CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

July 15, 2009

Committee Members Present:	Bill Cathcart Adrienne Gladson Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett
Committee Members Absent:	Tim McCormack
Staff in Attendance:	Ed Knight, Assistant Community Development Director Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Sonal Thakur, Assistant Planner Diane Perry, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

The Committee met for an Administrative Session beginning at 5:12 p.m.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the Administrative Session with any information from Staff.

Assistant Community Development Director, Ed Knight, stated there were no changes to the Agenda and nothing further to add.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the regular scheduled meeting of July 1, 2009. Changes and corrections were noted.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5: 25 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Tim McCormack 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: July 1, 2009

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee Meeting of July 1, 2009, with corrections and changes noted.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4364-08 – IRV SEAVER BMW

- A proposal for landscaping improvements related to the expansion of an existing motorcycle dealership.
- 607 W. Katella Avenue
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- Landscape Improvements Continued from DRC Meeting of April 15, 2009
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Cathcart recused himself from this Agenda item as he was the landscape architect on the proposed project.

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

Applicant, Evan Bell, address on file, stated if the trees were required in front of the showroom windows they would block the view of the showroom and the signs that were required to be displayed on the building by the BMW Corporation. It would cut the visibility of the outdoor displays. The lawn, in an area he pointed out on the plans, was 11' wide in that area with the portico hanging out 6' from the building, and to plant trees in that area at maturity would take up the space and the trees would need to be planted 3' from the sidewalk. Those trees would need to be kept trimmed at 10' tall for signage and window visibility. He felt having trees in the front area of the project would not work well and they would be too close to the building and block visibility and the display window. With the "cookie-cutter" rule on the trees, there was a perfect example of what was happening at Taco Bell, their signs were not even visible. He asked if the City would be doing the business a favor by requiring trees in the front of a building where they would be displaying merchandise in order to make a living? The other point he wanted to bring up was that the number of trees specified would be 28; however, given the west property line situation and the length of the building on that side, he had understood that the calculation, as they had spoken about cutting that area in half, should come to 14 trees. For some reason Staff had come up with 19 trees instead of 14 trees. If he was to eliminate the six trees at the front of the building and the two trees (he pointed to on the plans) and replace them with Cypress trees that would allow the visibility he needed. He asked if that would be acceptable by the DRC as an alternative plan?

Vice Chair Gladson stated that would be something the DRC could discuss and she asked if there was anything further from the applicant or the applicant's representative?

Jon Califf, Architect, address on file, stated he felt it was fairly simple as the variety of trees that had been chosen were more of a smaller tree and not large canopy trees. It was an issue in the front of the building, even with the high speeds that were traveled on Katella. It was not that easy to catch the sign on the building. He pointed to areas on the plans that would accommodate

trees to meet the tree requirement and compromise for the signage and visibility. Mr. Bell knew his business and his customers and what would work.

Mr. Bell stated they were located on Katella Avenue due to the high traffic count. They had moved from a higher traffic area that had been on Main Street in Santa Ana. To plant trees in front of the showroom windows and signs, would not work for his business; he wanted to expand and grow his business.

Public Comment

None.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the applicant was stating that he had submitted a plan that he was not in favor of?

Mr. Bell stated they were attempting to fit 19 trees on the property. The only way to accommodate that number would be to plant in front of the showroom.

Committee Member Woollett stated he understood the applicant had not agreed with the plans as submitted.

Mr. Bell stated that was correct; he had not agreed with planting the trees in front. He saw no reason to plant trees at the front of the building. He would be agreeable to plant trees along the side areas.

Committee Member Woollett stated if the applicant was not in favor of the proposed plans he would not want to act on those plans. He would want to continue the project to allow the applicant to submit a plan that the applicant could support; otherwise, he felt it was a waste of his time.

Mr. Bell stated he thought he had been requested to have a landscape architect draw up plans with 19 trees. He had understood it had been changed from 28 trees to 14 trees; all he was asking was to remove six trees from the front and add three trees in the corner.

