felt they should have at least 12" to 24".

Chair McCormack stated on grade structures there should be 1 to 3 feet for shrubs and 5 feet for trees, and he suggested the use of real soil, not lightweight soil. He pointed to an area that was designated handicapped and clarified a zero curb area. He stated on the plans there were notations for walls and he asked for clarification on the drain.

Mr. Manzer pointed out where the drainage would occur on the plans.

Chair McCormack stated there was an on-grade swale at 2% and there was an area that would be 7-8" below the walk and the site was fairly flat; he cautioned the applicant on how to drain the area. The landscape plans had not addressed a vegetative swale and what would occur if it was left at less than 1% would be that the water would just sit there. He suggested choosing a plant that would take water. The plant counts were 75% and 25% with 24" boxes and he had only noted that there were two 24" boxes. In the past they had stated on Palm trees they looked for brown trunk height with a minimum of 10". The other thing was that he had not necessarily understood the landscape plan and it needed some simplifying. The concentration could be on just one or two types of plants.

Committee Member Gladson stated in using the simpler plant palette it would play off of the architectural suggestions made by Committee Member Wheeler.

Chair McCormack stated on the Jack Sprat he suggested the use of 1 gallon plants spaced at 1 foot on center as it would only get 12" wide. He suggested simplification.

Committee Member Gladson stated she appreciated the comments by her colleagues. They had some medical projects that had been brought to them due to equipment location issues and because it was a medical use she wanted to suggest that they explored the placement of medical equipment on the roof.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they would want to explore the roof load requirements of the equipment as that could present an issue.

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for June 17, 2009 Page 13 of 15

Chair McCormack stated they could explore removal of wheel stops and addition of zero curb areas. The electrical plan noted lighting via the use of wall packs and there were hot spots along the building and he suggested getting a bit more creative with lighting instead of just the use of wall packs.

Mr. Manzer stated there were street lights all along the area that provided a lot of lighting.

Committee Member Woollett asked what Chair McCormack had in mind.

Chair McCormack suggested some more creative lighting other than the use of wall packs that were typically used in industrial areas.

Committee Member Woollett stated they could have lighting that was higher to illuminate the area better. There could be enough light reflected off of the building to meet their requirements.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested not using a stone treatment, which would give a better appearance and could save them some money.

Chair McCormack stated the suggestions were for simplification of the design.

The proposed project was presented for preliminary input and no motion was required.

(4) DRC No. 4421-09 – EHLEN & GROTE FAÇADE RENOVATION

- A proposal for a façade renovation to the contributing Ehlen & Grote commercial building, which fronts on Glassell and Plaza Square.
- 110 S. Glassell and 40-42 Plaza Square, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Dan Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

The item was continued to a date certain of July 1, 2009 due to lack of a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled meeting on July 1, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart and Craig Wheeler

MOTION CARRIED.