# CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

March 17, 2010

Committee Members Present: Bill Cathcart

Adrienne Gladson Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Ed Knight, Assistant Community Development Director

Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

#### Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Cathcart opened the Administrative Session with a review of the Agenda.

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, stated there were no changes or additions to the Agenda.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes and noted corrections and changes.

There was no further discussion.

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

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

### Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

### **ROLL CALL:**

All Committee Members were present.

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:**

Opportunity for members of the public to address the Design Review Committee on matters not listed on the Agenda.

There was none.

### **CONSENT ITEMS:**

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

### (1) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**: March 3, 2010

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee Meeting of March 3, 2010, with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

#### **AGENDA ITEMS:**

**Continued Items**: None

New Agenda Items:

### (2) DRC No. 4442-09 - POMEROY PLACE APARTMENTS

- A proposal to demolish an existing residential structure and detached garage to construct two (2)-two-story, five bedroom residential units.
- 768 N. Glassell Street
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Leason Pomeroy III, address on file, stated the proposed project consisted of two little buildings with a total square footage of approximately 3,600 square feet. The buildings were approximately 800 square feet on each floor; they were very small. The buildings would be built on a single lot that originally had a home and garage located on it. It was in a transition zone and they were looking to lease the units to students as they would be in walking and bicycling distance to the campus. He expected in time that the home adjacent to the proposed site would come down and there were apartment buildings in the area. The density on the lot next door was unbelievable and it was a business. The basic idea for the proposed project was that they would want to have five girls in each of the buildings; they would include a kitchen, living and dining areas and it would be a typical house that would include a study area and designed to accommodate students. In looking at the different architectural designs in the area, he had believed there was a structure across the street with a flat roof and some parapets and others had open gables and some with closed gables. He put together a combination of those and he had wanted to keep the height down at the street with the buildings setback. The buildings had a short parapet at the front with the roofs kicked up to emulate some of the surrounding structures and a sloped roof. There was a skylight that was above the stairwell with four bedrooms located around that space. The lower levels were carved out around the entry area with windows. Two sides of the building almost completely opened up to the outside for outside dining and activities on the outside. The upper level contained windows and to add some articulation to the upper level he proposed the use of awnings. He presented the proposed color scheme. He stated he would use perforated metal material for the awnings, probably stainless that could be colored to match or accent the building colors. Outside of the front setback there would be a wall to articulate the old picket fence idea of the homes and would allow additional privacy to the entry. The City would ultimately do a take and the curb would move back and the setback was included in the proposal.

#### **Public Comment**

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item for discussion by the Committee.

Committee Member Woollett asked what was the basis for the parking requirement?

Mr. Garcia stated the parking could be based on either a R-3 or student housing; either way with the proposed project the total number required spaces would be five, which was met, and it was based on the number of bedrooms.

Committee Member McCormack stated that would be 10 bedrooms.

Committee Member Woollett stated with 10 bedrooms it would be one car per every two bedrooms.

Committee Member McCormack stated in actuality it would probably be 10 cars.

Mr. Pomeroy stated there were many students at Chapman University that did not have cars and they rode bikes.

Committee Member McCormack stated living next to him were five people with five cars. They all had cars.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the site was gender specific as he had mentioned five girls?

Mr. Pomeroy stated no; however, he would prefer to rent to girls but was not certain how he would do that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was an article in the Los Angeles Times about the trend towards co-ed dorms and dorm rooms.

Committee Member Gladson stated that Mr. Pomeroy would own and manage the site and it would be his challenge.

Mr. Pomeroy agreed. With all that was going on with the University and the Police Department, he understood what all that was and they would want to manage it well.

Committee Member McCormack asked with the parking requirement would there be the need to have red curbs painted and no parking signs on site?

Mr. Pomeroy stated there was no parking on a street he pointed to on the model.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was referring to the area on the plans and not the street.

Mr. Pomeroy stated no one had mentioned that there would be a restriction.

Mr. Garcia stated the Fire Department had not requested any "no parking" on site and he believed sprinklers were being provided in both structures.

Mr. Pomeroy stated they also met the requirements for the hose length. He stated that one interesting point for the site was that it had to be pervious; there was nothing on the site that would hold water, with the exception of the roof.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had run into that situation on a project in another community and the soils engineer had stated that the soil, not only would it not take water, but if it would it would endanger the building and the buildings next door due to the soil type. His client had not wanted to jeopardize the project, but he had gone to the City and they had dropped the requirement.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had the same situation on a project at the Environmental Nature Center, a place where they would want to use pervious pavement and they had proposed that. Through the process of soil testing, the soils engineer had stated they could not have pervious paving due to the soil type.

Mr. Pomeroy stated understanding the City of Orange there had to be 50' of sand under there, the whole town was sand. He stated what they would do in pulling the permit was that they would condition the permit that if there were problems with the neighboring buildings based on the City's requirement it would be up to the City to fix the problem.

Chair Cathcart asked who had inflicted the size of the trees on the project?

Mr. Pomeroy stated those were the trees he had in his little box.

Chair Cathcart stated the reason he brought that up was there were smaller tree pockets than root balls; the root balls would be too large for the pockets and he suggested that the trees be smaller to fit into the tree pockets.

Mr. Pomeroy stated they would need to have a landscape architect assist with those elements as the model being presented was an architect's conception.

Chair Cathcart stated the Melaleuca hegophila had root problems. The tree was drought tolerant, but to plant a Melaleuca in a 24" pocket would present problems.