Committee Member Woollett stated he would not discuss that with the applicant. They were dealing with fundamentals and he understood that the law required 28 trees and they had looked at the project previously and knew that it had not made sense for the project. The building sat right on the property line and no trees could be planted there. If they could not substantiate what they agreed on, that could be precedent-setting and create problems on other projects in the future. Other applicants would come forward not wanting to meet the tree requirements and the DRC had to be very careful in what they agreed on. The particular trees the landscape architect had selected on the plans were all small trees and also ones, from the photos, that were single stem trees. He had driven by the applicant's business a number of times and the Irv Seaver sign was very clear and that was all he ever saw and the motorcycles parked out front. Attempting to look into the display windows as he drove by was nearly impossible. The fact that the windows

were there was an inviting feature; however, there was no way he could look into the windows as he drove by. The concern was that the trees not conceal the signs in anyway, and it appeared to him from the plans, that the trees selected were a type that would never conceal the signs. The base of the foliage would be above the height of a motorcycle and those would be visible. He was having some trouble understanding the applicant's argument as it had not fit into what had been submitted. He heard the applicant loud and clear, but that was not how the City functioned, it was not the rule. The DRC needed to deal with the rules.

Mr. Bell stated what he had understood was that there needed to be plans drawn up with 19 trees and the reasons why those 19 trees on his site would not work. That was his understanding from the previous meeting and from what was sent to him in the mail.

Committee Member Woollett stated if the applicant presented a plan and they stated there was a visibility issue that only meant that the trees had been placed in the wrong place. The trees needed to be moved.

Mr. Bell pointed out an area that the trees could be moved to on the plans.

Committee Member Woollett asked why trees could not be planted in an area he pointed to on the plans?

Mr. Bell stated that was a display area.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that area he referred to was called out as bark mulch and asked if motorcycles were displayed on that area?

Mr. Bell stated that was concrete and clarified the area that Committee Member Wheeler spoke about. He pointed out the existing landscape areas, and noted an area that trees could not be planted in, as it would obscure visibility for people turning onto the road. He would be replacing the signs with new corporate signs and he understood there were rules that governed the signage placement. He would be moving the sign closer to the building.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she concurred with Committee Member Woollett's observations. She had not understood what he was attempting.

Mr. Bell stated that was what he had understood from the previous meeting. That he needed to prepare a plan and explain why it would not work for his business.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the meeting minutes reflected that the applicant had to meet the City Code for landscape requirements. The rules were the rules. There was the ability for the DRC to review the requirements and to make adjustments based on an argument that landscaping in a specific area would not work. During the previous meeting they had discussed allowing the applicant credit for the physical constraints that were part of the property, however, that had not meant that the applicant would not need to plant trees.

Mr. Bell stated he would have trees, but not in the front area that he pointed to on the plans. He could plant two/three trees in an area he pointed to on the plans and there would be trees on the side. The 19 trees had not made sense, as the rules called for 28 trees.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not remembered the exact numbers, but in the case of the applicant's building where it was built to the property line and would not accommodate any plantings there, they had deducted that length twice from the formula. Staff used that calculation to come up with a tree count. That calculation came up with 19 trees, which he felt was a very fair approach. He suggested moving some of the trees, to an area he pointed to on the plans. He thought the applicant might want to use something other than the Crape myrtle, such as a King or Queen palm tree, which would lessen the visibility issue.

Vice Chair Gladson stated if the DRC were to take action on the proposed project, based on the number of times they had reviewed it and the fact that the applicant was not in support of the landscape plan; she would want to deny it and start all over again. She was sensitive to possibly allowing the applicant to come up with another scheme. She was not in a position to support having no trees in the front, and could not give the applicant relief from the revised requirement of under 19. If they took the six trees out of the front, that would drop the tree count to 13, and she could not be in support of that.

Mr. Bell stated his understanding was that the two sides of the building were not included in the tree requirement and it had cut the requirement in half. Those two sides of the building would not accommodate tree plantings. He understood that the requirement had been 28, and half of 28 was 14 and he had looked at it based on that number. He would deduct one from an area he pointed to on the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he understood the calculation to not be at half of the requirement. The DRC had taken into consideration the side of the building that there could not be trees planted on based on the building's property line. There was nothing in the City requirements that addressed that problem. When there was a driveway along such a property line that area had been worked into the calculation for the tree requirement. The DRC felt the applicant's property was unique and that they could be a bit creative in what they had come up with.

Mr. Bell stated he felt the City had not wanted him to expand or build and he thanked the DRC.

Committee Member Woollett stated they had not wanted to set a precedent in that an applicant could come to the City and not want to meet a requirement and they would just allow that to happen.

Mr. Bell stated he would just not expand his business.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she was attempting to come up with a logical analogy.

Mr. Bell stated there was not one. For one year he had been fooling around and had spent $80,000.00 attempting to comply with the City's rules and if it had not made sense for him to remain in business, to make a living and expand his business in the City of Orange, then maybe

he should not build the project and that was what it amounted to. It made no sense that for a few trees; he had come up with a logical way to comply with the requirement, and now the DRC stated that it had not fit their cookie-cutter rule.

Vice Chair Gladson stated it had not had anything to do with a cookie-cutter approach; actually they were reviewing a tailored way of reviewing the applicant's project and finding an appropriate way to work with the requirement. They had reviewed projects like churches and the CHOC Hospital and from all gamuts of the community and they all had to meet the code.

Mr. Bell stated across the street from his house they had just leveled 10 acres of lawn area and replaced it with a parking lot; they took out trees and he had not seen a City inspector yet.

Vice Chair Gladson stated that property owner would need to come before the DRC or to the City if they wanted to improve that area.

Mr. Bell stated no, they would not. They just moved in. It was a school and he understood they played by different rules.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the reality was that they had to work within the requirements. They wanted his business to remain in Orange; to be successful and to complete the expansion. They had approved the expansion and bifurcated the landscape plan.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt the item should be continued to allow the applicant to think about the plans some more and to come up with a creative way to design it.

Mr. Califf asked if the applicant would be agreeable to using Palm trees?

Mr. Bell stated there was 6' from the sidewalk; the general rule was that the diameter of the tree should be the distance that the tree should be planted from the building and that would place the tree 3' from the sidewalk.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt that would not apply with a Palm tree. The foliage of the Palm tree would be above the building.

Mr. Califf stated the trees could be closer to the sidewalk.

Mr. Bell stated he personally felt there should not be any Palm trees planted in the county. If there was not a way to get around not planting trees in front of the showroom windows and to have his building not be a good motorcycle visibility building for display he would not build.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to continue the project.

Mr. Bell stated he would just not build. He asked if the Committee could approve his project as presented and then he could take that back and decide if he wanted to do it or not. He was tired of the Committee.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they could approve as presented or approve with changes in the types and placement of trees, as long as the tree requirement was met?

Mr. Bell stated he wanted to clarify that the requirement stated he had to have 28 trees, and the ruling that he was told that took the two sides of the un-plantable portions of his building out of the calculation, had cut the requirement down to half. He was sent correspondence from Staff that stated the required number of trees was 28, however, given the location and the circumstances with the west property line the tree count had gone to 19. He had understood that it was half of the requirement, which should have been 14.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she would be more inclined to have the applicant meet with Staff to gain clarification on the tree count calculation and she believed it was a misunderstanding on how that formula had been arrived at.

Mr. Bell stated he had lived in the City since about 1942 and he had not remembered ever voting for the tree law the City had.

Vice Chair Gladson stated it would not have been a public vote, but rather a City Council action that had been done 20-30 years ago.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the landscape improvements for DRC No. 4364-08, Irv Seaver BMW, as presented and subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report, and to also allow the applicant to develop an alternative plan with a change in the tree type for the trees along Katella Avenue and to relocate the trees along the frontage. Changes would not need to return to the DRC.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4423-09 – QUALITY SUITES FAÇADE REMODEL

- A proposal to remodel the façade of an existing leasing office building associated with a motel.
- 3101 W. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Mark Raber, address on file, stated they would be bringing out the front entry a little bit, to give it a bigger front entry. The inside wall would be brought out 8' to create a new entry and to remove the false gables. He pointed out on the plans the areas that would be changed. He also pointed out the color scheme that they proposed.

Applicant, Sue Lee, address on file, stated they would be making changes in the color to identify the lobby from the rest of the building, to allow patrons upon entering the property to be able to identify where the lobby was.