Committee Member McCormack stated the other problem was that it would not look like a tree. Basically it was a shrub that could be trained into a tree. It grew with many trunks, and he had a Melaleuca at his home that he had for 10-12 years that finally died. It was not due to care it was a short lived shrub and not even a tree. He had seen the small footprints and would suggest that they be larger to allow for more ground space. He felt the applicant had simplified things and that was good as a concept and there were some plant choices that he probably would not have chosen himself, but now in reviewing the model there were other trees and suggested they use something other than the Melaleuca. Pointing to zones on the model, he asked why had there not been a tree placement to shade the parking to reduce the heat gain?

Mr. Pomeroy stated the sun would come around the other way from the south. They could add another tree for shade.

Committee Member McCormack suggested using larger trees to do the heavy lifting.

Mr. Pomeroy stated originally they had proposed a shade structure between the two buildings. But through the SRC process the structure went away, which was too bad as the thought had been to have a vine on the trellis area.

Committee Member McCormack suggested installing an efficient irrigation system. He stated most of the heads were rated for 8', 12', or 15' and the width of the turf panels should be the same to obtain a maximum amount of spacing for the irrigation system and less water use.

Chair Cathcart suggested in the area around the trees that would be planted in turf, to have enough of an area with mulch in it so the trees would not get weed whacked.

Committee Member McCormack suggested where the ping pong table was to plant a hedge that could be added to separate the area from the cars.

Committee Member Woollett stated he thought it was a great project and students would be much better on that street instead of in the residential areas. From a design standpoint it fit in there beautifully and the colors were great.

Committee Member Gladson stated there were Notes on Page 11 that stated there were places to park 10 bicycles.

Mr. Pomeroy stated there were bike racks on each side and pointed out the area on the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the driveway needed to be so wide?

Mr. Garcia stated it needed to be that wide for two way access and fire access. They had looked at that through the SRC and that was the requirement.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was concerned that there would be cars parked in that area. He asked if there had been any thought given, as the front unit was turned away from the street, to add something that would lure pedestrians down the walkway, such as a strip of tile or something that would suggest a walkway. He was concerned with extra cars parked along the walkway.

Mr. Pomeroy stated that was a good idea.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a lot of information missing on the carport cover. It was noted as steel and that it sloped; he asked if the fascia sloped with the roof?

Mr. Pomeroy stated that he hadn't done anything with it because the parking dimension had changed from 8'-6" to 9'-0" and it had affected the carport. He wanted to keep it as a skinny line with vertical columns.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the same material as the gable would be used?

Mr. Pomeroy stated it would be corrugated metal with a metal fascia and it would be cantilevered.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on Sheet No. 3 the window shown in Bedroom No. 3 had not seemed to stack with the sliding glass door below it and that also occurred with Bedroom No. 4 window; it had not stacked with the dining room. It appeared that the windows were reversed on the upper floor with the bigger window in Bedroom No. 5 and the smaller window in Bedroom No. 4. He reviewed the plans and the window placements with the applicant.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the elevation sheet there was a call out for the west elevation rear unit, but it was obviously not the west unit. A window was also missing and he pointed it out on the plans and suggested materials for different areas of the buildings. He asked on the ventilation for the attic, generally there would be ventilation of the eave and then have a ridge; he was not certain how the proposed plan would achieve proper ventilation. If the applicant wanted to be really bold he could use about a 20" diameter gable vent to do something strong, depending on the efficiency of the vent. If a section was cut through on the gable end they might find that the end needed to be raised a bit, because there might be a problem with the depth of the flat roof framing. On the roof plan the down spouts were shown on an area he pointed to on the plans and he asked would they duck back through another area he pointed to on the plans?

Mr. Pomeroy stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would need to be snaked around that area and suggested the downspout could be in the middle and create its own element. Exterior gutters would be nice.

Committee Member Wheeler asked why were there shade devices added to the north side of the building?

Mr. Pomeroy stated he wanted it to look nice.

Chair Cathcart asked the Committee Members if there was anything that they discussed that was more than just suggestions?

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed with Committee Member Wheeler about the addition of a walkway.

Mr. Pomeroy stated he agreed with that suggestion.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were all types of materials that could be used; there were pervious products, or they could use pavers with pebbles in the center.

Mr. Garcia stated there was an example at the new Carl's Jr.

Mr. Pomeroy stated he had visited the Walgreen's and it was probably the worst example of pervious material use that he had seen; it was white and had chewing gum and oil in it.

Committee Member Gladson stated they had discussed that project and the DRC had conveyed that they wanted some input on the water quality issues.

Mr. Pomeroy stated on a small project where there was not too much natural ground it would be a challenge and he was not certain how expensive the material was as they would need a lot of it.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested another area where a hedge could be added.

Committee Member Cathcart suggested the use of bollards in an area he pointed to on the plans.

Mr. Pomeroy stated in an earlier concept they had thought about installing a fence around the property with gates.

Chair Cathcart asked Mr. Garcia if he had written down the DRC Members suggestions?

Mr. Garcia stated he had taken notes.

Committee Member Gladson stated just as an FYI for the DRC Members, they had seen a lot of projects that had come to them with photovoltaics and was it something that could be pursued on the proposed project, or possibly place the wiring in to install at a later date?

Mr. Pomeroy stated if he was using the building for himself he would consider that to minimize the utility bill. There were a lot of added costs; the paving would be brutal and breaking up the design into two separate residences would give a more communal feel and more personal living spaces. He had worked on another scheme on another property that had three little buildings with only four girls per building. He would have liked to have added an outdoor recreation area, but the lot was so small and it became smaller with the City taking the curb.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4442-09, Pomeroy Place Apartments, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the suggestions presented by the DRC Committee Members.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

## **ADJOURNMENT:**

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee Meeting on Wednesday, April 7, 2010. The meeting adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.