Public Comment

None.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated it seemed to him when he went through the project it was different than when he had previously gone through there, and he asked if there had been another remodel?

Mr. Raber stated there had been a stair upgrade.

Ms. Lee stated there had been a renovation to the stairway to meet code. There had been foam trim added to the fascia in January.

Committee Member Wheeler commented re: the drawings, if the two gables were removed the applicant would end up with a situation where an area (he pointed to on the plans) was 4' back from another plane. There would need to be another piece of roofing added; he asked the applicant if additional roofing was proposed?

Mr. Raber stated yes, there would be additional roofing and he pointed to that detail on the drawings.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he could not find that detail on the roof plan and the roof plans had not matched what existed. He pointed out the discrepancies on the drawings.

Mr. Raber stated that was probably an oversight on their part. Committee Member Wheeler reviewed the roof plans with him.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that an elevation on the plans noted a wing that lined up to a back face and on the floor plan it showed the wing lining up with the building and not the recessed gable. He felt the elevation was wrong. He noted other discrepancies; columns that were missing and stated it was difficult to determine what they wanted to do from the drawings. Another item that confused him was that the chimney appeared to be projected and it was not.

Mr. Raber stated it was at an angle, and pointed that out on the drawings.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the planes appeared to be one plane and turned at an angle and went back in.

Mr. Raber stated it went to an angle then turned back to a plane he pointed to on the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated no, it was one continuous plane; there was no line there without a division. The barge board wrapped slightly over the end of it, but there was not a break there.

Ms. Lee stated there was an angle there and it was divided.

Committee Member Wheeler discussed the corrections that needed to be made to the drawings. He stated his first problem was that the drawings needed some work. They needed to be cleaned up and there needed to be a roof plan that reflected actuality. His second problem was the design. One of the things the DRC was required to do in their findings was that the design had an internally consistent integrated design theme and to him it had not done that. The proposed changes consisted of new elements that had not occurred anywhere else in the project. There were all these new things; intricate moldings that went in weird angles, the canopy, false windows, the columns, and arches. The arches were different sizes and there was no real symmetry or consistency and the arch had not carried around the corner. There was a decorative ornament, some sort of large fancy light fixture, and there was so much stuff that was different. His feeling was that the proposed project needed to be simplified. It was the entry and the focal point of the project and the applicant should be able to do something different. He suggested that they add some new elements and colors to make it special, and to concentrate on those things and not attempt to add all the different elements to the proposed project.

Ms. Lee stated they added the canopy and anticipated adding canopies to the other buildings and it would tie into what they were adding. The future plan would be to have a canopy on each building.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if there was something they could add on the drawings to establish that those changes would happen?

Ms. Lee stated yes. They were still constructing the inside and developing everything on the other building. The particular design of the canopy would be added to the other buildings. She had not wanted the structure to appear as a big chimney without any architectural design; it would appear so plain. They could tailor it down; she could speak with the architect about the design.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that the design be simplified and cleaned up, and to add only a few entry elements.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she concurred with Committee Member Wheeler; it was too busy and there was too much going on. It was a good point to add attention to the lobby area to direct patrons, but she had difficulty making a finding that the design was internally consistent with anything else on the property.

Ms. Lee stated the look of the whole property was what the DRC should consider; they were attempting a French design. It would have all the curves and architectural molding and designs. She could see their point on some of the features.

Vice Chair Gladson asked for some clarification on the honey color they proposed to use. The colors had not given her too much of a problem.

Ms. Lee stated that color had been discussed between her and the architect and it would be used only for the trim.

Ms. Thakur stated that was not what had been presented.

Ms. Lee stated they would not use that color for the body of the property and she pointed out the color they proposed on the color samples she presented.

Ms. Thakur stated the honey color had been called out on the plans.

Ms. Lee asked Ms. Thakur if she had received the revised color palette proposal?

Mr. Raber stated they had originally had the honey color on the fascia, but they had changed their color placements.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the current discussion had her feeling that there were still issues that needed to be worked out.

Ms. Thakur stated one of the main concerns from Staff, regardless of what color they used, was the color they proposed on the remodel stopped abruptly and had not continued onto any other areas of the building.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was opposed to the color just stopping.

Committee Member Woollett asked if there was any honey color currently on the building?

Ms. Thakur stated no.

Ms. Lee stated the building had not been painted yet. There was a sand color and there was dark brown, but the honey color had not existed on the building.

Ms. Thakur asked if the applicant was considering using a color that appeared on the apartment complex across the street?

Committee Member Woollett stated he had not seen the colors in the photos that he had recalled seeing on that location. There were two red colors and as he came around there was a much more yellow color.

Ms. Thakur stated the only thing she had seen that was close to that color was on the apartments.

Committee Members Woollett and Cathcart stated they concurred with the comments made by Committee Member Wheeler.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they needed to simplify and he reviewed his suggestions with the applicants.

Mr. Raber asked if the DRC would want to see the future canopy additions on the next submittal?

Ms. Lee stated those would be added within three months, before the end of November. They owned the property; the only expenses were the remodeling and it had taken a lot of time for the approvals on the front. The height of the hotel business was June and July. They had not wanted to start any construction until after Labor Day. By that time they could order the canopy or awnings for the rest of the project. The renovation was costing $3,000,000 and they were paying cash for everything.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the changes to the building would be great and she would be supportive of the applicant pursuing that. Changing the gables had not troubled her; she wanted the plans to depict everything they wanted to do. The plans should be nice and simple, and it would probably be something that would have her support.

Ms. Lee stated she would want to address the landscaping with the DRC. They had hired a landscape architect. She was also being asked by her sign contacts when her sign would be started, but they could not give them a time frame without all the other things being approved.

Ms. Thakur stated Staff had nothing on their sign information and if the applicant wanted that to be approved they would need to submit their specifications.

Ms. Lee stated Choice International Hotels had their own sign vendor for that and it was out of their jurisdiction. She had wanted to use a local vendor.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to continue DRC No. 4423-09, Quality Suites Façade Remodel, with the suggestions and recommendations provided to the applicants.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(4) DRC No. 4429-09 - CIBOLA SYSTEMS

- A proposal to remodel an existing non-contributing industrial building, including landscape and site improvements.
- 180 S. Cypress Street & 527 W. Almond Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Susan Secoy Jensen, address on file, stated she was the architect on the project and also introduced the Landscape Architect, Paul Danel, who had worked with the business owner. The business owner was featured in Orange County Metro as one of the best companies to work for. They had started out more ambitious with the design and had refined things to work within the business owner's budget, who was applying for a SBA Loan. It was an $800,000 investment as far as the improvements went; that would entail cleaning up the property. She had initially designed a more elaborate lobby and clear story glass, and none of that would be occurring. They would be repairing what existed and the landscape would be enhanced. The color scheme was very simple, using galvanized metal and working with the red brick. They would be keeping it monochromatic and just cleaning up the property. She presented photos to the Committee to review. They were excited to get going on the project. They had the neighbors on board and had explained to them from the beginning what they were doing. Initially, senior housing had been wanted for that area, and after expressing what they were proposing, everyone had concurred it was a good thing.

Landscape Architect, Paul Danel, address on file, stated as far as the landscaping was concerned, they would be replacing portions of the existing concrete with interlocking pavers. Referring to areas on the plans, they would be eliminating some asphalt and keeping existing concrete areas for truck access. The landscaping would be redone in the front of the building to compliment the street trees. They would be replacing a tree that was in poor shape and matching the Camphor trees. There would be green screening along the streetscape to screen the wrought iron. The interior areas would incorporate natural grasses and low water plantings. There would be water harvesting tanks installed under the decks and they would be tapping into the large warehouse that could fill up with over 1,800 gallons of rain water and they would be able to use that for their watering. The courtyards would be private, but pleasing to the street line.

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated they were going for LEED Certification on their project. They had so many things going for it already: the location was near public transportation, bike riding, and they would be recycling. They would be using the corrugated metal from one building and using it for some repairs on the other building.

Mr. Danel stated they would be using piping to make vine trellises and everything they could to keep everything on site, instead of taking those things to a land fill. In replacing the parking lot

they would not be taking all the asphalt out. They would be doing an overlay on some of the asphalt areas.

Committee Member Woollett asked for additional information on the overlay.

Mr. Danel stated there were specifications for overlaying pavers on top of asphalt and much of the asphalt would not need to be removed. They would save money on demolition. The standard elevations would be for 4" and 6" and he only needed 4" for the pavers.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there would not be permeability for the water.

Mr. Danel stated that would be one downfall; the specifications would call for drainage along the border areas. There would be screen trees in the back, along the railroad tracks. The courtyard would be a great look for the business and surrounding areas.

Committee Member Cathcart stated he felt the variety of the plant material was excellent. He suggested looking into using Rotundaloba instead of Palo Alto for Liquidamber.

Public Comment

None.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Cathcart stated he would hate to see the proposed project marred by the Liquid Amber balls and he would also suggest when they got down to details to look at root barriers. He suggested panel barriers next to the hardscape areas and particularly around the Liquid Amber. He suggested using the Indian variety of Crape Myrtle, as they were mildew-resistant. He asked how they planned on containing the Golden Bamboo?

Mr. Danel stated it would be planted in a contained area that would be bordered by concrete and pathways.

Committee Member Cathcart asked if that would be at an extended depth in that area?

Mr. Danel stated in the past he had always used root barriers around them to contain that planting. It would be in a contained area and would not travel anywhere. He felt the use of that element would be a good screen between the parking lot and the building.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a call-out for the wrought iron fencing that had the curved element and he asked if they had looked at other possibilities? He had used a metal mesh material on a project that was un-climbable and was used a lot in Disneyland and was very nice looking.

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated they would certainly be open to that. She had met with the gate contractor and he was just in the infancy of putting together numbers and proposals and they could look at alternate proposals.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not liked the fencing that ran along the front of Fred Kelly Field, it looked like suicide fencing. The mesh material looked much better and there was not enough room to place your feet into it.

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated she spoke from experience and there was an issue with the area and they needed some type of fencing there.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the applicant could probably justify removing the very historic trees along the side and he asked the applicant if they needed to remove the trees from an area he pointed to on the plans?

Mr. Danel stated there were very large Ficas trees that were damaging the area and there had been some lifting; personally, he wanted to take those out to keep from any future sidewalk damage or tripping issues. There was one Canary Island Palm which he found unsightly; it was a rat's nest and there were seed droppings.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the wire mesh on the windows would be removed?

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated that would be removed and the glass would be repaired. The exterior would have a clean, historic glass element and the frames would be a charcoal color. The interior would have an anti-theft device.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the history department of the Orange Library would want photo documentation of the project?

Mr. Ryan stated that was a good idea.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the Staff Report noted that the project exceeded the area for the landscape requirement, and the first application they had reviewed was all about the tree numbers; she wanted clarification on whether the proposed project was okay with the code or had it applied to the project before them?

Mr. Ryan stated the question being was there a nexus between improvements that required an upgrade of all the landscaping. There was no additional square footage being added and they were mostly doing tenant improvements. Staff felt there was not a nexus for bringing the entire site up to code. The fact that they were improving the islands and landscaping the other features, Staff felt it was an excellent suggestion in improving the entire site. Staff could not have required the applicant to go as far as they had on the improvements. They were attempting to meet code, but were going beyond what the City would have asked for.

Vice Chair Gladson stated on the fencing they would be removing the razor wire and chain link, and she asked if there were areas that would remain?

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated some areas would remain. There was a gate and another gate would be added to an area she pointed to on the plans.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she reviewed the roof plan and it appeared that everything was screened.

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated there was screening. The mechanical equipment would remain and be screened.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if there would be a signage package presented at a later date?

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated her client had not wanted any signage, they were a destination business.

Vice Chair Gladson asked which one of the trees had not had a grate on it?

Mr. Danel pointed out which trees had grates on the streetscape.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4429-09, Cibola Systems, with the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the additional conditions:

1. The applicant prepare a historic photo documentation of the building for the Orange Public Library.
2. Use Rotundaloba species for the Liquidamber trees and the Indian variety for the Crape Myrtle.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled meeting on August 5, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

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

MOTION CARRIED.